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Introduction

The 1990s’ introduction of post-colonial theory into Joyce criticism has brought about a thorough reassessment of Joyce’s relationship to politics and history in general, and British imperialism and Irish nationalism in particular. In contrast to the New Critical vision of his work as the manifestation of an apolitical, cosmopolitan modernist aestheticism, his texts have come increasingly to be seen as complex – most often subversive – sites of ideological involvement. The “Cyclops” episode of *Ulysses*, which most explicitly engages with the issue of Irish nationalism, has been at the forefront in this process. The chapter’s engagement with Irish nationalism, noted by the first commentators, underwent a particularly vigorous reappraisal in the past decade. This process evinced a shift from associating nationalism exclusively with the xenophobic citizen’s nostalgia and violence against Bloom to problematising the issue by contextualised readings accommodating the discourses of imperialism and nationalism. My inquiry aims to further this ongoing critical enterprise by placing the episode in the discursive context of Irish cultural nationalism.

Highlighting the text against the backdrop of Irish cultural nationalism in general, not only the 1890s Celtic Revival, which provided the most immediate cultural context for Joyce and which has hitherto been mostly targeted, I explore how the text ironically re-inscribes crucial discursive formations arising out of an organic conception of the nation, and how it subversively enlists the key cultural means of their dissemination. Not denying the validity of analyses emphasising that the chapter stages how extreme nationalist sentiment boils over into physical violence towards a stigmatised other, I focus rather on how the discursive violence of nationalist sentiment – mostly, but not exclusively focused in the citizen’s rhetoric – is subversively counteracted in the episode both thematically – on the levels of plot and characterisation – and, more important, formally, by means of textual praxis.
“Nationality, [. . .] nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind,” argues Benedict Anderson in his seminal study on the emergence and spread of the modern phenomenon of nationalism (4). Nations came to be imagined in terms of communities with a unique spiritual, cultural identity, as “pristine but continually evolving historical communities” (Hutchinson 38) with the dawn of Romanticism at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The idea – rooted in German idealism and consciously adopted, among others, in Ireland by the Young Irelanders, a group of 1840s intellectuals – was disseminated by cultural, educational projects aspiring to homogenise heterogeneity, to create an authentic homogeneous national identity that belies all apparent gaps and divisions.\(^1\)

While there was never a unanimous agreement as to the exact nature and location of the unique spirit of the Irish nation, proliferating cultural nationalist projects throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century invariably appealed to the Gaelic past – myths and legends and folklore, their modern day preserver – for authenticity and legitimacy in their endeavour to create the future, emphasising the existence of a basic continuity that connects an ideal origo, the apparently ruptured present and a redemptive future – a sort of teleological safeguard of the nation’s aspirations.

I argue that the dense texture of the “Cyclops” episode functions as a heterogeneous site of ironic counterdiscourses challenging discursive formations drawing on the two basic aspirations of diverse cultural nationalist projects – creating a homogeneous communal identity and representing the temporality of the nation in organicist terms as a teleological development. I have found the context of Irish cultural nationalism particularly apt for such a hitherto unattempted extended study of the episode since it

\(^1\) Most cultural critics and historians – David Lloyd, Kevin Whelan, Terry Eagleton, Tom Dunne, D. George Boyce – agree that the Romantic concept of the spiritual nation first manifested itself in Ireland in the cultural nation-building campaign of the Young Irelanders in the 1840s. Mary Helen Thuente, however, argues that cultural nationalism appeared in Ireland with the United Irishmen in the 1790s. John Hutchinson, in turn, locates
1. can ascribe irony to several puzzling formal – structural and stylistic – games in the episode, major cruces of Joyce criticism, such as the use of a narrator (the only one in the whole of *Ulysses*), the split structure of the chapter – a stylistically and perspectively disjointed, fractured body of narrative – and the nominal economies of the episode,

2. can reveal and/or create not readily visible subtextual/intertextual dramas subversively re-staging diverse cultural nationalist *topoi* and subversively enrolling cultural vehicles of inventing the Irish nation – newspapers, ballads, and drama,

3. and most importantly, enables me to tackle the function of one of the most problematic and hitherto scarcely discussed formal features of the chapter: its numerous lengthy lists. Two of the most monstrous lists provide the dynamic foci of two chapters. The context of Irish cultural nationalism can reveal and/or create ironic formal and thematic – heterogeneising and countereleological – dynamics operating within the lists, which counteract the discursive violence of the nameless narrator’s zone.

The method I deploy is that of the archaeologist. Drawing on the work of theoreticians of the modern idea of the nation such as Anderson, Homi K. Bhabha, and John Hutchinson; cultural critics focusing on Ireland such as Kevin Whelan, David Lloyd, Oliver MacDonagh, Luke Gibbons, Richard Kearney, Declan Kiberd, Joep Leerssen, Mary Helen Thuente, C. L. Innes, Mary Trotter, and Seamus Deane; those who critique teleological modes of historical imagination such as Hayden White and Michel Foucault; and applications of their findings to Joyce’s texts by Vincent J. Cheng, Robert Spoo, James Fairhall, Emer Nolan, Marjorie
Howes, Derek Attridge, and so forth; as well as on ample documentary sources – such as revivalist histories of Ireland, popular journalism, music and theatre, and the manuscripts of *Ulysses* in progress – I contextualise and historicise discursive formations and the vehicles of their dissemination woven into the composite texture of “Cyclops” to better illuminate the ideologically subversive implications of their use. Since “Cyclops” is one of the few episodes of *Ulysses* in which Joyce totally changed his compositional strategies, scrutinising the genetic development of the episode yields precious insights into the text’s subversive dynamics.

Preparatory to anything else, however, to locate my inquiry in the critical discourse, I briefly survey the history of the discussions of nationalism in relation to “Cyclops,” paying special attention to the results of the past decade.

**Through the Critical Looking Glasses**

“Good puzzle would be cross Dublin without passing a pub,” thinks Leopold Bloom in the early morning of 16 June 1904. It would be an equally good puzzle to work one’s way through the amassed criticism on the “Cyclops” episode of *Ulysses* without passing a reference to Irish nationalism. Although the currently predominant concern with the political, ideological implications of Joyce’s texts began to supplant previous depoliticising – de-contextualising, de-historicising, de-culturalising – readings only two decades ago, “Cyclops” deals with political issues so explicitly that this aspect was noted even in the heyday of New Criticism. Joyce himself ascribed “politics” as an art to the episode in his schema popularised later by Stuart Gilbert. The politics of the episode, in turn, was for decades primarily –

---

2 Pinted in Gilbert’s *Ulysses* and reprinted in Richard Ellmann’s *Ulysses on the Liffey*, Appendix. “Cyclops” has been described as “the political chapter of *Ulysses*” (Manganiello 138), “the most politically committed piece of fiction that Joyce ever produced” (Parrinder 172), and “the episode [. . .] most rich in political theme and reference” (Rodstein 146). In 1977 Charles Peake argued that although “[i]t is often suggested that, in his writings, Joyce is apolitical and amoral, [. . .] this chapter alone proves to the contrary” (242).
almost exclusively – discussed in terms of Joyce’s moral (satirical) repudiation of Irish nationalism. As Enda Duffy diagnosed in 1995, “critics invariably characterize ‘Cyclops’ as the set-piece in which Joyce, with the heartfelt agreement of his readers, sends up chauvinistic and ignorant Irish nationalism” (109). More particularly, the episode for a long time was unanimously read “as a magisterial deflation of the tradition of physical force republicanism, which is always identified, perhaps anachronistically, as a highly pernicious discourse,” as Susan Sola de Rodstein noted three years later (153). To some extent, such a reading relied on Joyce’s own cue. At an early stage of the episode’s composition, in a letter to his Zurich friend, Frank Budgen, he described the citizen, the figure dominating the scene in Barney Kiernan’s pub, where the episode is set, as a “Fenian,” and ascribed “Fenian” as a symbol to the episode in the Gorman-Gilbert schema. As Joyce explained to his Italian audience in one of his Triestine articles (1907-12) aiming to give a sketchy outline of his country’s cultural history, Fenianism had come to mean the Irish “insurrectionist movement,” the physical force wing of nationalism (CW 188). Thus, Budgen and several other critics partly echo Joyce in their description of the citizen as a “Fenian giant, representative of the most one-eyed nationalism” (Budgen 155), a “Fenian living on his past” (Hayman, “Cyclops” 264), or a “Fenian Cyclops” (Manganiello 138). Some recent readings carry on this assessment, albeit

---

3 According to James Maddox, the episode is “one of the strongest ethical centres of the book” (86), while Philip Herring has argued that “Cyclops” is the place in Ulysses where Joyce flagrantly abandons his general “moral neutrality” (qtd. in Nolan 92).

4 Patrick Parrinder sums up the political “message” of “Cyclops” as “a rejection of the violence and hatred engendered by the two opposing political systems, British imperialism and Irish nationalism” (172). Dominic Manganiello in the first book length study of Joyce’s Politics (1980) argues that “[i]t is the Sinn Féin philosophy, employing violent rhetoric, proclaiming, ‘We’ll put force against force,’ that Joyce is primarily attacking” (137). A noteworthy exception from, or rather modulation of this critical paradigm is Marylin French’s discussion of “Cyclops” (1976). Although French quintessentially sums up “Cyclops” as a chapter “about war and aggression” (139), and notes that “[i]t appears at first that Joyce has come out of the closet in this chapter, that he has openly labelled something as good, another thing as evil,” she concludes with the Freudian touch that “[e]ven Bloom is aggressive in this chapter. Aggressiveness is as inherent in the human being as sexuality” (156).
they eschew the moralising tone of earlier critics. According to James Fairhall, “[t]he citizen represents the blustery, public face of physical force nationalism” (178), while Duffy goes so far as to anachronistically call the citizen “the Irish terrorist in Ulysses,” describing “Cyclops” at large as “the episode of the book that confronts Irish nationalist terrorism” (114).

Such an evaluation of the chapter’s politics for a long time relied on the humanist assumption that Joyce was an avowed pacifist and liberal humanist, who abhorred any form of violence, and whose attitude toward Irish nationalism in general could be best “characterised as one of disgust and frustration” (Callow 190). Thus, while the citizen was castigated for his belligerence, his “blind” and “grotesque chauvinism” (Hayman, “Cyclops” 247), Bloom, identified as Joyce’s spokesman in “Cyclops,” became elevated into “a vessel of value” (Schwarz 180), an “ethical hero” (Maddox 86) courageously “speaking for peace and love in a den of violent fools” (Hayman, “Cyclops” 250). Bloom’s valorisation took its most eloquent and absurd form in descriptions of his role in “Cyclops” as Christ-like.

This critical paradigm underwent a wholesale reappraisal in the past decade, largely as a result of the postcolonial turn in Joyce studies, which radically altered and greatly diversified the vision of Joyce’s relationship to Irish nationalism in general. As Marjorie Howes and Derek Attridge noted in 2000, “[t]he rise of postcolonial perspectives in Irish

---

5 Joyce wrote to Budgen in June 1919: “The chapter of the Cyclops is being lovingly moulded in the way you know. The Fenian is accompanied by a wolfhound who speaks (or curses) in Irish. He unburdens his soul about the Saxo-Angles in the best Fenian style and with colossal vituperativeness alluding to their standard industry” (Letters I 126). In his other schema sent to Carlo Linati in 1921 Joyce ascribed “Nation,” “State” and “Fanaticism,” among others, as symbols to the episode.

6 In his seminal biography of Joyce, Richard Ellmann argues that in his art Joyce “expressed his only piety, a rejection, in humanity’s name and comedy’s method, of fear and cruelty” (Joyce 379). According to Manganiello, Joyce took a stand “against political violence and against the physical force tradition in Irish history” (4).

7 As opposed to the vilification of the citizen as a “monster” (Sultan 242), “brutally nationalistic” (Mason 52), the embodiment of “the ugly face of Irish nationalism,” (Parrinder 72) or of “all that’s worst about Ireland” (Hodgart 101), Bloom was described as an “innocent man,” “a reasonable man among partisans” (Budgen 165), “a true hero” “allowed to state an ethical view which is superior to that of the people around him” (Ellmann, Liffey 114), “the triumphant representative of humanism” (Hodgart 103), to mention just a few examples.

8 Legions of critics contributed to the reification of such a vision. Stanley Sultan describes Bloom as “a bringer of light and deliverer” (56), Peake calls him “the prophet of love among savages and pagans” (241), according to Matthew Hodgart, he “speaks with the voice of Christ” (102), while in Daniel Schwarz’s words, “the execution, trial, and resurrection of Bloom has the effect of establishing him as a Christ figure” (179).
studies has generated a good deal of controversy, nowhere more so than in Joyce scholarship; in a 1996 review, Colm Tóibín quipped that ‘the battle for the soul of Joyce has become almost as intense in recent years as the battle for the GPO in Easter Week’ ” (4). As the unified portrait of Joyce as an apolitical modernist cosmopolitan aesthete has become splintered in the course of this intense and unresolved battle into multiple, often conflicting portraits – Joyce, the modern Irish writer with variously assessed nationalist leanings; Joyce, the Irish writer, whose textual politics can be associated with subaltern practices; Joyce, the Irish writer occupying the same strategic location as Irish revisionist historians; or Joyce, the split colonial subject partly caught in the discursive nets of nationalism – so the unanimous vision of the politics of “Cyclops” has become diversified into often conflicting assessments.

Evidently, one of the main targets of the wholesale reappraisal of the politics of “Cyclops” has been the tone of Joyce’s representation of the citizen and Bloom’s relation to it. In the past decade or so several critics have taken away the ethical palm from Bloom and dismissed the earlier view that Joyce’s representation of the citizen constitutes a satirical attack on one-eyed nationalism – mostly on the grounds of the numerous overlaps between Joyce’s views in his Triestine writings and the citizen’s utterances. Rodstein, in her excellent 1998 article on “Cyclops,” has labelled readings making the citizen “the scapegoat of Ulysses, the incarnation of all that Joyce (Bloom) finds repulsive” anachronistic in that they magnify violence portrayed in the episode in the retrospective light of the events in Ireland during the time of the episode’s composition – the guerrilla warfare and the civil war of 1919-22 (178). As she points out, in and around the quiescent and politically multivalent year of

---

9 While Ellmann and Manganiello emphasise Joyce’s sympathy for Arthur Griffith’s Sinn Féin policy, Emer Nolan in James Joyce and Nationalism (1995) aims to dissociate Joyce from Griffith, and emphasises his leanings towards certain aspects of the republican tradition of Irish nationalism (22).
10 See Cheng’s Joyce, Race and Empire, Duffy’s The Subaltern Ulysses and Lloyd’s Anomalous States.
11 See especially Theresa O’Connor and J. G. Watson.
12 See especially Rodstein and Semicolonial Joyce, a collection of essays edited by Howes and Attridge.
13 Robert Bell and David Lloyd have persuasively challenged descriptions of Bloom in “Cyclops” as “exemplary hero,” “the voice of the future” (Bell 142-44 and Lloyd 110).
1904, the ambiguous endorsement of physical force was characteristic of all modes of nationalist discourse as much as of Joyce’s Triestine writings, which work both against and within nationalistic discourses (155-57, 175). Thus, Rodstein reinscribes the effect of the citizen’s representation in terms of “comic pathos and irony” instead of satire (179) and describes Bloom’s role as “functionally oppositional rather than precisely categorizable” (174).

The most radical redefinition of this aspect of the episode’s politics has been attempted by Emer Nolan in her major book-length revision of Joyce’s relation to nationalism (1995). Slighting Bloom’s utterances as evasive and monologic (97) – a quality previously associated with the citizen – she ascribes a virulent energy to the citizen’s discourse, and posits a kind of complicity between the citizen and Joyce in that both use as “means of attack” verbal techniques – satire and invective – derived from the same colonial Dublin community (93). In contradistinction to Rodstein and Nolan, Donald E. Morse redeems not the citizen but the representation of nationalism in “Cyclops” from earlier negative portraits by describing Bloom’s role in the episode in terms of an “inclusive, multi-Irish nationalism” as opposed to the less palatable “exclusive nationalism” of the citizen (177-78).

The growing diversification in the critical assessment of the chapter’s politics has greatly been facilitated by the increasing tendency to read the text in the light of recent critiques of nationalism, and against diverse discursive backgrounds. Fairhall in his book-length study of Joyce’s representation of history in Ulysses (1993) and Vincent J. Cheng in his groundbreaking postcolonial reading of Joyce, Joyce, Race and Empire (1995) apply Anderson’s analysis of the nation in terms of an imagined community to illuminate Joyce’s representation of the “pathologies of Irish nationalism [and] racism” in “Cyclops” (Fairhall 182). Within this general theoretical framework, Cheng explores how “Cyclops” represents

---

14 See Rodstein, Gibson, Nolan.
the discourse of radical Celticism, constructing the Irish nation on the basis of racial purity, in
the citizen’s figure, at the same time offering an alternative to it through the agency of Bloom.
It is not without irony that Cheng, focusing on how “Cyclops” exposes and surpasses the
binary traps of radical Celticism, discusses the episode entirely in binary terms – violent,
xenophobic citizen, in whom “all [the] binary structures get focused” (208) versus reasonable
Bloom, who “like Joyce refuses to be sucked into their trap” (208).

Duffy in The Subaltern Ulysses (1994) redefines the chapter’s politics in terms of its
exposure of colonial interpellative strategies, especially that of stereotyping – identifying
Bloom and the citizen in “Cyclops” as “the Ariel and Caliban of Ulysses, the two sides of
colonialist portraits of the colonised other now presented together by a native writer” (111)
and argues that “Cyclops” offers novel representational strategies through which some form
of postcolonial subjectivity can be constituted (115). It is also highly ironic that Duffy’s initial
ambition to radically redefine the episode’s politics boils down to the conventional conclusion
that “[a]s such, ‘Cyclops’ stages Bloom’s own potentially revolutionary moment, represented
in such a way as to also open the reader’s eyes” (129).

Rodstein, by contrast, gives a less radical but a genuinely refreshing re-reading of the
issue of violence in the chapter by mapping the intricate interwebbings of its Cyclopean
representation and the discourse of the Irish revolutionary tradition, especially its
manifestation in popular cultural forms. While Cheng and Duffy ascribe a progressive,
liberating effect to the textual politics of “Cyclops” – mainly focused in Bloom’s utterances –
undermining the oppressive discourses of nationalism and imperialism, according to Rodstein,
Joyce’s representation of nationalism in “Cyclops” shows that nationalism is not a discourse
“to be easily ‘transcended’ in the mock-ascension of the oppositional ‘ben Bloom Elijah’ as
though it were just one more language for Joyce to master. It is a net as vast and as ludicrous
as the Citizen’s gigantified handkerchief map of Ireland – a compelling comic instrument but not one Joyce could contain or simply rise above, chariot or no chariot” (149).

The discourse of Irish cultural nationalism, the conceptual framework of my analyses, has also been taken up as a relevant context in which the textual politics of “Cyclops” can be illuminated. Hugh Kenner, as early as 1956, noted that revivalism is one of the targets of “Cyclops” (255), Andrew Gibson and Len Platt, however, elevated it into “the target of ‘Cyclops’” in the 1990s (Platt 144). While Platt in his book-length revision of Joyce’s relation to the Anglo-Irish Literary Revival (1998) gives a sketchy overview of how numerous Cyclopean strategies ironically comment on Revivalist discursive practices, Gibson in a 1991 article, exclusively devoted to “Cyclops,” focuses on how the episode functions as a sustained thematic as well as formal “assault on Revivalist historiographies and constructions of Irish history, and the aesthetics and politics implicit in them” (54). David Lloyd’s more abstract inquiry, in turn, in Anomalous States (1993), suggests that Joyce’s anti-representational literary strategies in Ulysses in general, and in “Cyclops” in particular, work contrary to cultural nationalist representational politics and aesthetics. My approach to “Cyclops” is probably closest to Lloyd’s claim that the episode “circulates not only thematically but also stylistically around adulteration as the constitutive anxiety of nationalism” (106).

As this sketchy overview suggests, the post-colonial turn in Joyce criticism has produced several refreshing re-readings of the politics of “Cyclops,” yet, as Anne Fogarty observed at the 2002 Trieste Joyce Symposium, the decades-long critical habit to reduce the complex narrative structure of “Cyclops” into a political allegory has not been completely superceded. The lapse into this old mould is most evident in the most pronouncedly post-colonial readings of Cheng and Duffy. My tightly focused deep-digging inquiry aims to map the multiple intricate ways whereby “Cyclops” resists such an assessment, thus it shows the
greatest affinity with those of Gibson, Rodstein and Lloyd, who have shifted the focus from
the duel between the citizen and Bloom, and have highlighted Cyclopean textual politics in
terms of their interaction with modes of nationalist discourses. Although my analyses are
heavily indebted to these readings, they also point beyond them. While Rodstein and Gibson
concentrate on how “Cyclops” engages with one particular discourse – the discourse of Irish
revolutionary violence and Revival historiography respectively – my aim is to show that the
episode is made up of vastly heterogenous elements staging and intricately subverting diverse
nationalist discursive practices. Also, although Lloyd has greatly influenced my thinking
about the politics of “Cyclops,” while Lloyd eschews the demonstration of how his theoretical
observations actually operate in the text, the novel reading strategy I deploy aims to
demonstrate theoretical propositions in their concrete textual operations, illuminating several
recesses of the text hitherto ignored or scarcely dwelt on, as well as one of the most
conspicuous, but least examined formal elements of the episode, the numerous lengthy lists.

In the bulkiest second chapter, through the dynamic focus of one of the monstrous lists
in the episode, I offer a corrective to a reified critical vision concerning the target of Joyce’s
representation of the citizen. In contrast to legions of critics – humanists, like Budgen,
Hayman, Ellmann, Parrinder, Mason, Sicker, and pronouncedly non-humanists such as
Cheng, Fairhall, Gibson, Rodstein – who describe him either as a Fenian, the embodiment of
a “narrow-gauge nationalism,” or identify him with Michael Cusack, historical founder of the
Gaelic Athletic Association, Joyce’s initial model for the citizen, I hope to show that the
citizen is a much more complex construct than any such simple definition could sum up, since
the adulteration, which the chapter dramatises at virtually every level, is also dramatised in
the discursive motley of this anonymous figurehead.

The opening chapter of the thesis to some extent functions as a complement to this
introduction, since in contradistinction to the next four chapters where I examine the text’s
engagement with the discourse of Irish cultural nationalism by focusing on particular textual
details, mainly revealing/creating hitherto unnoted textual dynamics, in the first chapter I
discuss how some overall structural and stylistic features – upon which a considerable amount
of critical commentary has already been amassed – can be ironically illuminated by the
context of Irish cultural nationalism. While here in the introduction I have briefly surveyed
the development of the critical treatment of the chapter’s representation of nationalism, in the
first chapter my argument will be wrought by the critical assessment of the numerous holistic
critical statements concerning overall formal features of the episode.
Chapter 1

“The Epic Proceeds Explanatorily”: Ironisation of Form

“Cyclops” is one of the few episodes of *Ulysses* in which Joyce radically changed his compositional strategies in the course of writing. In June 1919 soon after the inception of the episode, he described his method to his Zurich friend, Budgen, as “the epic proceeds explanatorily” (*Letters* I 126) and planned to make use of what he called the “initial style” of *Ulysses* – the familiar interior monologue technique facilitating direct access to the mental processes of the protagonists – as the early drafts of the episode show. Yet, the end product denies direct access to Bloom’s mind, and instead of offering an explanatory crutch, baffles the reader with its heterogeneous web of conflicting discourses. A nameless narrator’s linear story-telling asymmetrically alternates with parodic mimicries of written discourses – variably referred to as interpolations, asides, insertions or parodies in Joyce criticism.\(^1\) The compositional development of the episode also marked a turning point in the compositional strategies of the whole of *Ulysses*. As Michael Groden has argued, “Cyclops” made the break with the initial style decisive and final (*Progress* 165). As early as “Aeolus” the initial style comes under attack when the headlines intrude on the narrative space of the newspaper office. “Wandering Rocks” and “Sirens” further elasticate its boundaries, but “Cyclops” erases it completely.\(^2\)

Here, I explore how several puzzling formal – structural and stylistic – features of the episode both deceptively evoke and ironically counteract nationalist imaginings of the Irish nation in organic terms. In particular, I focus on three interrelated aspects of the episode’s

---

\(^1\) Joyce labelled the technique of the episode “alternating asymmetry” in his schema sent to Carlo Linati in 1921.

\(^2\) According to Herbert Schneidau, a parodically distorted echo of the interior monologue can be spotted in the narrator’s urination scene (97).
textual politics: the use of a narrator, the only one in the whole of *Ulysses*; the dynamics of splitting, parodic multiplication; and the nominal economies.

**Mimetic or Mimic “I”?**

After the textual pyrotechnics of Sirens, “Cyclops” opens in a surprisingly conventional narrative fashion. The narrative voice becomes anchored in a consciousness: an eye-witness and participant in the events reports in the first person. The narrator seems to abide the conventions of mimetic verisimilitude by the fact that he has a job, probably a temporary one, as a collector of doubtful debts, and that he engages in a conversation with Joe Hynes. This initial reassuring display of a conventional mode of story-telling soon becomes explicitly challenged by the fact that the narrator’s oral tale is recurrently and unexpectedly disrupted by heterogeneous verbal material evidently beyond the scope of his narrative control. Nonetheless, the narrator’s verisimilarity is kept up throughout the episode by his identifiable perspective and recognisable style: his gossipy, anecdotal, often witty and perceptive scurrility indiscriminately demeans all the events and characters in the pub. The mimetic aspect of the narrator has proven captivating for certain critics, notably for David Hayman, who evolved a “dual temporality hypothesis,” according to which the oral report of the I-narrator takes place hours later the same night in another pub, where the narrator tells the tale to an interlocutor to cadge more free drinks (“Cyclops” 265). A wonderful imaginative construction entirely. No wonder it immediately came under attack by Herbert Schneidau, who dismissed it as an attempt to naturalise the complex narrative structure of the episode. As Schneidau contends, the narrative of “Cyclops” “confounds its own time” – the

---

3 As Fritz Senn has noted, this is a regression to a traditional mode that Joyce abandoned after the first three stories of *Dubliners* and did not exploit in the first eleven episodes of *Ulysses* (“Law” 433).

4 Duffy rivals Hayman with his equally imaginative construction of the narrator as an informer, a police tout like Korny Kelleher (122). Even Karen Lawrence, in her otherwise excellent discussion of the narrative complexities of “Cyclops,” finds that the I-narrator “can be naturalized according to novelistic conventions” (101).
narrator’s story seems to be both retrospective and a running commentary (101). Such an assessment is also supported by Fritz Senn’s observation that the narrator switches tenses in mid-stream (“Law” 435). As Schneidau amply demonstrates, the laugh is on us if we interpret the narrator’s figure and tale according to the norms of naturalistic conventions. Marylin French agrees with Schneidau in that the narrator is “not a realistic character, despite the naturalism of his language” (139). However, French distrusts the narrator’s credibility as a realistic character on the grounds that he is “far too bright, far too absolute in his cynicism, and far too alive in his language” (139), which stays within the epistemological framework of realism that Schneidau rightly discards in discussing Cyclopean narrative processes. The clash of critical responses concerning the narrator’s verisimilitude acts out the inherent ambivalence of the Joycean device: it conjures up and at the same time it undercuts the representational mode of mimetic verisimilitude. What concerns me here is how the Cyclopean narrator – the deceptive anchorage of a seemingly unified voice in a mind – ironically comments on the identititarian thinking of Irish cultural nationalism.

As Lloyd has observed, cultural nationalism with its central project of identity formation operates within the narrative order of mimetic verisimilitude (Anomalous 108-10). Irish cultural nationalist projects throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries purported to erase the disrupting, dislocating effects of colonialism by creating coherent, linear, univocal narratives prefiguring “the entry into full self-realisation of the unitary subject known as the people” (Eagleton, “Nationalism” 28). Yeats often compared the national unity he sought to the organic oneness of a single mind (Howes 69). Likewise, he hoped to see the emergence of an “Irish literature which, though made by many minds, would seem the work

---

5 Schneidau perceptively maintains that “[t]he narrator is not strong on names: in speaking of Crofton the Orangeman, he is never sure he has the right name; it’s ‘Crofton or Crawford’ or ‘Crofter.’ But in the dialogue he is simply and accurately Crofton; thus the dialogue is separate from the reporting of it.” Likewise, Joyce “teases us when he inserts Rumbold’s letter into the text with grotesqueries of spelling and capitalisation faithfully reproduced. Since no one, however good a story-teller, can read words aloud in such a way as to
of a single mind” (*Autobiographies* 69). The individual, in turn, came to be figured as a representative instance of the unitary communal subject of the nation. As Lloyd argues, according to the ethical vision of nationalism, “the freedom and full identity of the individual are achieved only when he is immersed in the greater life that is the nation” (*Nationalism* 70).

“Cyclops” both evokes and debunks the nationalist ideological formation of the unitary subject of the people and the correlative formation of the representative individual. The citizen evidently sees himself as the embodiment, or representative instance of the allegedly unitary subject of the Irish nation, a status that Joe Hynes, who visits Barney Kiernan’s in order to “give the citizen the hard word about” the cattle traders’ meeting in the City Arms Hotel also appears to acknowledge. As most of the citizen’s utterances show, his mind and being are *almost* totally immersed in the greater life of the nation: “What Garry? Are we going to win?” (12.148); “Sinn Fein! Sinn Fein Amhain! The friends we love are by our side, the foes we hate before us” (12.523-24); “We want no more strangers in our house” (12.1150-51); “The strangers, says the citizen. Our own fault. We let them come in. We brought them in” (12.1156-57). He laments the loss of “our missing twenty millions of Irish,” “our lost tribes” (12.124041); gives a long litany of “our ruined trade and our ruined hearth” (12.1255); and envisions the future when “we’ll put force against force” (12.1364-65), and when “our harbours that are empty will be full again” (12.1301) (emphases added). Countering the citizen’s utterances, the text deflates his representative status in multiple ways. The narrator’s introducing him on entering the pub as “There he is, says I, sitting in his gloryhole with his cruiskeen lawn and his load of paper working for the cause” (12.122) evidently caricatures it. So does the parodic refraction of John Wyse Nolan’s report to the citizen about the Corporation meeting dealing with the issue of the Irish language as “O’Nolan [. . .] low bending made obeisance to the puissant and high and mighty chief of all indicate capital letters or their lack, the laugh is on us if we take this as a naturalistic rendering of a narratable
Erin” (12.1183-86). The satire of the longest interpolation, the execution scene also targets the paragon of the representative individual: the national “hero martyr.” The grotesque elaboration of the circumstances almost totally obscures the “central figure of the tragedy” (12.629-30).

Beyond these local ironic comments, the narrator’s elusive persona contests the nationalist ideological formation of the unitary subject of the people and the correlative formation of the representative individual in a more subtle way. Through mimicry it disrupts the order of mimetic verisimilitude within which the unitary subject and the representative individual can be conceived. The subversion of mimetic verisimilitude in multifarious other ways in “Cyclops” also invalidates the – until the 1990s – widely held critical opinion that the episode posits Bloom as the exemplary hero, the voice of the future, as Lloyd and Robert H. Bell have observed (Lloyd, Anomalous 110, Bell 142-44).

Even though through the narrator “Cyclops” calls into question the notion of a unified consciousness, legions of critics have assumed that the interpolations thwarting the narrator’s story-telling also issue from a unified mind. Richard Ellmann (109), Daniel Schwarz (175), James Maddox (86), Philip Sicker (64) simply envision two narrators. French refines them into an “on-stage narrator” and an “off-stage narrator” (141). Hayman moves only apparently away from this narrative mould: his obscure term, “arranger,” “a nameless creative persona” (Mechanics 84) positioned between the implied author and the narrator, likewise describes the narrative authority behind the interpolations in terms of a unified consciousness. Bell pits a “Parodist” against the I-narrator, whom he calls “Satirist” (138). Surprisingly, even critics approaching Joyce through post-colonial methodology repeat this reified critical habit. Nolan following Bell posits a “parodist” behind the interpolations (108). Platt opens his discussion of the episode with noting that “the double-narrative of ‘Cyclops’ images culture as a
process” (142), but fails to maintain this stance later when he remarks that “the consciousness behind the interpolations is ostensibly deeply patriotic” (148). Cheng, in turn, uses the term “narrator” indiscriminately and unproblematically to describe the narrative authority lying behind all the narrative processes throughout the episode (Race 191-218).

“Doubled Up”: The Ineluctable Modality of “Cyclops”?

If the I-narrator’s persona underdetermines the order of mimetic verisimilitude through a subtle game of mimicry, the episode on the whole openly challenges it in multifarious other ways. In stark contrast to the initial reassuring illusion of a unified narrative authority, “Cyclops” is wrought with continual modulations of style and perspective which fracture or multiply the I-narrator’s voice and frustrate the linear march of his story. Thus, the episode in general stages a wholesale formal intervention into Irish cultural nationalist projects to create coherent, linear, univocal narratives of the nation.

Here, I focus on two aspects of this formal intervention. On the one hand, I explore how the formal dynamics of splitting both evokes and counters the formation of national identity within a Manichean structure, a crucial feature of anti-colonial nationalisms in general, on the other hand, how the stylistic interaction between the I-narrative and the interpolations, and the stylistic adulteration within the interpolations ironically refract the translational aesthetics of anti-colonial Irish cultural nationalism.

As Frantz Fanon contends in The Wretched of the Earth,

The colonial world is a Manichean world. It is not enough for the settler to delimit physically, that is to say with the help of the army and the police force, the place of the native. As if to show the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessential evil. [. . .] The native is declared insensible to
ethics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense he is absolute evil. (qtd. in Trotter 45)

Thus, colonial discourse posits an absolute difference between the coloniser and the colonised, wherein the coloniser casts himself as morally superior and dehumanises, vilifies the colonised. As several critics of nationalism have pointed out, anti-colonial nationalist ideology projecting the colonised as a unique nation distinct from and superior to the coloniser inverts this relationship, but stays within the same binary structure.⁶

That a Manichean logic holds grip on the citizen’s imagination is evident from his utterances repeatedly vilifying the English – attacking their barbarity (12.432), cruelty (12.1331), vile religion (12.1507), lack of civilisation (12.1197), and illegitimate race (12.1201) – and glorifying Ireland (12.1239-55) and the Irish (12.1545). Likewise, the logic of binary opposition seems to drive the events of the episode at large, continually staging clashes between the citizen and Bloom and leading to their “grand” altercation at the end. That up to the 1990s critics had almost exclusively read the episode in binary terms – citizen (and company) versus Bloom, usually condemning the former and valorising the latter – demonstrates the seductive power of the Manichean logic that dominates the action.⁷

The binary structure of imagination also seems to be inscribed into the very form of “Cyclops,” which is reflected in the almost unanimous critical description of the episode’s rhetorical system as split into two or doubled up, like Alf Bergan on entering Barney Kiernan’s (12.259). According to Duffy, “[t]he two directly opposing styles – the realist

---

⁶ As Howes and Attridge have noted, one well-established argument in the critique of nationalism is that it is “derivative of imperialism and that its intellectual structures simply invert and mirror those of imperialism” (9). As Cheng has observed in relation to the Irish context, ironically, “both projects – that of a racialist imperial discourse and that of a nationalist self-definition – are, although emanating from very different political positions both engaged in defining Irishness as distinctively “other” and different” (“Authenticity” 242-43).
narrative of the Nameless One and the heteroglossic hyperbole of the interpolations – seem to correspond to the conflict between Bloom and the Citizen that is mostly described in the realist *recit*” (116). The list closing the previous section can be complemented by another one taking count of those readings which, although not configuring the narrative authority behind them, also conceive of the interpolations as belonging to some shared narrative space that vies for mastery with the I-narrative. Karen Lawrence distinguishes two stylistic “masks”: a narrative persona and “a series of parodies” that represent the “anonymous voice of culture” (101-2); Mark Osteen envisions two “narrative zones,” borrowing Bakhtin’s term to give a single name to the heteroglossic discursive site, the “collection of voices” that “interrupts Nameless’s narration” (168-9); Colin MacCabe speaks of a text and a counter-text (90), André Topia of “two alternating utterances” (117), and Duffy of two stylistic halves (111-12); while according to Susan Bazargan, “two discursive systems vie for dominance and authority” in the episode (751).

Nonetheless, if the Cyclopean formal dynamics of splitting seems to abide in the binary imagination, it also works contrary to it. Paradoxically, several of the bipolar models in the second list of critical responses recognise the puzzling heterogeneity of the interpolations that defy totalisation. Also, while for decades critics tended to describe the two components of their bipolar models in terms of absolute stylistic difference – deflation versus inflation, or “all bile” versus “all oil,” in Ellmann’s words (*Liffey* 111) – more recent readings increasingly emphasise the stylistic overlaps between them. As Osteen observes,

---

7 Anne Fogarty also made this point at the 2002 Trieste James Joyce Symposium.
8 Although Duffy does not reduce the heterogeneity of the interpolations to a single mind, he unproblematically calls the I-narrative “the realist half of ‘Cyclops’” (109).
9 As late as 1987 Schwarz suggested that “Cyclops” has a “binary rhetorical system” in which Joyce “often implicitly speaks on Bloom’s behalf” (175). Christy L. Burns in her 2000 book exploring Joyce’s gestural politics repeatedly, and grossly reductively, describes the stucture of “Cyclops” as split into “two mirrors of positive and negative exaggeration” (125, 126, 127).
Both zones draw from a vast store of received opinion and collective discourses: the Nameless One knows all manner of gossip, scandal and secrets, while the parodies borrow from legal documents, travelogues, theosophy, Irish legends, newspaper reports, graffiti and so on. Indeed, “Cyclops” is a kind of emporium for the dissemination of discarded, second-hand collective discourses. (169)

Duffy spots a mutual stylistic interpenetration in the “profusion of languages seeping into both stylistic arenas,”10 as well as in the incorporation of written “set-pieces” like the hangman’s letter and the Irish Independent “deaths, births and marriages” section into the apparently spontaneous oral I-narrative (116). It is such a “set-piece,” the satirical skit describing the Alaki of Abeakuta’s visit to England, which the citizen supposedly reads out of Griffith’s paper, the United Irishman, that most glaringly contests the binary stylistic model of the episode. Although it forms part of the I-narrative, its parodic grotesqueries could qualify it as an interpolation.11 The skit also demonstrates Mark Nunes’s observation that “as the interactions develop, the distinction between parody and ‘straight’ narrative continue to blur” (181). Nunes exemplifies how some of the supposed parodies tend “to lose their parodic tone” by the interpolation staging a mock-religious procession and consecration of Barney Kiernan’s pub, which finally “collapses into a blessing that, translated, shows no real parodic element” (180).

The stylistic manoeuvres challenging the episode’s seemingly binary rhetorical system by refusing to uphold absolute difference between the components are complemented by structural ones that work contrary to the other fundamental assumption of the binary

---

10 Duffy’s example functions, however, as a beam in an Hungarian eye: “the citizen contributes Irish (“To hell with the bloody brutal Sassenachs and their patois” is his opinion), Bloom is bid farewell in Hebrew [sic] − “Viszontlatasra!” – while the dead Dignam, appearing in a seance, natters on in a language that looks like Sanskrit but slips off the tongue as Americanese: “alavatar, hatakalda, wataklasat . . .” (116).
imagination: the privileging of one component over the other. As Nunes notes, bimodal descriptions of “Cyclops” in general assume that “the first-person narration stands primary to the secondary parodic narratives” (177), which is manifest in the critical labels themselves: “interpolations,” “asides,” insertions.” Yet, as Nunes also observes, many moments in “Cyclops” work against this assumption. At times it is the I-narrator who functions as the disruption, such as when his voice mimicking that of Mozes Herzog momentarily disrupts the enumeration of the dubious natural treasures of “Inisfail the fair” in the mock-heroic second interpolation: “I dare him, says he, and I doubledare him” (12.100-101). In the case of the longwinded execution scene, his voice provides the comic disruption that breaks off the whirlpool of grotesqueries and returns us unexpectedly to the pub (12.678). Also, the interpolations comment on or ironically counteract not only the I-narrative, but at times also each other. For instance, the mock-theosophical reportage of a spiritist seance staging Paddy Dignam’s ghostly return (12.338-73) breaks off not with a return to the I-narrative, but with a short lamentation for Paddy Dignam in the by-then-familiar mock-heroic register (12.374-76). The final blow to the binary model occurs in the last sentence, which begins in a mock-biblical style – “When lo, there came about them all a great brightness and they beheld the chariot wherein He stood ascend to heaven” – proceeds through a pseudo-scientific register – “at an angle of fortyfive degrees over Donohoe’s in Little Green Street” – to a final flourish in the narrator’s scatological Dublin colloquialism – “like a shot off a shovel” (12.1910-17).12

Given the episode’s multifarious thwarting of binary thinking, Nunes dismisses the binary approach to the alternating asymmetry of “Cyclops” and offers instead a rhizomatic model to capture the heterogeneous narrative structure of the episode:

11 Hayman pointed out the ambivalent status of the Alaki passage a long time ago: “One passage from the narrative proper could qualify as an aside (see the Alaki’s visit)” (266). I elaborate on the skit’s function and effect in Chapter Five.
12 Donald Morse drew my attention to the potential scatological dimension of the chapter’s closing phrase. Bernard Share’s Dictionary of Irish Slang gives the phrase as synonimous with “like shit from a shool” (256).
In place of a centered, authoritative narrative, the “Cyclops” section presents a complex interaction between multiple, limited voices: a ‘rhizome’ of narrative encounters. “Cyclops” presents an assemblage in place of a total/totalizing narrative, an open system of narrative resonances in which experimentation and proliferation replace the authority of a singular eye. (183)\(^{13}\)

I find Nunes’s move away from the bipolar narrative models a welcome step, yet his model, like the ones it discards, relies on the concept of “voice,” which as Lloyd has persuasively argued, is also inadequate to describe Cyclopean textual processes.

“Freely Translated”

As noted in the Introduction, throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries anti-colonial Irish cultural nationalist projects invariably appealed to Gaelic culture – ancient myths and legends, and their modern day preserver, folklore – as the *locus* of a unifying original essence, of an authenticating “otherness” of the Irish people. Thus, in their repeated efforts to create a modern national literature, envisaged as the prime agent of forging a national consciousness, they invariably drew on extant Gaelic written sources and the oral tradition of the peasantry. However, as a result of the large-scale supplanting of Irish language culture by the language and culture of the coloniser from the seventeenth century onwards, to most modern Irish nation-builders, whose mother-tongue was English, Gaelic culture – past or

\(^{13}\) Although Nunes uses the concept of the rhizome, coined by Deleuze and Guattari, to describe the narrative structure of “Cyclops” without any post-colonial implications, it is worth noting here that Bill Ashcroft has recently applied the concept to describe “the ambivalent, fluid, chaotic, relationships within the colonial exchanges” (50). In Ashcroft words, “[t]he rhizome describes a root system which spreads out laterally rather than vertically, as in bamboo, which has no central root but which propagates itself in a fragmented, discontinuous, multidirectional way” (50).
present – was available only through translation. Thus, not surprisingly, nationalist cultural thought invoked translation as “a mode of return and reintegration,” “an unrefractive medium” that could restore continuity with the past and “transmit the national spirit untransformed,” as Lloyd contends (Nationalism 95).\textsuperscript{14} As Lloyd and several other cultural critics have pointed out, however, the ideal of cultural homogenisation (by means of reproducing in English the essential spirit of the Gael undistorted) practically meant the assimilation of alien, modern material into Gaelic culture, producing what D. P. Moran called a “mongrel thing” (qtd. in Gibson 59).\textsuperscript{15}

“Cyclops” offers a multifaceted – both thematic and formal – critique of the cultural nationalist vision of translation as a translucent medium of the Gaelic spirit. It is explicitly caricatured in the parodic journalistic report commending the “marvellous exhibition of cynanthropy,” Owen Garry’s Irish verse bearing “a striking resemblance (the italics are ours) to the ranns of ancient Celtic bards.” The report presents the poem’s English translation by an unnamed “eminent scholar” and claims that although “[t]he metrical system of the canine original [. . .] is infinitely more complicated” “the spirit has been well caught” (12.712-36, emphasis added). The narrator’s habitual appellation of Garryowen throughout the episode as a “bloody mongrel” is reminiscent of Moran’s witticism in this context. The satirical skit describing the African royalty’s visit to England also targets, among others, the refractive nature of translation:

The delegation partook of luncheon at the conclusion of which the dusky potentate, in the course of a happy speech, freely translated by the British chaplain, the reverend

\textsuperscript{14} Lloyd also notes that such a vision of translation was equally characteristic of unionist thought.

\textsuperscript{15} Nunes borrows the term “assemblage” also from Deleuze: “The assemblage’s only unity is that of co-functioning: it is a symbiosis, a ‘sympathy.’ It is never filiations which are important, but alliances, alloys” (qtd. in Nunes 183).
Ananias Praisegod Barebones, tendered his best thanks to Massa Walkup and emphasised the cordial relations existing between Abeakuta and the British Empire, stating that he treasured as one of his dearest possessions an illuminated bible, the volume of the word of God and the secret of England’s greatness, graciously presented to him by the white chief woman, the great squaw Victoria, with a personal dedication from the august hand of the Royal Donor. (12.1518-26, emphasis added)

Apart from this slur in the skit, translation does not figure as an issue in the talk of the barflies in contrast to the concern with the revival of Irish, “the winged speech of the seadivided Gael” (12.1189) – presumably both the citizen and Joe Hynes are “workers in the cause of our old tongue” (12.907-8). Yet, the parody in numerous interpolations targets modern translations of Gaelic bardic literature, as Don Gifford and Robert J. Seidman noted long ago. More recently, Gibson and Platt have argued that “insofar as it is possible to speak of ‘parody’ in ‘Cyclops,’ its most important targets are the styles of Revival historiography and related poetry and translation” (Gibson 61, Platt 144). While the episode in general functions as a “recycling of a stock in trade,” “a whole mode of discourse,” as Gibson contends, the parody often targets concrete examples of translation. For instance, the first mock-epic interpolation dwelling on the “pleasant land” of “Inisfail the fair” makes specific use of phrases from one particular poem, James Clarence Mangan’s translation of “Alfrid’s Itinerary,” a poem in Irish by Alfrid, a seventh-century exiled king of Northumbria (Gifford 316). That Joyce first evokes modern translatorese of Irish literature through echoes from a translation by Mangan is probably not accidental. Although cultural nationalists made repeated efforts to figure him as a representative poet of the Irish nation, his poetic practice

15 The Young Irelander Thomas Davis described the English language itself as “the mongrel of a hundred breeds” (qtd. in Dunne 77). Translation also functioned as a means of ideological manipulation, a process I discuss in the “Unholy Wars” section of Chapter Two.
incessantly resists, in more or less explicit ways, the nationalist vision of translation as an unrefractive medium, the smooth transmission of an original spirit.\textsuperscript{16}

Beyond these satirical, parodic thematic echoes, “Cyclops” also stages an intricate formal resistance to cultural nationalist translational aesthetics, destabilising the very premises upon which it relies. The I-narrator’s glaringly refractive representation of the events in the bar evidently counters the ideal of translucent mediation. As Topia has noted, “[t]he real retracts into the hypothetical and is completely masked by a sort of screen constituted by the voice of the narrator” (118). Furthermore, his voice is not only refractive, but also questions the assumption of a transmissible original essence. His report of the events in the bar is intersected with “all manner of gossip, scandal and secrets” (Osteen 169), targeting mostly the intimate sphere – conjugal and filial relations – of the Blooms (12.5001-18; 12.834-43; 12.1579-85), but containing also numerous other alleged skeletons in the cupboard – concerning Bob Doran (12.397-402; 12.800-16), J. J. O’Molloy (12.1022-29), Blazes Boylan (12.998-1002), the citizen (12.1311-16) and Queen Victoria (12.1393-98) – which issue from either unclarified or such dubious authorities as one Pisser Burke, Paddy Leonard, or Bantam Lyons.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, his speech, according to Topia,

is a good example of literally alienated discourse through which circulates a whole collection of stereotypes. His obsession is the ceaseless search for origins and guarantees outside himself. And in this his discourse is pure echo, and even the echo of an echo. He is the prototype of Dublin speech, which is only an infinite series of reverberations. And he is profoundly Dublinesque inasmuch as he is merely a

\textsuperscript{16} For a detailed analysis of Mangan’s dubious practice of translation see Chapter Four of Lloyd’s \textit{Nationalism and Minor Literature} and also Deane’s “Joyce the Irishman.”
resonating chamber within which reverberates something which has already been spoken, itself an echo which will in turn produce other echoes, and so on to infinity. (121)

Although Topia, like Cyclopean interpolations, becomes somewhat carried away in his reverberating post-structuralist vision, I agree with his basic point that the narrator’s apparently unified voice belies a “resonating chamber,” and thus subverts the assumption of identifiable legitimising, authenticating origins.18

The interaction between the I-narrative and the interpolations also becomes loaded with subversive potentials in this context. Metaphorically speaking, the majority of the interpolations “are translations [of the I-narrative] into some other, often hypothetical, mode that is often parodic,” as Senn has noted (“Law” 434). In Lawrence’s description, “[l]ike the headings in ‘Aeolus,’ the parodies seem to be generated in the text from some insignificant event or comment in the narrative. And like the headings, the passages give an exaggerated version of the ‘original’ story, this time by expanding rather than encapsulating it” (102).19

Although Lawrence treats the I-narrative as primary to the interpolations, the quotation marks around the word “original” highlight the inadequacy of the term to describe Cyclopean formal dynamics. As Senn observes, the forms of interaction between the I-narrative and interpolations show a puzzling diversity (“Law” 434), which resists in multiple ways the neat dichotomy of original/derivation.

---

17 Bantam Lyons’s function in Ulysses is to embody errant beliefs and dubious knowledge in general. In “Lotus Eaters” he takes Bloom’s innocent remark “I just wanted to throw it away” as a tip for the Gold Cup horse race, as is reinforced in Lestrygonians. His act of misinterpretation leads to Bloom’s scapegoating at the end of “Cyclops.”

18 Heidegger describes gossip – “das Gerede” – as the very language of inauthenticity (Jameson 134). For a discussion of the role of gossip as a mode of discursive “dereification” in Ulysses see Jameson. According to Luke Gibbons, Joyce’s use of language in general “is akin to the language of rumour as analysed by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak” (161). Spivak emphasises the “primordially (originally) errant” nature of rumour. “No one is its origin or source,” rumour is “always in circulation without an assignable source” (213).
When the interpolations do function as “translations” in the sense that they arise out of a verbal gesture of the I-narrative, it is their tangential trajectory – their “ballooning” away from the I-narrative, as Lawrence puts it (101) – that dismantles a symmetrical relationship of original and derivation. As Senn has noted, the interpolations “are crassly provective. They pick up a trait in the conversation and take it to absurd lengths,” thus pushing their point of origin into oblivion (Scrutinies 43). The best example of this is probably the slapstick description of the hero martyr’s ever-deferred execution. On occasions, the “translation” lacks an “original,” that is, a hypothetical mode instead of tangentially elaborating on a detail in the I-narrative takes over from the I-narrator the description of an event in the bar, such as when

---

19 It should be noted here that just as not all interpolations thrive on exaggeration in “Cyclops,” not all Aeolian headlines give an exaggerated version of the ‘original’ story. The headlines tend to become frenzied and comic when Stephen’s Parable begins.

20 Provection is Senn’s term “for that characteristic Joycean process of incremental changes that tend to become qualitative and idiosyncratic shifts” (“Law” 434).

One among the interpolations is unique in this respect. Although it arises out of verbal gestures in the I-narrator’s story and incorporates several of them, it also relies on a fixed matrix, the wording of the Creed:

They believe in rod, the scourger al mighty, creator of hell upon earth and in Jacky Tar, the son of a gun, who was conceived of unholy boast, born of the fighting navy, suffered under rump and dozen, was scarified, flayed and curried, yelled like bloody hell, the third day he arose again from the bed, steered into haven, sitteth on his beamend till further orders whence he shall come to drudge for a living and be paid (12.1354-59).

The Cyclopean revam ped Apostle’s Creed is preceded by another one in “Seylla and Charybdis,” where Mulligan sums up Stephen’s “theologicoophilolological” theory of Hamlet in a parodically rehashed Creed (9.493-99). As opposed to Mulligan’s version, however, the Cyclopean one targets not the Catholic but the shorter Protestant version as if in compliance with the citizen’s disparaging of “sanctimonious Cromwell” and his use of the Protestant religion to justify his homicide in Ireland. Furthermore, the parodic treatment of the Creed in “Cyclops” also evokes the United Irishmen’s practice to parodically replay religious texts, catechisms, sermons, and the Scriptures as vehicles of political satire (Whelan, “United” 281). More particularly, like Ulysses, the United Irishmen produced their own revamped version of the Apostle’s Creed:

I believe in John Beresford, the Father Almighty of the Revenue, creator of the North Wall, the Ottiwell Jobb and the Coal Tax, and in his true Son John Claudius, who was conceived in the spirit of the Chancellor, born of the Virgin Custom-house, suffered under Earl FitzWilliam, was stigmatized, spurned at and dismissed. The third week he arose again ascendeth into the cabinet and sitteth on the right hand of his Father, from whence he shall come to Judge by Court Marshal both the Quick and the Dead, those who are to be Hanged and those whose Fortunes are to be confiscated, I believe in the Holy Earl of Clare in the Holy Orange Lodges, in the Communion of Commissioners, in the forgiveness of Sins by acts of Indemnity, in the Resurrection of the Protestant Ascendancy and Jobbing Everlasting. Amen. (Whelan, Fellowship 34)

That Joyce was familiar with the United Irishmen’s “Cread” is suggested by the curious “coincidence” in “Cyclops” that the citizen indignantly evokes the corrupt Ascendancy politician, John Beresford, the first target of the United Irishmen’s parody, a few lines before the Creed parody.
Alf Bergan’s act of paying for his drink is depicted as “the young chief of the O’Bergans” offers “a testoon of costliest bronze” (12.290, 291-92). The doubled-up description of Alf Bergan’s entry into the bar – a stylistic enactment of Bergan’s being doubled up with laughter (12.259) – in turn, reverses the hierarchical relation between original/derivation, since the mock-heroic representation of the event precedes the depiction of the scene in the narrator’s colloquial register. In a similar manner, several interpolations undercut preleptically monocular utterances aired in the bar. For instance, an absurd list of “many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity” (12.176), which I discuss in detail in the following chapter, counteracts preleptically the citizen’s gesture of hero-worship introducing his discourse on history (12.479-82, 498-501). Likewise, the parodic commendation and enumeration of the “lofty trees” of “Inisfail the fair” in the first mock-heroic interpolation ironically comments on the citizen’s plea for the reafforestation of Ireland towards the end of the episode (12.1261-62).

If the interactions between the I-narrative and the interpolations destabilise the dichotomy of original/derivation, the stylistic dynamics within the interpolations counter the fundamental cultural nationalist desire to transplant an authenticating Gaelic spirit into English by means of producing a stylistically singular voice. As Lloyd observes, the constantly parodic mode, “the internal heterogeneities, [and] the adulteration of discourses as Joyce constructs them in ‘Cyclops’ and throughout Ulysses” dismantle the very category of “voice” (Anomalous 105). In contrast to readings that reduce the process of hybridization in the episode to the juxtaposition of a set of equivalent representational modes or coherent “voices,” Lloyd suggests that hybridisation in “Cyclops” takes the form of the “entire intercontamination” of the clashing discourses, which stylistically enacts the irredeemable
hybridity and inauthenticity of the colonised culture haunting and thwarting the translational project of cultural nationalism (Anomalous 105-8).  

Although the often Rabelaisian mixing of various styles, the internal incongruities within the interpolations have been commented on by several other critics, such as Hayman (275), Lawrence (106-7), Osteen (169) and Peake (297), Lloyd’s reading differs from previous ones in that he highlights the implications of this Cyclopean feature in relation to Irish cultural nationalist imagination.

The most explicitly heterogeneous, hybridised textual sites are the numerous lists that saturate the episode functioning somewhat like interpolations within the interpolations. Since the majority of them are monstrous catalogues of names, they point to my last concern in this chapter, the nominal economies of “Cyclops.”

What’s in a Name or No Name?

As Senn notes, “Cyclops,” among others, “is also a treatise on names and naming” (“Law” 431). Joyce’s delight in nominal games permeates his whole oeuvre and has provoked

21 Lloyd’s critique particularly targets MacCabe’s argument concerning the doubled up description of Alf Bergan’s entry that “the object of description can only be identified in a discourse which already exists and that identification is dependent on the possible distinctions available in the discourse” (92). Topia’s reading could also fall under similar critique, since he contends that each interpolation “offers the systematic and quasi-mechanical unfurling of a discourse that is wholly constituted, completely prepared, fully armed, which then ‘covers’ the real like a rhetorical grid, like a sort of formal matrix whose existence precedes any actualization in the text. [. . .] Each insertion is in fact a little machine for the production of a certain kind of text” (122). Hayman likewise questionably assumes that the asides have “a closed structure” with their “own inner consistency and predictability” (“Cyclops” 269).

22 Lawrence offers the most detailed analysis of the stylistically hybrid or uneven character of “Cyclops,” but she confines its implications to a modernist aesthetic of style and to Joyce’s “skepticism about the ordering of experience in language and the desire to be above the constraints that writing usually imposes” (120). The frustration and the various end-products of repeated critical efforts to identify the stylistic or discursive targets of the interpolations demonstrate the elusiveness of the stylistic manoeuvres within them. See the different charts by Hayman (275), French (148), and Topia (118-19). MacCabe notes that “there are several passages which are extremely difficult to characterise such as the marriage of Jean Wyse de Neaulan and Miss Fir Conifer (social-arboreal?) or the enumeration of the beauties real and symbolic of the Citizen’s handkerchief” (90-91). Hayman’s chart encounters difficulty with the interpolation describing the preparations for a legal case concerning a will. His description reads like a parody of identificatory efforts: “law court – legal language mixed with epic and romance revival plus comic Irish reference” (“Cyclops” 275).
some critics into writing whole books on the subject.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, “Cyclops” is not unique in its multifarious nominal manipulations, even if it offers one of the richest fields in \textit{Ulysses} for onomastic investigation. The narrator’s and the citizen’s namelessness, and Bloom’s name list provided at the end of the episode to authenticate Jewish identity have repeatedly been commented on as a Joycean replay of Odysseus’s tricking the Kyklops through his anonymous pseudonym, \textit{Outis} (Noman), and revealing his true identity only when believing himself in safe distance from the giant.\textsuperscript{24} What concerns me here, however, is how the nominal economies of the episode comically re-negotiate nationalist nominal practices, especially those rooted in an organic vision of nationhood.

In the discursive context of nationalism, the citizen’s and the narrator’s namelessness can be seen as an ironic enactment of “the hallmark of the modern nation” in general, according to Anderson: a “remarkable confidence of community in anonymity” (36). Ernest Gellner likewise suggests that “[h]omogeneity, literacy and anonymity are the key traits” of the modern nation (qtd. in Bhabha 294). Ironically enough, if the citizen’s namelessness reflects an essential feature of the modern nation in general, the clash between his non-name or nickname “citizen” and his vision of nationhood exposes one of the basic splits within the multiply Janus-faced concept of the nation. While the citizen’s utterances testify to his definition of nationality in terms of mystical ties, original organic essences, his appellation highlights the contrasting political, legalistic definition of nationhood in terms of shared rights, interests, and aims.\textsuperscript{25}

Furthermore, the citizen’s and the narrator’s anonymity can also ironically comment on the widespread Irish anti-colonial strategy to either completely conceal nominal identity or

\textsuperscript{23} See Shari and Bernard Benstock and Claire A. Culleton. Culleton’s book, however, almost completely ignores the Cyclopean nominal economies.
\textsuperscript{24} For a sophisticated exploration of more intricate Homeric nominal implications in “Cyclops” see Osteen (163-65) and Senn’s “Kyklonomastics.”
\textsuperscript{25} For a detailed discussion of the differences between the political and cultural definitions of the nation see Hutchinson.
to use pseudonyms. As numerous cultural historians have pointed out, agrarian and republican secret societies, like the Whiteboys, the United Irishmen, the Ribbonmen, and the Fenians devised strange passwords to ensure secrecy and anonymity (Garvin 26), or adopted pseudonyms like Captain Moonlight (Williams 16, Whelan, “United” 292), which figures among the citizen’s “many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity.” The ritual of identification by means of passwords instead of names is dramatised in “Cyclops” by the strange playacting that takes place between the citizen and Joe Hynes at the beginning of the episode:

– Stand and deliver, says he.

– That’s all right, citizen, says Joe. Friends here.

– Pass, friends, says he.

Then he rubs his hand in his eye and says he:

– What’s your opinion of the times?

Doing the rapparee and Rory of the hill. But, begob, Joe was equal to the occasion.

– I think the markets are on a rise, says he, sliding his hand down his fork.

So begob the citizen claps his paw on his knee and he says:

– Foreign wars is the cause of it.

And says Joe, sticking his thumb in his pocket:

– It’s the Russians wish to tyrannise. (12.129-40)

That this enigmatic verbal exchange does mimic a secret society identification ritual is supported by the early drafts of “Cyclops,” where Joyce describes it as “the password of the Ribbonmen” (Herring 186-87). This initiating secretive ritual of identification avoiding

---

26 In the early drafts of the episode (V.A.6) the forerunner of the passage reads:
Cusack was telling Joe about the password of the ribbonmen.
direct naming is comically expanded by the citizen’s ordering a drink in a coded language. When Hynes requests him to “give it a name,” he does so by calling Guinness the “wine of the country” (12.143-44). Direct naming of drinks is avoided throughout the episode: Guinness is referred to as a “cup of joy” (12.244), “foamy ebon ale” (12.281) or an “imperial yeomanry” (12.1318), whiskey as “a half one” (12.487, 1320) or “J.J. and S” (12.1669). Reference to the act of drinking is also clad into metaphors like “libation” (12.1668) or “blessing” (12.1664).

The total or partial concealment of nominal identity was likewise widespread among cultural nationalists throughout the nineteenth century. The publication of patriotic poetry and journalism anonymously or under pseudonyms suggested the total immersion of the identity of the creator in the greater life of the nation (Lloyd, Nationalism 77). As Thomas Davis, the master mind of the Young Irelanders, whose ballad “A Nation Once Again” the citizen is reported to sing in one of the interpolations, said, if he had his will, “all the songs of The Nation [a newspaper functioning as the prime agent of Young Ireland nation-building] would be remembered afterwards and the authors quite forgotten” (qtd. in Deane, Field Day 3). Davis’s own pennam e “The Celt” demonstrates his aim perfectly (Dunne 78). The cultural nationalist practice of using pseudonyms or sobriquets is openly caricatured in the Cyclopean interpolation eulogising the supreme verse of “the famous old Irish red setter wolfdog formerly known by the sobriquet of Garryowen and recently rechristened by his large circle of friends acquaintances Owen Garry” (12.715-17). It is also highlighted by assigning the

− What’s your opinion of the times?
− I think the markets are on a rise.
− Foreign war is the cause of it.
− It’s the Russians wish to tyrannize.
− What’s the age of the moon
− Really I don’t know.

Then he rubs his right hand over his eye and the other fellow slides his left hand down his pocket and then the first chap puts his hand on his knee and the other fellow sticks his thumb in his breeches pocket. (Herring 186-87)
satirical skit in the *United Irishman* to one “P”, a pseudonym under which Griffith wrote into his own paper (12.1540). Ironically enough, the barflies seem to be ignorant of Griffith’s use of this pseudonym, but are familiar with Shanganagh, another pseudonym under which Griffith published his writings in the same paper (Gifford 366).

These comic evocations of nationalist naming practices also imbue with an ironic aura the chapter’s wholesale play with anonymity and pseudonyms. The barflies often playfully avoid straightforward nominal identification of people such as when Alf Bergan, perhaps to tease Bloom, circumscribes rather than directly names Boylan: “– I heard So and So made a cool hundred quid over it, says Alf. – Who, Blazes? Says Joe” (12. 942). To Joe Hynes’s inquiry “– Who is the long fellow running for the mayoralty, Alf?” Alf elusively answers “– Friend of yours […] I won’t mention any names” (12.823-26). In the narrator’s storehouse of alleged skeletons in the cupboard, in turn, pseudonyms are used to conceal the less respectable aspects of respectable Dublin citizens’ lives. Bob Doran supposedly treats whores and talks against the Catholic religion as one Joseph Manuo (12.804), while J. J. O’Molloy is reported to have once pawned his watch under the name Dunne (12.1028). Furthermore, a piece of current news in the papers, the Canada swindle case, discussed in the bar, points to the use of pseudonyms as a means of swindle: “one of the bottlenosed fraternity it was went by the name of James Wought alias Saphiro alias Spark and Spiro” (12.1087). That a S. Anonymous and a S. Pseudonymous march hand in hand in the monstrous Cyclopean list of “saints and martyrs, virgins and confessors” (12.1689) can be seen as a comic self-reflexive gesture highlighting these nominal features of the episode.

“The Honourable Milesian Names”

The later version not only describes a secret society practice, but also renders the spirit of the proceedings by creating an aura of secrecy around it, which baffles the uninitiated reader.
If the all-pervasive anonymity and use of pseudonyms comically evoke long-standing and all-pervasive Irish anti-colonial nominal practices, not exclusively related to an organic definition of the nation, other facets of Cyclopean nominal economies conjure up nominal imaginings inescapably rooted in an organic vision of nationhood. Some aspects of Cyclopean naming can become ironic against the backdrop of a concrete instance of Romantic onomastics motivated by nationalist ideology.

In “The Necessity for De-Anglicizing Ireland,” a lecture delivered to the newly formed Irish National Literary Society in 1892 – which Joyce most probably knew – Douglas Hyde drew his audience’s attention to the lamentable “anomalous position” “the Irish race” was in: “imitating England and yet apparently hating it” (3). According to Hyde, the wholesale “West-Britonizing of ourselves,” which threatened to undermine the ancient race and nation became manifest in various ways, among others, in Irish naming practices. Noting how names were used as a battlefield upon which the English colonisers have waged war against the Irish since medieval times, he is disgruntled by seeing how in the last sixty years Irish people have betrayed themselves: “It seemed as if the people were possessed with a mania for changing [their Milesian names] to something – anything at all, only to get rid of the Milesian sound.” He laments that people drop the “O”s and “Mac”s, metamorphose, translate their “honourable Milesian names” and call themselves “beastly names, in preference to the surnames of warriors, saints, and poets” (8). In a similar manner, in a nostalgic effusion worthy of the citizen he laments the disappearance of fine old Irish Christian names, enumerating a lot, noting how some of them have become West-Britonized, for instance Murtagh into Mortimer.27 Hyde ends his overview of the Irish nominal scene by a clarion call: “I do think that the time has now come to make a vigorous protest against this
continued West-Britonizing of ourselves,” appeals to leaders “to stop [people] from
translating their Milesian surnames into hideous Saxon and help to introduce Irish instead of
English Christian names,” and adds in the prophet’s voice: “As long as the Irish nation goes
on as it is doing I cannot have much hope of its ultimately taking its place amongst the nations
of the earth, for if it does, it will have proceeded upon different lines from every other
nationality that God ever created” (9).

“Cyclops” seems to take Hyde’s warning to heart, since it embarks on a wholesale
restoration of old Irish surnames. Several characters’ names in Barney Kiernan’s become
translated into Milesian names. Also mimicking Hyde’s vision that the revival of ancient
names would function as a means of restoring a sense of continuity with the past, the
Cyclopean embellishment of names with a Milesian sound on occasions goes hand in hand
with an emphasis on lineage, belonging to an ancient community. Thus, “little Alf Bergan” at
one point becomes “the young chief of the O’Bergans” (12.290), J. J. O’Molloy
metamorphoses temporarily into “one of the clan of the O’Molloys” (12.1008), while Joe
Hynes “as a worker in the cause of our ancient tongue” becomes “Mr Joseph M’Carthy Hynes
(12.908). John Wyse Nolan makes his entry into the bar as “O’Nolan, clad in shining armour”
(12.1184), while Dignam is lamented as “O’Dignam,” “Patrick of the beamy brow” (12.374).
Even Bloom makes his nominal entry into the episode as “O’Bloom, the son of Rory”
(12.216). When the name is left untouched, like that of Ned Lambert, the lineage is still
emphasised: “prince and heir of the noble line of Lambert” (12.1010). Whether the publican is
really called “Terence O’Ryan” or the superintendent of the market, described as “a chieftain
descended from chieftains” (12.90) “O’Connell Fitzsimon” is undecidable, since these names

27 It is impossible not to hear Hyde’s despairing voice when, by a masterstroke of irony, Joyce baptises Mina
Purefoy’s baby, the only baby born in Ulysses, Mortimer Edward (after the influential third cousin of Mr
Purefoy in the Treasury Remembrancer’s office, Dublin Castle) (14.1334). I am indebted to Fritz Senn for this
remark.
appear only in mock-heroic interpolations, but they intensify the Milesian nominal aura of the chapter.

“Cyclops” also answers Hyde’s crusade to restore ancient Irish Christian names like Patrick, Brian, and Murtagh, since the gigantic list of “many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity” parades some of them. Yet, with the accompanying surnames – Patrick W. Shakespeare, Brian Confucius, Murtagh Gutenberg, Patricio Velasquez (items 54-56) – they may not be for the greater glory and purity of the Irish nation.

“S. Homonymous and S. Paronymous and S. Synonymous”

If “Cyclops” critiques the cultural nationalist vision of names as genealogical markers, carriers of a sense of continuity and thus unified identity, by means of parodic mimicry, it also counters such a nominal vision more openly. As Senn has noted, in “Cyclops” “names are doubtful, withheld, variable, and open to bantering metamorphoses” (“Law” 440). The most striking nominal transformations occur to Bloom, who after being introduced as “O’Bloom, son of Rory” (12.216) is referred to as “Herr Professor Luitpold Blumenduft” (12.468), “Mr Knowall” (12.838), “good uncle Leo” (12.848), “L. Bloom” (12.912), “Senhor Enrique Flor” (12.1288), “Virag from Hungary” (12.1639), “Nagyaságos uram Lipóti Virag” (12.1816), “ben Bloom Elijah” (12.1916) – dramatising Bloom’s riddling identity.29 The diversity of Bloom’s appellations is rivalled only by the citizen’s imaginative flourishes for the English. He variably refers to them as “Saxon robbers” (12.1158), “bloody brutal Sassanachs” (12.1190-91), “the foe of mankind” (12.1249), “yellowjohns of Anglia” (12.1255),

28 It is worth noting that in the early drafts, Bloom’s Milesian sounding nominal introduction is accompanied with his Hungarian lineage: “O’Bloom, the son of Rudolph (the son of Leopold Peter, the son of Peter Rudolph) (V.A.8) (Herring 152).
29 As Senn has suggested, Bloom emerges in the course of the book as a kind of “grammatical paradigm,” since his name is “taken through all the cases of the singular,” thus, it becomes “a grammatical case history,” while at times “it appears more like a verb,” thus becoming “a universal paradigm of the school book” (Dislocations 126).
“mongrels” (12.1297), “British hyenas” (12.1371). On a smaller scale the nominal multiplication affects Molly Bloom,\(^\text{30}\) Garryowen the dog, and drinks. If, despite the diversity, most of the time the referents behind the appellations can be easily guessed at, on occasions, the multiplication of appellations can lead to confusion, as in the boxing match interpolation. The Irish and English combatants are referred to in so many ways within so little space – the Irish Myler Keogh is called “Dublin’s pet lamb,” Irish gladiator,” Eblanite,” “Santry boy” (actually he cannot be both), “the pet,” “the lamb”; while the English Percy Bennett is called “the welterweight sergeant major,” “artilleryman,” “the soldier,” “the redcoat,” “Pucking Percy,” “the military man,” “the opponent,” “the Portobello bruiser” – that the two sides tend to blur under the proliferating appellations.

That a S. Synonymous marches in the gigantic list of saints (12.1697-98) can be seen as a comic self-reflexive gesture highlighting these nominal features of the episode. His companions S. Homonymous and S. Paronymous, in turn subsume further nominal manipulations in the episode. On occasions, the homonymous imposture of names confounds the barflies: the citizen’s construct “that old ruffian sir John Beresford” (12.1338) welds Sir Charles Beresford, the most famous naval officer at the turn of the century, whom Joyce mentions with pride in “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages” (\(CW\) 172) and the notoriously corrupt eighteenth century politician, John Beresford. Likewise, John Wyse Nolan’s “Ulysses Brown of Camus” (12.1383) merges two field marshals of Maria Theresa: Maximilian, Count von Brown, Austrian-born son of a Wild Goose, and George, Count de Brown, born in Camus, Limerick (Gifford 360). The narrator’s multiplication of the Protestant Crofton into Crofter or Crofton or Crawford – which ironically counteracts Crofton’s blatant

\(^{30}\) She is evoked as “Mrs B” (12.993), “pride of Calpe’s rocky mount” (12.1003), “the ravenhaired daughter of Tweedy” (12.1003), “the chase spouse of Leopold” (12.1006), “Marion of the bountiful bosom” (12.1006).
excommunication of Bloom for his threateningly elasticated identity (12.1634)\(^3\) – in turn, can be placed under the patronage of S. Paronymous.

“Pile It On”

Among the numerous puzzling formal games of the episode, it is probably the several monstrous name lists that take the palm of intricacy. The comedy of the piled on heterogeneity of ancient heroes and heroines (12.176-199), of saint and virgins (12.1688-1712), of arboreal female guests at a wedding (12.1267-80), the beauty spots of Irish landscape (12.1451-61) has often been noted. Yet, the internal dynamics of these monstrosities, and their interaction with the rest of the text has scarcely been investigated. The few analyses that do tackle either their internal dynamics – by the Benstocks and Senn\(^3\) – or their rhetorical function – by Osteen, Bazargan, Brigitte L. Sandquist, Caroline Webb and Marylin Reizbaum – do not illuminate them in the context of nationalism, let alone cultural nationalism.\(^3\) I have found that this context facilitates the emergence of numerous internal dynamics within the lists, which become ironically meaningful in the wider perspective of the catalogues’ interaction with the rest of the text. Thus, in the next two chapters two of these gigantic catalogues provide the dynamic foci of my inquiry.

\(^3\) “We don’t want him, says Crofton the Orangeman or Presbyterian” (12.1634).

\(^3\) More than two decades ago the Benstocks inquired into whether Ulyssesan catalogues operate according to some general laws. Their answer was in the negative.

\(^3\) Osteen examines how the economies of excess in the nameless narrator’s zone are duplicated and counteracted by the verbal excesses of the interpolations; Sandquist discusses the general rhetorical function of the catalogues inductively focusing on the tree weeding catalogue; Bazargan inquires into how the theme of injustice pervading the episode becomes manifest in the rhetorical strategies, especially in the lists of “Cyclops”; Webb compares how Woolf and Joyce “establish contrasting perspectives on notions of linguistic and literary authority” through their different uses of lists in *Orlando* and “Cyclops” respectively (191); while Reizbaum examines how the cherished nationalist “subjects of sacrifice and heroism, in tandem with the politics of race and national identity are illuminated by the [. . .] recessed categories of gender and sexuality” focusing on the dynamic interaction between the abject othering of Bloom in the nameless narrator’s zone and a list of women saints appearing in a mock-religious interpolation intruding upon the narrative space of Bloom’s othering (“Saints” 168).
Chapter 2

From Cuchulain to “The Man in the Gap”: Cyclopean Hero-Worship

The search for descent is not the erection of foundations: on the contrary, it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified, it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself.

Michel Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History”

The Hero and “Many Irish Heroes and Heroines of Antiquity”

Ancestor-worship is one of the cornerstones of Romantic nationalism. As Ernest Renan, one of the high-priests of Romantic nationalism claims, “[o]f all cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory (by which I understand genuine glory), is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea” (“What is a Nation” 19). George Russell, one of the spiritual leaders of Irish cultural nationalism in the 1890s, rhymes with Renan when he asserts, in an equally axiomatic fashion, that a nation is a living entity constituted of “immortal deeds and heroic spirits influencing the living, a life within their life moulding their spirits to its likeness” (qtd. in O’Driscoll 404). Russell’s remark voices more explicitly the metaphysical assumption underlying the significance of ancestral heroes in nationalist identity formation. If the central ethical and aesthetic project of nationalism is to create individuals who are integrated with and reproduce the continuously evolving spirit of the nation, as Lloyd contends, then national
heroes provide the ideal model of the individual’s relation to the nation, since their identity is totally immersed in the spirit of the nation. They are symbols in the Coleridgean sense of the term, who “by virtue of their participation in the original – and in its occluded depths – continuous life of the people, represent the virtual nation that has yet to be realized. Around these symbols the aesthetic formation of the citizen subject takes place” (Lloyd, “Counterparts” 131).

“Cyclops” stages a comic intervention into the ethical/aesthetic project of nationalism to weld individual and national identity through the cult of heroic ancestors by transfiguring the citizen in one of the earliest interpolations into a sort of hudibrastic ancestral hero, and embellishing his body with a hudibrastic record of his ancestral tradition: a monstrous gallery of “many [allegedly] Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity” (12.176), which I will refer to as the Hero-list from now on. In contrast to the nationalist vision of heroic ancestors, the list rather enacts Nietzsche’s conception of ancestral heritage in terms of “an unstable assemblage of faults, fissures and heterogeneous layers that threaten the fragile inheritor from within and from underneath” (Foucault, “Nietzsche” 81).

Here, I read the list against the backdrop of the citizen’s utterances and narrative representation in the episode at large. Through the dynamic focus of the list I aim to revise the hitherto offered reductive readings of the citizen’s figure as a representative of some kind of definable ideology – even if there has been no critical agreement as to what kind – by demonstrating that this anonymous figurehead, just like the heterogeneous Hero-list, functions as a motley woven out of colonial representations of the Irish, diverse cultural nationalist topoi and conflicting nationalist discourses. To facilitate the reader’s orientation, I begin with an outline of the genetic development of the Hero-list, the perusal of which has induced the novel reading strategy I employ in this chapter. The header shows the various phases when

---

1 Coleridge defines symbol in *The Statesman’s Manual*: “while it enunciates the whole, abides itself as a living
the names underneath were inserted. The temporal expansion of the list is demonstrated spatially in a movement from left to right.

Page Proof 2 (Oct. 1921)
2nd Thought in Page Proof 2
Page Proof 3 (Oct 1921)
2nd Thought in Page Proof 3

Cuchulin
Conn of hundred battles
Niall of nine hostages
Brian of Kincora
the ardri Malachi (5)
Art MacMurragh
Shane O’Neill
Father John Murphy
Owen Roe
Patrick Sarsfield (10)
Red Hugh O’Donnell
Red Jim MacDermott
Soggarth Eoghan O’Gowney
Michael Dwyer
Francy Higgins (15)
Henry Joy M’Cracken
Goliath
Horace Wheatley
Thomas Conneff
Peg Woffington (20)
the Village Blacksmith

Captain Moonlight
Captain Boycott
Dante Alighieri
Christopher Columbus (25)
S. Fursa
S. Brendan
Marshal MacMahon
Charlemagne
Theobald Wolfe Tone (30)
the Mother of the Maccabees
the Last of the Mohicans
the Rose of Castile
the Man for Galway

The Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo
The Man in the Gap (36)
The Woman Who Didn’t

Benjamin Franklin

gentially is representative” (qtd. in Lloyd, *Nationalism* 71).
Napoleon Bonaparte
John L. Sullivan (40)
    Cleopatra
    Savourneen Deelish
Julius Caesar
Paracelsus
sir Thomas Lipton (45)
William Tell
Michaelangelo Hayes
    Muhammad
    the Bride of Lammermoor
    Peter the Hermit (50)
    Peter the Packer
    Dark Rosaleen
    Patrick W. Shakespeare [W. added in Page Proof 3]
        Brian Confucius
        Murtagh Gutenberg (55)
        Patricio Velasquez
        Captain Nemo
        Tristan and Isolde
        the first Prince of Wales
Thomas Cook and Son (60)
    the Bold Soldier Boy
    Arrah na Pogue
    Dick Turpin
    Ludwig Beethoven
    the Colleen Bawn (65)
    Waddler Healy
    Angus the Culdee
    Dolly Mount
    Sidney Parade
    Ben Howth (70)
Valentine Greatrakes
Adam and Eve
Arthur Wellesley
Boss Croker
Herodotus (75)
    Jack the Giantkiller
Gautama Buddha
    Lady Godiva
    The Lily of Killarney
    Balor of the Evil Eye (80)
    the Queen of Sheba
Acky Nagle
Joe Nagle
Alessandro Volta
Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa (85)
Don Philip O’Sullivan Beare
The Desirability of the Revivability of Joyce’s Game

Apparently, with the exception of the initial eleven names, the list is piled-on heterogeneity incarnate, a random shuffling together of names: Irish historical heroes rub elbow with such comic absurdities as Goliath, Julius Caesar, William Tell, Patrick W. Shakespeare, and so forth. Any effort to make sense of this jumble seems a doomed enterprise and evidently goes against the grain of its function. The only readily discernible patterns in the list are of formal nature – rhyming couples like “Captain Moonlight, Captain Boycott”; repetition of the same linguistic structure such as “the Mother of Maccabees, the Last of the Mohicans, the Rose of Castile”; and hibernian hybrids such as “Patrick W. Shakespeare, Brian Confucius, Murtagh Gutenberg, Patricio Velasquez”; as has been catalogued by Shari and Bernard Benstock (“Cataloguing”) – which further emphasises its arbitrary nature.

Nevertheless, my effort has been encouraged by two considerations, the first of which is that the gigantic list is the result of massive and gradual augmentation. In the *Little Review*, where *Ulysses* appeared first in serial form, it comprised altogether twelve names – the first eleven plus the last one in the extended list – all of whom were representative icons in Irish nationalist heroic mythology. When, two years later, Joyce started to augment the list he began to add non-Irish names, embellish it with a fictional, musical, and theatrical aura and was increasingly working on the undoing of its linearity. Thus, the genetic evolution of the list can help the reader locate sites of ruptures and detect some initial lines of association that further augmentation increasingly undid. The most striking example is the separation of the last two names of the initial list – Red Hugh O’Donell and his contemporary, Don Philip O’Sullivan Beare, both trying to muster Spanish aid for an agonising Gaelic civilisation under increasingly forceful Tudor colonisation in the early seventeenth century – by a gulf of seventy-four names. Why did Joyce not add the seventy-four names to the end of the list instead of slicing off the last item and relegating it to the end? I will explore this question in
more detail later. Ironically enough, he added the epithet “Irish” to the earlier “many heroes of antiquity” when the list began to assume an international air.

Furthermore, the citizen himself at the beginning of the episode engages in a similar exercise: he reads a list of names out of the *Irish Independent* to show how Anglicised Parnell’s paper has become. As Schneidau has argued, this narrative incident functions as a signpost towards the technique of the interpolations: “That the citizen should derive evidence for a political diatribe by reading such a list is both delicious and an oblique comment by Joyce on how we can interpret apparently pointless verbal material.” Joyce’s lists can be “revealing of conceptual strands in the Irish psyche as well as of possibilities of lists, as in newspapers, containing hidden patterns of information that the compilers never intended to put there” (99). Some items in the list do encapsulate conceptual strands of the Irish psyche that Joyce the compiler clearly had in mind according to the evidence of the early drafts (V.A.8.). For instance, in the embryonic version of the episode Dark Rosaleen (item 52 in the list) is explicitly associated with the Irish language revival in the midst of fierce disparaging of the mongrel race, tongue and culture of the English:

It’s on the march – [not yet decided who] cried, Dark Rosaleen’s hour of triumph.
What about the scoffers now? A nation once again. To hell with the bloody brutal Sassenachs and their language!
– But still English, – [not yet decided who] said, we must keep it also for culture, I mean.
– To hell with them, – [not yet decided who] bawled, they have no culture, no music, no literature, no nothing. All they are good for is making waterclosets. Any civilisation they have they stole from us. (Herring 160).
The transplantation of Dark Rosaleen from the tirade against English civilisation (later stylised into the racist ‘syphilisation’ in the citizen’s version [12.1197]) into the list as a neighbour of Patrick W. Shakespeare, a hibernised icon of the English cultural canon can hint at some hidden pattern of information inscribed in the list. Similarly, as Gifford has noted, Joyce’s Triestine article, “The Mirage of the Fisherman of Aran” (1912) reveals some hidden pattern behind the apparently unrelated sequence: “Dante Alighieri, Christopher Columbus, S Fursa, S. Brendan,” since there Joyce singles out the latter two as the precursors of the former two, an example of how “seeming diffuseness in ‘Cyclops’ often returns to Irishness,” as Rodstein has observed (179). In what follows, I plough the catalogue in search of further potential hidden patterns and dynamics that make the list function simultaneously as a sort of psychograph of the citizen and as a web of ironic counterdiscourses working against his and by extension Irish nationalist stances and rhetoric. Although in certain cases I draw on information provided by Gifford’s invaluable Annotations, the speculative insights I offer mostly rely on my own philological spadework.

“The Memory of the Dead”

The embellishment of the citizen/hero’s figure with the Hero-list in the opening pages proleptically duplicates his evocation of the heroic dead as a prelude to his discourse on history saturating the episode: “So of course the citizen was only waiting for the wink of the word and he starts gassing out of him about the invincibles and the old guard and the men of

---

2 Several other names that made it into the Hero-list in the end initially formed part of the conversation of the barflies in the early draft. Cuchulin, heading the list, is implicated in the sports revival, another crucial national issue of the day. Brian Boru is associated with the pantomime, a detail which Joyce later worked into Ithaca (17.419). Marshal MacMahon is explicitly mentioned in a mini list of Wild Geese, “the best blood” that Ireland has given to the world, which is preserved in the printed text without MacMahon’s name (12.1379-84). Napoleon is recalled to have scoffed at the English as “a nation of shopkeepers.” The Peter the Packer and Captain Boycott of the printed list in the early draft are associated with strategies promoted by Griffith’s party, Sinn Féin: “Peter the Packer . . . can pack a jury for the crown, why can’t you pack the civil service and the police and the constabulary and swindle them in taxes and boycott the post too” (Herring 153-87). As a strategy,
sixtyseven and who fears to speak of ninetyeight and Joe with him about all the fellows that were hanged, drawn and transported for the cause by drumhead courtmartial” (12.479-83). This mini list encapsulating phases of the republican struggle for Irish independence in a regressive order from the political assassinations by the Invincibles in the 1880s through the Fenian Rising of 1867 down to its inception, the 1798 Insurrection of the United Irishmen, is soon followed by another one naming some of the most cherished icons of Irish nationalist martyrology: “And the citizen and Bloom having an argument about the point, the brothers Sheares and Wolfe Tone beyond on Arbour Hill and Robert Emmet and die for your country, the Tommy Moore touch about Sara Curran and she’s far from the land” (12.498-501).

As noted in the Introduction, because of his wholesale belligerence the citizen has often been described as the representative of physical force nationalism, and the episode has often been read “as a magisterial deflation of the tradition of physical force republicanism” (Rodstein 153). His prophecy of future retaliation of the wrongs Ireland suffered from England by the use of force with (by implication Fenian) help from America (12.1364-5), and his gesture of physical violence against Bloom in the end sustain such a reading. So does, apparently, his gesture of enumerating heroes and martyrs of the republican cause. However, the energising rhetoric of heroism and martyrdom was essential to any nationalist movement in Ireland, not just to the physical force faction (Boyce 309). It was also internalised to some extent by Joyce himself. Rodstein has rightly noted that “at many points in the prose writings Joyce seems more bitter about Irish unworthiness of its tradition of heroes and rebels than about the tradition itself” (153). As Oliver MacDonagh has observed, “the myth of repetitive heroic violence” formed a staple of nationalist culture throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (6). According to Joep Leerssen, the 1798 Rebellion “gave rise to a nationalist perspective that every generation needed to reassert Ireland’s right to boycott originated with the Irish, who, as Joyce himself informed an Italian audience in his Triestine articles:
independence, and the ultimate historical perspective of this apostolic succession of
nationalist champions was of course that of the country’s sovereign autonomy” (“1798” 42).
In the retrospective light of this telos, in turn, the past became an extension of this apostolic
succession. As Patrick Pearse on his last Christmas eve in 1915 claimed, “[l]ike a divine
religion, national freedom bears the marks of unity, of sanctity, of catholicity, and of apostolic
succession. [...] of apostolic succession, for it or the aspiration after it, passes down from the
nations’ fathers” (226). By the mid-1820s the 1798 rising paraded in nationalist
historiography “as the latest chapter of an age-old but unvarying struggle against English
oppression” (MacDonagh 5).

Two decades later, with the Young Irelanders’ Romantic nationalist project to endow
history with the mythic role of “creating an imagined community with a common identity”
(Whelan, “United” 273), the wholesale homogenisation of Irish history into an ongoing
heirloom and tradition of greatness and heroism traced back to mythic origins began
(Leerssen, Remembrance 148). The citizen’s mini list conjuring up the heroes of 1798 through
a line from a ballad, “The Memory of the Dead,” draws attention to the popular cultural
medium that beside the press was mostly enlisted to disseminate such an aestheticised
historiographic vision.\footnote{Written in the 1840s by the Young Irelander John Kells Ingram, it becam e one of the nationalist anthem s throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sung during the 1916 Rising as “Who fears to speak of Easter Week.” The song bemoans the fact that the bodies of many of Ireland’s heroes lie “far beyond the Atlantic foam,” yet it assures its listeners that “In true men, like you, men, / Their spirit’s still at home.”}

Realising the power of music over the Irish imagination, Thomas
Davis hoped to create a “ballad history of Ireland” with the aim

\'[t]o hallow or accurse the scenes of glory and honour, or of shame and sorrow; to give
to the imagination the arms, and homes, and senates, and battles of other days; to
rouse, and soften, and strengthen, and enlarge us with the passions of great periods; to

\textit{made ‘boycott’ an international war-cry” (CW 194). See also CW 191, 223.}
lead us into love of self-denial, of justice, of beauty, of valour, of generous life and
proud death, and to set up in our souls the memory of great men, who shall then be as
models and judges of our actions – these are the highest duties of history, and these are
best taught by a Ballad History. (122)

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries ballads – educated Anglo-Irish
ballads and street ballads and rebel songs – established a line of heroic figures from the
present through the more recent past – Wolfe Tone, Robert Emmet, the Manchester martyrs
(“the men of sixtyseven”), and Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa – reaching back to the more
distant past – Brian Boru, Red Hugh O’Donnell, Owen Roe O’Neill, and Patrick Sarsfield. All
of these, except Emmet, figure in the Cyclopean Hero-list. The predecessors of the most
recent heroes were “repeated in a litany like names of saints” (Zimmermann 66).

Besides the ballads, it was the populist illustrated histories/stories of Ireland
proliferating in the second half of the nineteenth century that aestheticised and froze Irish
history into a series of heroic tableaux blending myth and history. According to Leerssen,
their emergence must also be seen as a response to Young Ireland “idealistic monument-
building-in-the-abstract” (Remembrance 149). In addition to making Irish history “familiar to
the mind and pleasant to the ear” through ballads, Davis also had a project to make it pleasant
to the eye by capturing its high points in a series of paintings. In an essay, “Hints for Irish
Historical Paintings,” he suggests themes for a whole array of canvases as if in a catalogue. It

4 Some lines from Davis’s ballad, “The Green Above the Red” demonstrates this perfectly: “Sure ’twas for this
Lord Edward died, and Wolfe Tone sunk serene – / Because they could not bear to leave the Red above the
Green; / And ’twas for this that Owen fought, and Sarsfield nobly bled – / Because their eyes were hot to see the
Green above the Red” (The Spirit of the Nation 211). See also the song “Ireland’s Liberty Tree,” which I quote
in full in Chapter Four.

Yeats in a public lecture in 1903 spoke of “those names that are rated upon the rosary of our national
life,” giving as examples Parnell, Tone, Red Hugh O’Donnell and Hugh O’Neill, and concluding that “the
greatest sin a man can commit against his race and against mankind is to bring the work of the dead to nothing.”
Remembrance of these heroic dead can create the “phantom armies of the future” (qtd. in O’Driscoll 415).
Easter 1916 bore Yeast’s observation out.
begins with “The Landing of the Milesians,” the third scene is “Niall and his Nine Hostages,” and ends in: “‘Father Murphy administering the pledge in a Munster county,’ [. . .] and (O glorious prospect!) ‘The lifting of the Irish flags of a national fleet and army.’” (qtd. in Leerssen 149). One can hear the citizen’s wishful sigh in unison with that of Davis when uttering his grand vision of Ireland’s future regeneration:

Our harbours that are empty will be full again, [. . .] And will again, says he, when the first Irish battleship is seen breasting the waves with our own flag to the fore, none of your Henry Tudor harps, no, the oldest flag afloat, the flag of the province of Desmond and Thomond, three crowns on a blue field, the three sons of Milesius. (12.1302-10)

Populist illustrated histories were such catalogues fleshed out, as Leerssen contends. They endlessly recycled the same material enumerating the famous and known picturesque high points from the Milesians to the present. Later historians did not critique, but rather took up older historians and continued their narratives “until the present day,” leaving it to a future sequel to finish the story (Remembrance 152-55).

**Chronological Scrambling**

The initial Cyclopean tribal gallery of twelve heroes in the *Little Review* could almost have figured in a populist illustrated history/story of Ireland. Complementing the citizen’s recited mini list of heroes it extends the apostolic succession from 1798 back in time down to the mythic dawn of the nation. It opens with the ancient Milesian hero, Cuchulin [sic], described by Standish James O’Grady as “uncomparably the greatest of all the heroes who figure in the front of Irish history” (99), by Russell as the embodiment of “all that the bards
thought noblest in the spirit of their race” (qtd. in O’Driscoll 412), and by Patrick Pearse as the “true type of Gaelic nationality” (58). He is followed, in turn, by two of the most important founding fathers of the Irish nation, according to O’Grady’s *History of Ireland*: Conn of hundred battles and Niall of Nine Hostages (also the third theme in Davis’s projected gallery). O’Grady in his monumental imaginative reconstruction of the life of Irish pre-Christian warrior society, eulogises Niall for his conquest of the whole of the British Isles and part of Northern Europe and for his grand achievement of a “comparative national solidarity,” which before him only Conn could to some extent realise (274). The first three ancient martial heroes of the Hero-list are representatives of three successive phases of the emergence of the nation from myth into verifiable history according to O’Grady: Cuchulainn embodies the mythic age of heroes, Conn stands for the cycle blending verifiable history with fable, while Niall represents the period of martial predominance (67-72).

The enumeration of representative names highlighting chronologically the course of Irish history is carried on for a while: Brian of Kincora and the Ardri Malachi mark the heroic fight against the Danish invasion in the tenth-eleventh centuries. Art Macmurragh stands for the first Gaelic revival in the fourteenth century after the major trauma of the Norman conquest two centuries before, while Shane O’Neill represents the feudal wars of the Tudor period. At this point, however, the list performs some chronological scrambling by jumping two centuries forward with Father John Murphy, a hero of the 1798 Rebellion. Chronology is once again restored by Owen Roe and Patrick Sarsfield, who mark the last two high points of taking arms against the sea of English (and by then by extension Protestant) trouble, represented by Cromwell and William of Orange respectively, before the dawn of the modern Irish nation. Yet again, with the final couple, Red Hugh O’Donnell and Don Philip O’Sullivan Beare, chronology crumbles, since they fling us back to the beginning of the seventeenth century conjuring up the traumatic last battle and end of Gaelic civilisation.
A muted rebellion, an ultimate agonising effort of chronology to regain power and continue the story of Ireland until the present day can be detected in the appearance of Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa as the last-but-one item in the extended list. His presence also points to the future, that is, the future relative to the novel’s present, since it was the funeral of this “unrepentant Fenian” shortly before the 1916 Rising that gave actuality to Pearse’s increasingly sacrificial rhetoric: “Life springs from death; and from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations,” as he oracled at O’Donovan Rossa’s grave (136-7). Yet, the seventeenth-century Don Philip O’Sullivan Beare, clinging to his final position also in the extended list, clinches this rebellion.

The Spirit of Perspective

Beyond such chronological tampering, the initial list counteracts nationalist genealogical historical narratives in more subtle ways. It draws attention to the inescapably perspectivised nature of historical knowledge. One could ponder, for instance, why the 1798 rebellion is represented by the Wexford priest, Father John Murphy and not by Theobald Wolfe Tone, the chief architect of the United Irishmen figuring in the citizen’s mini list? (Tone was inserted later into the Hero-list). Here, the presence of Don Philip O’Sullivan Beare signals a potential answer.

All the initial twelve figures are martial heroes, including O’Sullivan Beare, who fought in the last rebellion of Gaelic Ireland led by Hugh O’Neill and Red Hugh O’Donnell, his initial neighbour in the list. While the others were only actors in the historical drama, he, beside being an actor, was also its retrospective creator. After his lands were confiscated he sought refuge in Spain, where he wrote the first published history of Catholic Ireland:

---

5 Several studies have discussed how the future, especially the 1916 Rising, is gestured into “Cyclops.” See Kenner, Fairhall, Duffy, and Rodstein. I find the last the most subtle and convincing.
Historiae Catholicae Iberniae Compendium (1621). Since his purpose was to gain military aid from the Spanish monarch in the reconquest of Ireland from the English, and since Spain was the stronghold of Catholicism/Counter-Reformation at the time, he portrayed the whole course of Irish history through the lenses of religion – representing the Irish as the victims of English tyranny and the “defenders of faith” against “English heresy” – and appealed to the Spanish monarch for help in terms of a “holy crusade” (Carroll 104-23). While Protestant historians vilified the Compendium’s lack of reliability, it remained an important source for Catholic historians, and in the nineteenth century it became part of an emerging Irish Catholic nationalism, which also manifested itself in a partisan confiscation of the memory of 1798.

While the aim of the United Irishmen, the chief architects of the 1798 Rebellion, was to transcend sectarian, ethnic and political divisions – Tone’s pronounced aim was “[t]o unite the whole people of Ireland, to abolish the memory of all past dissensions, and to substitute the common name of Irishmen in place of the denominations of Protestants, Catholics and Dissenters’ (qtd. in Whelan, Fellowship 21) – by the end of the nineteenth century the memory of 1798 was forced into the straitjacket of sectarian interpretation. In his A Popular History (1870) a Wexford friar, Patrick Kavanagh, worked out “a faith and fatherland model of the rebellion as a Catholic crusade devoid of United Irish influence” (Whelan, Fellowship 6).

For O’Grady, the great merit of O’Sullivan Beare’s history was that it was written “by one who had conversed for many years with all the principal actors of the Irish war theatre” (qtd. in Carroll 105). Ironically enough, the gulf of seventy-four names later inserted into the list severs this connection. The whole “Cyclops” episode is the story of an eye-witness who conversed with the actors in Barney Kiernan’s pub theatre.

Since the Compendium was written from the perspective of a dispossessed exile it represents Irish history “as tragedy on an epic scale” (Carroll 122). Carroll’s description would fit the citizen’s vision of Irish history as well. Also, some musical allusions imbue the citizen’s figure with the aura of an exile. His paraphernalia comprise the dog Garryowen, his papers, and what the narrator calls his cruiskeen lawn, meaning “little full jug.” In George Sigerson’s Bards of the Gael and Gall (1907) the song “Cruiskeen Lawn” represents drinking as a patriotic act of an exile waiting for a national deliverance from outside (271). Furthermore, when the citizen utters a plea for the salvation of the trees of Ireland “for the future men of Ireland on the fair hills of Eire O” (12. 1264), his concluding sigh evokes Mangan’s translation of an eighteenth century Irish song, which presents an Irish exile’s perspective, who “pining thousand miles away from the fair hills of Eire” “pours a lament forth for Eire’s decay,” and is “pining, again to behold / The land that belongs to the brave Gael of old” (Sigerson 259).

In a sense O’Sullivan Beare’s final name leads the list up to the present, since the English translation of the third volume of the Compendium focusing on the war led by Hugh O’Neill and Red Hugh O’Donnell against Queen Elisabeth was published in 1903.
126). As Whelan observes, Kavanagh’s “message was simple, even simplistic: Father John Murphy, and he alone, was at the real and metaphysical heart of 1798 in Wexford, the heroic leader of the defenceless, passive people, under attack solely because of their religious persuasion” (*Tree of Liberty* 170). After Kavanagh the “mighty wave of Father Murphy swept all before it” (Whelan, *Fellowship* 126). From the 1890s, well beyond the creation of the new state, a wholesale idealist monument-building-in-the-abstract began around him in ballads, novels, and melodramas.8 Kavanagh’s demonisation of the United Irishmen as riddled by spies and ruined by drink and self-important leaders, in turn, gave rise to sensation-seeking books publicising the spies of the 1790s, the most popular being *The Sham Squire and Informers of 1798*. When Joyce started to augment the Hero-list he inserted two leaders of the 1798 Rebellion, Michael Dwyer and the United Irishman Henry Joy M’Cracken [*sic*] (items 14 and 16), somewhat removed from Father Murphy. Given the 1904 interpretative climate of 1798 little wonder that Francy Higgins (alias the “sham squire”), who ran a team of informers in Dublin and to whom the devastating arrest of Lord Edward FitzGerald, the leader of the Dublin section of the United Irishmen on the eve of the insurrection is due, figures between them.

That Joyce was aware of the growing invasion of a Catholic “faith and fatherland” perspective of Irish history in turn-of-the-century Ireland is clear from his description of Stephen’s discussion of nationalism with Madden in *Stephen Hero* (Davin in *A Portrait*): “The watchcry was Faith and Fatherland, a sacred word in that world of cleverly inflammable enthusiasms” (57). The inscription of this perspective into the Hero-list may be read as an instance of its function as a psychograph of the citizen, since his brand of nationalism has

---

8 Probably the best known ballad, P. J. McCall’s “Boolavogue” describes Father Murphy as “sweep[ing] o’er the earth like a mighty wave” (Zimmermann 290). See also such melodramas as P. J. Bourke’s *When Wexford Rose* (1910) and Ira Allen’s *Father Murphy* (1912). As Whelan argues, this interpretation of 1798 underlies more recent representations of 1798 such as Thomas Flanagan’s *The Year of the French* and Seamus Heaney’s “Requiem for the Croppies” (*Tree of Liberty* 172).
been allied with Catholicism. Yet, like Nolan, I see nothing “particularly Catholic about the citizen’s blasphemous obscenity” (98). True, he invokes St. Patrick to come back and assist the Irish in purging Ireland from contaminating strangers like Bloom, but his curse on the English strangers equally sweeps away the fountainhead of religion: “The curse of a goodfornothing God light sideways on the bloody thickluggered sons of whores’ gets” (12.1198-99). Nevertheless, if not in terms of religion, it still can be read as a component of the citizen’s psychograph, since the deliberately sectarian moulding of history conjured up through these figures resonates with the sectarian attitudes of the citizen at large.

“Wolfe Tone beyond on Arbour Hill”

The dynamics surrounding the name of Theobald Wolfe Tone (item 30) provides the clearest demonstration of how historical meaning (like meaning in general) emerges through retrospective semantification. Spatially disunited from the other United Irishmen, he is preceded by Charlemagne and followed by the Mother of the Maccabees. As the genetic development of the list shows, however, his original companion was not her, but Benjamin Franklin, who, in turn, is followed by Napoleon Bonaparte. As proximity is a powerful organiser and distance blurs connections, Wolfe Tone’s image changes in the retrospective shadow of his neighbours.

The initial sequence hints at the two roots of United Irish ideology: the American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789. According to Whelan and other historians, “the American Revolution provided an enormous boost to Irish radicalism. [. . .] Most of the influential leaders of the United Irishmen were born in the 1760s and were literally as well as politically children of the American Revolution” (Fellowship 9). As Franklin recognised, “The cause of America was the cause of Ireland. The cause of Ireland was the cause of America” (qtd. in Whelan, Fellowship 3). The French Revolution, in turn,
broke the sectarian mould of European politics, and Tone, as the main interpreter of the French revolution for an Irish audience, broke the sectarian mould of Irish politics. As United Irish Ambassador he went to France via America to seek a supportive French invasion. As a result of Tone’s success in gaining French support, no matter how abortive its actualisation was twice in 1796 and 1798, the authorities felt threatened by a French invasion during the time of Napoleon.9

In contrast to this initial sequence which accentuates Tone’s contours as the major ideologue of the United Irishmen, his later companion, a Jewish martyr-mother who together with her seven sons sacrificed herself in defence of her faith (Gifford 323), strengthens his martyr aspect.10 So does the citizen, who in his argument with Bloom conjures up not the United Irish ideologue, but the martyr for Ireland, who committed suicide in his prison cell

9 Napoleon was hailed in street ballads as the potential liberator before Daniel O’Connell assumed the title (33). The decade after the fall of Parnell evinced Napoleon’s resurgence of popularity. In 1900, Griffith’s United Irishman serially published his biography, while Dublin theatres produced plays about him. J. W. Whitbread’s melodrama, Wolfe Tone (1898) stages an encounter between Tone and Napoleon (Watt 35-60, Herr 245-53).

It is worth noting that Napoleon’s full name is given in the proximity of the two freedom fighters, Tone and Franklin. Napoleon Bonaparte, the Corsican freedom fighter began to use his Christian name alone upon becoming the first consul of France, that is, when he began to metamorphose into an empire-builder, who considered himself a modern day Charlemagne. The clash of steels that can be heard in Tone’s juxtaposition with Charlemagne – the steel of monarchy with that of republic – is reconciled in the figure of Napoleon, who, although the child of French Republicanism, grew into a monarch. Thus, the sequence of Charlemagne, Wolfe Tone, Benjamin Franklin, Napoleon Bonaparte brings us from empire through republic “by a commodious vicus of recirculation” back to empire. Napoleon Bonaparte’s Southern neighbour in the Hero-list, John L. Sullivan, can also participate in this sequence. Although, as Gifford suggests, he was a celebrated Irish–American boxer at the turn of the century (323), in the wake of Tone, Franklin and Napoleon, this name can also echo that of the nineteenth-century expansionist New York journalist, John L. O’Sullivan, as Szilárd Orosz pointed out to me. In 1845, in a manner reminiscent of the citizen’s rhetoric, O’Sullivan argued that it was “the manifest destiny” of the American republic, “allotted by Providence,” to overspread the whole North American continent (Schroeder 806-7, LaFeber 94-95). Later Joyce exploded this sequence by inserting several fiction and song titles between Tone and Franklin. Yet, among them features Balfe’s opera “The Rose of Castile,” from which professor McHugh sings two lines in Aeolus: “ ‘Twas rank and fame that tempted thee, / ‘Twas empire charmed thy heart” (7.47102). Through the song the seductions of power assume the hue of sexual seduction.

10 The Woman Who Didn’t, a few names later, conjures up another fictional martyr. In his masterpiece of Victorian kitsch, The Woman Who Did, the Canadian writer Grant Allen (who won a 1000 pound prize with a story for Tit Bits!), tells the story of a woman who did dare to say ‘No’ to marriage. She, Herminia, conceives of herself as a martyr for women’s freedom, and sees her acts as a “self-imposed sacrifice for humanity’s sake” (65). The novel teems with such sententious statements concerning the cause of women that Irish nationalist rhetoric employed as to the cause of the nation: “To succeed is to fail and failure is the only success worth aiming at. Every great and good life can but end in Calvary” (44). This unmistakably resonates with Professor McHugh’s piece of wisdom in “Aeolus” (7.551-2). Accordingly, but somewhat ironically, the novel ends in failure: Herminia’s self-imposed sacrifice is of no avail in the end, since her daughter Dolores, (the namesake of the yearning Queen of the Eastern Seas!), whom Herminia meant to bring up to become the Saviour of women, denounces her mother’s ideals and, like a good Victorian girl, marries a gentleman.
“beyond on Arbour Hill” the night before his execution. This might be put down to his one-eyed vision of things, but it can also be read as a realistic marker of how Tone’s memory became preserved in populist nationalist historiography. If heroes are central icons in nationalist identity formation, martyrs are their paragon, since they are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for the nation. As Davis’s ballad “Sweet and Sad” claims:

Freedom has arisen,
Oft from statesman’s strife,
Oft from battle’s flashes,
Oft from hero’s life,
Oftest from his ashes.

(The Spirit of the Nation 213)

But why is Tone juxtaposed with a woman martyr/martyr-mother? This could be read as a Cyclopean contribution to the increasing sentimentalisation of Tone’s image. Davis, who began Tone’s poetic transubstantiation into a martyr, in his pioneering ballad “Tone’s Grave” writes:

For in him the heart of a woman combin’d
With a heroic life, and a governing mind
– a martyr for Ireland – his grave has no stone –
his name seldom named and his virtues unknown.

(The Spirit of the Nation 110)
More than half a century later Patrick Pearse in an address at the grave of Tone in Bodenstown, which had become a regular place of pilgrimage by the early twentieth century, conjures up before the mind’s eye an even more maudlin picture:

I do not think there has ever been a more true and loyal man than Tone. […] and now and then there breaks into what he is writing or saying a gust of passionate love for his wife and his children. ‘O my babies, my babies!’ he exclaims. . . . Yes, this man could love well; and it was from such love as this he exiled himself; with such love as this crushed in his faithful heart that he became a weary but indomitable ambassador to courts and camps; with the memory of such love as this, with the little hands of his children plucking at his heartstrings, that he lay down to die in that cell on Arbour Hill. (58)

Beware of Analogy-Mongers I.

The emergence of Tone’s martyr aspect in the Hero-list through his juxtaposition with a Jewish martyr, the mother of the Maccebees, also functions as a comic exposure of a crucial strategy of nationalist identity formation: recourse to historical analogy. When the citizen qualifies “our missing twenty millions of Irish” as “our lost tribes” (12.1240-41), and envisions the vengeful return of those Irishmen “that came to the land of the free [America]” from “the land of bondage ” (12.1372-74), his reflexive metaphorical gestures enact a widespread nationalist topos: the comparison between the children of Israel in exile and the oppressed children of the Gael. John F.Taylor’s piece of oratory recited by Professor McHugh in “Aeolus” evidently draws on this topos. As Dáithí Ó hÓgáin notes, it was a recurrent theme in Irish literature well before the dawn of the modern nation (126). Red Hugh O’Donnell (item 11), for instance, was lauded by his friend and biographer as a latter-day Moses (Ó
hÓgáin 136). The fact that the citizen attacks Bloom partly because he considers him Jewish is not an idiosyncratic, nor Irish, contradiction in his figure. As Reizbaum contends, not only in Ireland but in Europe generally, Jews as a people were seen in symbolic, almost mythical terms, often analogyzed with oppressed peoples (the Irish, the Hungarians), and thereby romanticized. Once Jews stepped out of this symbolic role and became the citizens of a real country, however, they became detestable, no longer a symbol of the oppressed but the killers of Christ, usurpers of Jerusalem, usurers, heathens (*Judaic Other* 19).

It is not without irony that the Last of the Mohicans following the Mother of Maccabees in the Hero-list and duplicating her formal pattern, conjures up another analogy that was created and perpetuated not by Irish anti-colonial, but English colonial discourse, evoked by the citizen’s bitter recollection of how during the Famine “the *Times* rubbed its hands and told the whitelivered Saxons there would soon be as few Irish in Ireland as redskins in America” (12.1367-9). As Gibbons notes, the comparison of the Irish to native Americans in terms of their relative primitiveness and savagery served as a justification for the conquest of Ireland in Elizabethan times and has survived down to the present day in loyalist popular memory in Northern Ireland (152). English colonial discourse established a whole “network of affinities” between the subject populations. It perceived a common primitive culture in their dwelling places, dress, and sleeping habits. “When Shane O’Neill (item 7 in the Hero-list) presented himself at the court of Queen Elizabeth in 1562, decked out in a vivid saffron cloak the historian Camden wrote that he was looked upon with as much wonderment as if he had come form ‘China or America’ ” (Gibbons 151).

The citizen’s barbarity has been customarily condemned by critics until the 1990s.
Even some postcolonial readings, notably Duffy’s 1995 attempt to redefine the clash between the citizen and Bloom in terms of a clash between the two poles of the barbarian/civilian dichotomy created by colonial discourses reinforces the critical habit to describe the citizen as a barbarian. The interpolation containing the Hero-list does lend him a savage air manifest in his gigantic body, primitive clothes, and use of a Palaeolithic weapon. But the citizen’s rhetoric turns the colonial stereotype of the savage Irishman against the English when he calls the English hangman “a barbarous bloody barbarian” (12.432). Elevating this remark into the citizen’s “most important statement,” Nolan’s postcolonial redefinition of the politics of the episode has made an attempt to redeem the citizen from the slander that Duffy reinforces (See especially 104).

By a stretch of imagination one could detect in the two items following the Last of the Mohicans in the Hero-list, the Rose of Castile, and the Man for Galway faint thematic echoes of the Irish reaction to the English racial slurring of the Irish as barbarians. Around the time that O’Sullivan Beare published his history of Ireland written in Latin for a Spanish audience, Seathrúin Céitinn (Geoffrey Keating) wrote a history of Ireland in Irish for an Irish audience, Foras Feasa (a source book of later nationalist historiography) to refute colonial representations of the Irish as barbarians needing the bliss of English civilisation. Like O’Sullivan Beare, he claimed that the Irish, whose ancestors, the sons of Milesius, came originally from Spain, had a more ancient civilisation than the English. Joyce in his Triestine article “The City of the Tribes” points out the Spanish origins of Galway city, and looking beyond “bothersome modernity” conjures up “the Spanish city” “in the twilight of history” (CW 229). Noting how Galway’s “connection with Latin Europe” is inscribed in its street names, he gives a few examples, among others, the street name: Velasquez de Palmeira Boulevard (CW 230). Velasquez, christened Patricio, figures in the Hero-list.
Beware of Analogy-Mongers II.

The incorporation of several legendary and historical heroes of other peoples in the extended Hero-list can also be seen as a comic dramatisation of such historical analogy-mongering that Stephen explicitly dismisses in *Stephen Hero*:

He saw that many political absurdities arose from the lack of a just sense of comparison in public men. The orators of this patriotic party [enthusiasts gathering around a figure whose description recalls Michael Cusack, the initial model of the citizen] were not ashamed to cite the precedent of Switzerland and France. The intelligent centres of the movement were so scantily supplied that the analogies they gave out as exact and potent were really analogies built haphazard upon very inexact knowledge. (66)₁¹

Haphazardly built analogies abound not only in oratory but in historical writings and songs, and much of the comic absurdity of the Hero-list can be transubstantiated into ironic commentary against their backdrop. Here are a few examples: O’Grady compares the heroes of the third phase of his Irish history, among them Conn of hundred battles, to Charlemain [sic] and his Paladins (71). When he describes how the Celtic god Lugh, “the genius of Irish patriotism,” chose the hero’s alternative and killed the tyrant Balor of the Evil Eye instead of becoming a powerful member of the dominant race, an option also available to him, he analogises Lugh’s choice with that of Moses in Hebrew, Gaudama in Indian, and the Gracchi in Roman history (117). While the Hero-list parades Gautama Buddha, he is followed a few names later not by his analogous Irish hero, Lugh, but his opponent, the Gaelic Cyclops,
Balor. A rebel song praising Father John Murphy conjures up the biblical combat between David and Goliath before elaborating on the Irish hero’s fight against the English “heretical clan” (Zimmermann 142-45). David does not figure in the Hero-list, but the biblical version of the Cyclops, Goliath follows in Father Murphy’s wake. The image of William Tell in the act of executing the foreign tyrant, in turn, adorned the first broadsheet ballad written on the Phoenix park murders by the Invincibles (mentioned in the citizen’s mini list) (Zimmermann 62). Tell’s companion in the Hero-list, Michaelangelo Hayes, a nineteenth century Dublin painter, notorious for his belligerence (Welch 470), has nothing to do with the Swiss legendary tyrant killer, but one version of the ballad “The Rory of the Hill,” an echo of which can be heard in the narrator’s description of the citizen’s first gesture as “doing the rapparee and Rory of the Hill” (12.134), valorises a peasant hero who “shot a tyrant / and so did Michael Hayes” (Zimmermann 268). Michael Hayes is of course only a deceptive echo of Michaelangelo Hayes. Yet, so are all historical analogies, which, conceived in the spirit of a monumental/heroic vision of history, masquerade as identities, as Nietzsche claims (40).

The Hero-list appears to pay a particular tribute to the Italian historian, Guglielmo Ferrero, whose *The History of Rome* Joyce read with fascination while living in Rome and which most probably inspired him to write a story called “Ulysses” (*Letters* II 190). As Robert Spoo contends, “what really must have struck Joyce is Ferrero’s anti-heroic treatment of the great Romans. Caesar, for example is presented as a demagogue and an ‘Archdestroyer’” (29). Ferrero’s contemporary critic Benedetto Croce particularly lamented that Ferrero characterised ancient matters with modern names and concepts, and compared “Julius Caesar to a socialist leader or a Tammany Hall Boss in New York” (qtd. in Spoo 28). Tammany Hall,

1Stephen continues: “A glowing example was to be found for Ireland in the case of Hungary, an example as these patriots imagined, of a long-suffering minority, entitled by every right of race and justice to a separate freedom, finally emancipating itself” (67). That the Hero-list lacks any trace of the Hungarian/Irish analogy can reflect the fact that the “revelation” that Bloom gave the Hungarian idea of Sinn Féin to Griffith does not get too much applause from the citizen in “Cyclops.”
originally founded as a charitable institution in the second half of the nineteenth century,
became synonymous with wholesale corruption after it became dominated by Irish-American
politicians, who used it to accumulate their fortunes. The Irish born Richard Croker
(nicknamed Boss Croker) was the “most notorious bloody robber” (to borrow the “Cyclopes”
narrator’s words) among them. His years as Tammany leader were “a record of ruthless
dictatorial power and massive corruption” (Drudy 176-77). Although the Hero-list pushes
them apart by subsequent augmentation, it accommodates both Julius Caesar and Boss
Croker. In 1904 the latter was happily settled in Ireland as a multi-millionaire breeding and
racing horses (O glorious prospect for the barflies in Barney Kiernan’s!) after a 1903 scandal
finally forced him to resign his office in New York. 12

The Cyclopean Touch about the Heroines

As we have seen so far, meaning in the Hero-list (as in the whole episode generally)
emerges locally out of contiguity rather than organically as the revelation of some inherent
essence, and the proliferating semantic ramifications cannot be subsumed into some overall
pattern. Nevertheless, concerning the heroines almost a general rule seems to apply: with two
exceptions all of them belong to the symbolic domain of legend, music, fiction, and drama,

12 The proximity of Cleopatra to Caesar in the Hero-list can also be seen as an enactment of another crucial
feature of Ferrero’s treatment of ancient history. As opposed to the Hegelian/Carlylian Great Men theory of
history dominating nineteenth century historiography, Ferrero’s psychological, humanising approach established
a causal relationship between private acts and larger historical developments. This must have endeared Ferrero
to Joyce immediately, since shortly before Joyce came across Ferrero’s history he wrote in a letter to his brother
Stanislaus: “I am sure that the whole structure of heroism is, and always was, a damned lie and that there cannot
be any substitute for the individual passion as the motive power of everything – art and philosophy included”
(Letters II 81). The Hero-list separates/bridges Cleopatra and Julius Casear by the Irish song “Savourmeen
Deelish,” a pathetic description of how a soldier takes leave of his lover and how he finds out on his return that
she has died of sorrow. I cannot but hear the wishful sigh of Caesar, so ungenerously paid by his one-time lover
for his help in restoring her to the throne. My conjecture is born out by a passage in Finnegans Wake, where
“Clipiatria, thy hosies history” appears in the proximity of “Sire Jeallyous Seizer” (271.3-5).

Cleopatra’s presence in the Hero-list can also be imbued with irony in the light of an analogy –
perpetuated in Irish nationalist historiography and poetry, among others by Thomas Moore – between Cleopatra
and Dearbhorgil, the “dishonoured wife” of O’Rourke, prince of Breffin, the prime historical scapegoat of both
the citizen and Mr Deasy. For the source of this analogy in Giraldus Cambrensis (one of the citizen’s
authorities), its perpetuation by Moore and its operation in Ulysses see Senn’s “Fabled by Misogyny.”
and are nominally deindividualised. Eve as Adam’s, and Isolde as Tristran’s companion, Lady Godiva, the Queen of Sheba and the mother of the Maccabees belong to legend; the Rose of Castile, Savourneen Deelish, Dark Rosaleen, the Lily of Killarney resonate with music; The Woman Who Didn’t, the Bride of Lammermore spring from fiction, while Arrah na Pogue and the Colleen Bawn from drama. Apparently, Peg Woffington and Cleopatra are exceptions, yet as the former was a celebrated Irish actress in the eighteenth century and the latter is mostly recalled by modernity through the poetic filter of Shakespearean drama, they are also implicated in his domain. Also, the name Cleopatra, used today to signify one particular historical queen, was a regular name of the queens of Egypt in the Ptolemaic dynasty (Encyclopedia Britannica 11th ed.). This tendency in the list duplicates one of the most conspicuous features of the episode at large: women are present in Barney Kiernan’s male world only as images constructed by (male) representational filters. The citizen’s litany of national martyrs pays a tribute to Tommy Moore’s poetic touch – a masculine wish-fulfilment fantasy – about Sara(h) Curran rather than to Robert Emmet’s fiancée herself (12.501).13

Foretelling the redemption of Ireland the citizen figures the avenging male agents returning from America as “the sons of Granuaile, the champions of Kathleen ni Houlihan” (12.1375-76). Ascribing agency to men, he casts women in the symbolic roles of mother and inspirer of the male agents. The only instance when he allows historical agency to a woman – unnamed – simultaneously figures her as the scapegoat of Irish history: “The adulteress and her paramour

13 While in Thomas Moore’s popular Irish Melody, “She is far from the Land,” Sarah Curran’s “heart in his [Emmet’s] grave is lying,” thus she “turns from other lovers’ gaze and weeps,” and will soon follow her lover into the grave, in reality Sarah Curran married an English officer two years after Emmet’s execution. Although the subsequent ballads of the Young Irelanders substituted Moore’s sentimental wailing with militant optimism, they carried on Moore’s gender politics: “The lover upon the gallows tree! / The maid with her plighted troth, / Dying with grief on a bier-like bed! / O, God, have mercy on both” (“Emmet’s Death,” The Spirit of the Nation 216). The maudlin song “Savourneen Deelish” (item 42 in the Hero-list) projects a similar fate for the heroine, with the difference that in her case her soldier-lover’s absence suffices for her to die of grief. Joyce exposes the discrepancy between such masculine fantasies and historical reality in the interpolated parodic execution scene, where the “brushing bride elect” of the hero martyr accepts the marriage proposal of a handsome young Oxford graduate on the spot (12.662). Also, it might not be accidental that Savourneen Deelish is accompanied by Cleopatra, a sexually empowered woman, who needs something more material than grief to kill her.
brought the Saxon robbers here. [ . . .] A dishonoured wife, says the citizen, that’s what’s the cause of all our misfortunes” (12.1157-64).

These three instances of the citizen’s rhetoric perfectly demonstrate Cynthia Enloe’s remark that nationalisms have “sprung from masculinized memory, masculinized humiliation and masculinized hope” (qtd. in McClintock 353). Of course, a major irony lurks in the fact that while nationalist ideologies invest a lot in the idea of popular *unity* they invariably rely on constructions emphasising gender *difference*, as McClintock argues (353). Thus while nationalist ethics and aesthetics typically safeguard national agency for men, women mostly function as symbolic bearers of the nation, the backdrop against which men determine the fate of the nation. In colonial Ireland, in the nationalist heroic scenario of Irish history, to revert to Leerssen’s remark quoted above, women were cast as the “ultimate perspective” of the “*apostolic* succession of national champions”: “the country’s sovereign autonomy.” As C. L. Innes has claimed in her comprehensive study of the portrayal of woman and nation in Irish literature and society:

Locked into confrontation with Britain and contestation over the motherland, Irish literature and Irish history have created males as national subjects and women as sites of contestation. Liberators, Uncrowned kings and would-be Messiahs abound in the rolls of honour, but women tend to be ignored except as muses or mates, such as Sarah Curran, Maud Gonne, and Kitty O’Shea. Those women who sought involvement in the
national liberation have been dismissed as ‘pretty ideologues,’ [. . .] or as fanatics, and viragos. (3)\(^{14}\)

Throughout the history of its colonisation, Ireland (land and sovereignty) was embodied in a variety of feminine forms – Eire, Erin (or Eriu), Banba, Fodhla, Hibernia, Mother Ireland, Ganuaile (also spelt Granu Waile, Grana Uaile, Grania, Granu), the Poor Old Woman (or the Shan Van Vocht), Shighile ni Gara, Cathleen ni Houlihan, Dark Rosaleen – and in a variety of feminine roles – queen, mother, lover, bride, spouse, widow, virgin, or even a harlot in dalliance with the foreigners – in accordance with the vicissitudes of Irish history and changing political agenda.\(^{15}\) Without a doubt, from among the proliferating feminine images of Ireland the eponymous figure of Eire/Erin takes the palm. As Breandán Ó Bruachalla has pointed out, she was a primary constant in Irish political ideology form the earliest times down to the twentieth century, providing a sense of continuity over time and legitimising or undermining the legitimacy of the successive waves of kings, monarchs and liberators:

\(^{14}\) As Sighle Bhreathnach-Lynch has claimed, although women played a significant role in Irish public life and politics since the beginning of the nineteenth century – women activist groups such as Anna Parnell’s Ladies’ Land Leauge, Maud Gonne’s *Inghinidhe na h-Eireann* (the Daughters of Erin), the *Cumann na mBan* (the Council of Women), end so forth, proliferated especially after the 1880s – their activities gained little public acknowledgement or were regarded with suspicion by men. In the course of the “statumania” (Maurice Agulhon’s coinage qtd. in Owens 103) sweeping across the freshly established Irish Free State to create its legitimising icons only one monument commemorating a woman was erected. It was to Countess Constance Markievicz, founder member of the militant *Fianna Eireann*, member of the *Inghinidhe na h-Eireann*, of the Irish Citizen Army and commander in the 1916 Rising, in short, a soldier, not calling the sons of Ireland to fight for Ireland’s freedom, but fighting for it herself. Yet, as Breathnach-Lynch has noted, the unveiling speech of President de Valera, which downplayed the countess’s revolutionary activities and concentrated on her charitable work – creating a “chocolate box heroine” out of her, as Hannah Sheehy Skeffington put it – showed that “he had a problem with women playing an active role in men’s affairs” (165).

\(^{15}\) According to Denis Zimmermann, although the personification of the land as a woman was not unique in Ireland, “the theme seems to have been used much more frequently in Ireland than anywhere else” (54). Since the feminisation of subdued lands has also been a typical feature of imperial discourse, feminine constructions of Ireland also abounded in British colonial representations of the Irish, evidently with different implications.
This ever young/ever old persona pervades Irish political literature and Irish political thought; she is the keystone on which all articulations of Irish national consciousness were constructed. When the Irish first arrived in Ireland, so the origin-legend goes, they were met by Eire, who foretold that Ireland would belong to the Irish for all time.

(115)

Yet, paradoxically, beside providing a sense of continuity, the image of Eire/Erin also became the prime expression of historical mutability. As Ó Bruachalla continues: “Throughout the centuries she was realised in whatever feminine role (queen/ hag/ maiden/ harlot [I would add mother]) as the political circumstances demanded, her physical condition always reflecting the state of the country” (115).

“Cyclops” parades several from among the feminine representations of Ireland, their use invariably wrought with irony. Its earliest instance is the citizen’s association with Erin in the interpolation containing the Hero-list. The descriptive detail that in the hero’s eyes “a tear and a smile strove ever for the mastery,” echoes one of Thoman Moore’s Irish Melodies,

---

16 Ned Lambert’s reaction to the citizen’s optimistic foretelling of Ireland’s redemption by the sons of Granuaile, the champions of Cathleen ni Houlihan ironically counteracts the citizen’s grandiose gesture by alluding to another feminine image of Ireland: “We are a long time waiting for that day, citizen, says Ned. Since the poor old woman told us that the French were on the sea and landed at Killala” (12.1377-8) (emphasis added). This remark is a clear-cut reference to the repeated failure of the French to help the Irish on the one hand, and on the other hand to the optimistic version of the story presented in the ballad, “The Shan Van Vocht,” the oldest version of which starts with the joyful news that “The French are on the sea! says the Shan Van Vocht,” and ends with the prophecy that “Yes, old Erin will be free […] says the Shan Van Vocht” (Zimmermann 133). In the parodic execution scene soon after the hero-martyr embraces his beloved Sheila, who “swears ever to cherish his memory,” she accepts the marriage proposal of an Englishman on the spot (12.642-62). Banba is invoked to “wail with [her] wind” the death of Patrick Dignam, transubstantiated into “O’Dignam, sun of our morning,” which parodically re-enacts Mother Ireland mourning the loss of her sacrificial sons. To hear the homophoneous echo of “son of our mourning” in Dignam’s appellation, “sun of our morning” is perhaps not too far fetched in an interpolation that mimicking the description of a spiritual seance focuses on a lost shoe, which has “to be soled only as the heels were still good” (12.369-70) (emphasis added).
“Erin, the Tear and the Smile,” thus, performing the Tommy Moore touch on him.\textsuperscript{17} That Joyce chose to associate the citizen with Thomas Moore’s version of Erin from among the proliferating, often contradictory representations of Erin circulating at the turn of the century heightens the irony of the gesture.\textsuperscript{18} Not only is the hero emasculated by assuming the hue of a feminine icon, but his muscular portrait becomes tainted by the most lamentable version of that icon embodying defeat, surrender and helplessness. Since Moore’s \textit{Irish Melodies} either nostalgically recall some unspecified Irish Golden Age or lament the present misery of the country, or both at the same time – also characteristic features of the citizen’s discourse on Irish history – Erin is typically portrayed as “remember[ing] the days of old, ere her faithless sons betrayed her,” sleeping in darkness, weeping vanquished, or, as in the song alluded to in the interpolation, with a tear and a smile blending in her eyes. Although the particular song the Cyclopean detail alludes to suggests that Erin’s split could be healed, it does not dangle too much hope before her: “Erin, thy silent tear ne’er shall cease, / Erin, thy languid smile ne’er shall increase, / Till like the rainbow’s light, / Thy various tints unite, / And form, in

\textsuperscript{17} The phrase also evokes the feminisation of the Celtic race in general, which originating with Renan and elaborated by Matthew Arnold, became internalised and/or fiercely contested by Irish nationalists in the second half of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. As Renan assumed, mayhap affected by Thomas Moore’s \textit{Irish Melodies}, the Celtic race was an “essentially feminine race,” emotional and melancholy, thus “[i] at times . . . [i] t seems to be cheerful a tear is not slow to glisten behind its smile; it does not know that strange forgetfulness of human conditions and destinies which is called gaiety” (\textit{Poetry} 7-8) The citizen, Janus-faced like the concept of the nation, is deprived of such gaiety heartening back to the past with one eye, while turning the other toward the destiny of the nation.

Yeats retrospectively surveying the Irish cultural scene at the time of his launching the Celtic Revival distinguishes three groups: those who supported the Celtic Revival, those whose minds were irredeemably saturated by Young Ireland doctrines, images and metaphors such as wolfhounds, round towers, shamrocks, harps, and whose smooth, smiling faces he likens to the self-complacent faces first appearing in Velasquez (item 56 in the Hero-list), and a third group made up of “old men who had never accepted Young Ireland, or middle aged men kept by some family tradition to the school of thought before it arose, to the Ireland of Daniel O’Connell and of Lever and of Thomas Moore, convivial Ireland with the traditional tear and smile” (207). If the tear and the smile in his eyes associates the citizen/hero with the last group, the dog Garryowen and the round tower as the accompanying image of the hero relate him to the complacent adherents of Young Ireland tradition.

\textsuperscript{18} L. Perry Curtis Jr. has distilled “four more or less distinct types or models” from the wide range of Erins and Hibernias produced by artists between 1780 and 1900. In his description, beside “defeated” Erins awaiting rescue – Thomas Moore’s version – favoured mostly by London artists by the end of the nineteenth century, after the ascension of Parnell Irish artists increasingly created more “empowered,” “monumental” versions of Erin defying the enemy and leading their people out of bondage (83).
Heaven’s sight One arch of peace! (Bauerle 427). Certainly, the heterogeneous bag of the Hero-list with its various disunited tints would not do this service to “half and half” hero-Erin.

The initial Tommy Moore touch about the hero may also be related to the puzzle why from among all the proliferating allegorical names of Ireland the Hero-list includes only Dark Rosaleen, while it figures several other echoes of female embodiments of sovereignty: a mother, a bride and a queen. Certainly, this can be explained in terms of the immense popularity of the image. But why not Kathleen ni Houlihan, whom the citizen himself evokes, and who enjoyed as much or even more popularity as Dark Rosaleen in turn-of-the-century Ireland, especially after Yeats’s play Cathleen Ni Houlihan (1902)? According to Rosalind Clark, as a result of the popularity of Mangan’s and Aubrey de Vere’s “translations” introducing these two sovereignty figures from the aisling tradition of Irish poetry into Anglo-Irish literature, in the second half of the nineteenth century “Roisín Dubh [Dark Rosaleen] and Cathleen Ni Houlihan eventually superseded the other names and became universally accepted” (163). In popularity they became equals. Yet, while Kathleen ni Houlihan, malleable like Eire, changed with the times and perspectives, and thus was in and out of the roles of pure virgin, shameless harlot, helpless maiden in need of rescue and warlike mother goddess calling her sons to fight/sacrifice themselves for her – the last version dominating the national imagination at the turn of the century, as the citizen’s rhetoric shows – the fixed image of Dark Rosaleen embodied the sorrowful version of Eire, the helpless maiden awaiting deliverance (along with the selfless devotion of her loyal adherents). The citizen would, no

---

19 The aisling (allegorical dream vision) tradition of Irish poetry, appeared after the colonisation of Ireland in the seventeenth century, flourished in the eighteenth and practically died by the nineteenth. Yet, several of its elements, for instance, the numerous allegorical names of Ireland, were salvaged into Anglo-Irish poetry. As Clark describes, “in an aisling poem, the poet has a vision of a beautiful woman who personifies Ireland. She bewails the sorrows of her country, but then comforts the poet with the hope that the English will be cast out and she will be wedded [or reunited] to the rightful king when the Stuart monarch is restored” (5).

20 The Hero-list also contains a mother in the company of a sacrificial son (the earlier discussed couple of Wolfe Tone and the Mother of the Maccabees), but as Joyce leaves no image unturned, she is not Irish and instead of becoming rejuvenated by the sacrifice of her sons, as the nationalist imagination prescribes for Mother Ireland, she partakes of her sons’ fate herself and dies with them.
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doubt, cast himself in the role of the latter, Cyclopean wires often get crossed. The way Dark Rosaleen is embedded into the Hero-list produces further ironies, which will form the epicentre of the next three sections.

**The Wars of the Roses**

As I have already noted, Dark Rosaleen’s neighbouring a hibernicised (Patrick W.) Shakespeare (items 52 and 53) may hint at some hidden ironic pattern of information in the light of the early drafts of “Cyclops,” where she is explicitly associated with the Irish language revival in the midst of fierce disparaging of the mongrel race, tongue and culture of the English. Apart from this, an inquiry into Dark Rosaleen’s cultural history can create another ironic link between the two. As Diane E. Bessai has argued, the widespread use of the convention to represent Ireland in the figure of the black rose after Mangan’s introduction of Dark Rosaleen into Anglo-Irish literature – by de Vere, Pearse, Plunkett, and Yeats – was largely due to the persistent assumption that it was of some antiquity (63). In 1899, Yeats suggested the possibility of a Celtic mythological source for the rose symbolism:

> If the rose was really a symbol of Ireland among the Gaelic poets, and if ‘Roseen Dubh’ is really a political poem, one may feel pretty certain that the ancient Celts associated the Rose with Eire, or Fotla, or Banba – goddesses who gave their names to Ireland – or with some principle god or goddess for such symbols are not suddenly adopted or invented, but come out of mythology. (notes to the *Wind Among the Reeds* qtd. in Bessai 80)

Bessai refutes Yeats’s conjecture, arguing instead that the Rose appears to have been grafted upon an ancient Irish tradition at a relatively modern stage (62). Clark agrees, pointing out
that while the Rose figured prominently as a symbol in medieval Europe including England – where it was used as a political symbol during the Wars of the Roses and became a national symbol afterwards often appearing in poems about Queen Elizabeth (a sovereign figure) – no such evidence can be found in Ireland. Thus, she assumes that seeing how successful the Rose was as an English symbol the Irish appropriated it, distinguishing their own Rose by its dark colour (165). Zimmermann’s finding that as opposed to Anglo-Irish patriotic literature of a higher level, in the Irish street ballad poetry of the nineteenth century the rose was still the English emblem as it had always been, bears out Bessai’s and Clark’s view (85). If the Irish appropriation of the rose image from the English is a feasible conjecture, the appropriation of the English Shakespeare’s poetic genius by the “Celtic spirit” was a historical fact, as the Dublin nativist journalist D. P. Moran’s satirical effusion in his pamphlet “The Battle of two Civilisations” (1905) shows:

Matthew Arnold happily came along just in the nick of time, and in a much quoted essay suggested, that one of the characteristics of Celtic poetry was ‘natural magic.’ [. . .] We [Irish people] seized on that phrase like hawks.[. . .] At last we have found the missing gulf, the missing something that separated us from the dull Saxon hind [sic], and rejoiced accordingly. We know now the difference between English and Irish literature and satisfied ourselves that Shakespeare was predominantly a Celt. (555) 21

As Moran’s remark suggests, the Irish did not invent the idea of Shakespeare as a Celtic genius out of nothing, but by turning Matthew Arnold’s cultural imperialist project inside out. Arnold’s idea – proposed in “his much quoted” “On the Study of Celtic Literature” – that

21 In 1900, Griffith’s United Irishman described Shakespeare as “a Celt born in England” (qtd. in Eagleton, “Culture” 260).
Shakespeare owed his genius largely to the Celtic strain in his personality\textsuperscript{22} was a gesture to make English people realise their true strength, namely that their composite race blended the positive aspects of the steady Teuton, the decisive Norman and the spiritual Celt,\textsuperscript{23} and thus was justified to claim the leading role in Arnold’s grand imperialist utopia: “one homogeneous English speaking whole,” “swallowing up [. . .] the separate provincial nationalities” of the British Isles (qtd. in Cairns 296). As opposed to this, in the Irish nationalist imagination Arnold’s tracing the excellence of English literature – its style, melancholy and “natural magic” (104) – to a Celtic racial well became reshaped into a means of widening the racial and cultural gap between the “provincial nationalities,” reaffirming the superiority of Irish spiritual culture to English imperial materialism. The citizen denying the existence of any genuine English civilisation at all would surely agree. Yet, the dynamics unfolding in the duet of Dark Rosaleen and Patrick W. Shakespeare work against his easy dismissal of English civilisation as stolen from the Irish (12.1200) as well as his vision of foreign influences as exclusively a source of contamination (12.1672).

\textbf{Unholy Wars}

While Dark Rosaleen and her Southern neighbour engage in a bloodless war of the roses, the names preceding her – Muhammad, the bride of Lammermorr, Peter the Hermit and Peter the Packer (items 48-51) – enact a Cyclopean holy war demanding casualties, which can also be subsumed within her semiotic aura. As I have already noted, in the wake of

\textsuperscript{22} See such passages as “Shakespeare’s greatness is thus in his blending an openness and flexibility of spirit, not English, with the English basis” (101). “Shakespeare in handling nature touches this Celtic note so exquisitely, that perhaps one is inclined to be always looking for the Celtic note in him” (126).
Mangan, Dark Rosaleen came to embody the sorrow of Eire and the selfless devotion of her loyal adherents. The patriotic message of the song that made her popular was taken for granted. This was not always the case however. Dark Rosalen (alias Róisín Dubh or the Little Black Rose), has a particularly convoluted history and her emergence into a patriotic icon was a triumph after a fierce interpretative battle. In a note accompanying his poem’s initial publication in *The Nation* (May 30, 1846), Mangan represents “Dark Rosaleen” as “translated from the Irish” from an original which “purports to be an allegorical address from Hugh [Red Hugh O’Donnell] to Ireland on the subject of his love and struggles for her, and his resolve to raise her again to the glorious position she held as a nation before the irruption of the Saxon and Norman spoilers” (qtd. in Bessai 64). As Bessai notes, it is unclear which original Mangan refers to, since there are several extant variants of the poem (64). Mangan unquestioningly describes the song as a patriotic allegory in the guise of a love song, like James Hardiman in his *Irish Minstrelsy* (1831) before him. Hardiman’s reading, however, was not universally accepted. Samuel Ferguson dismissed the Red Hugh associations as charming fantasy, and argued instead that the song was about a “bold priest,” who, overcome with desire for a girl, is awaiting some sort of dispensation from Rome so that he might enjoy his love to the full (Bessai 65). As opposed to Ferguson’s literal reading of motifs, allegorical readings saw in the references to the pope and clergy – refined into “Roman wine,” and “Spanish ale” in Mangan’s translation – expressions of hope to obtain moral and military assistance from the Catholic powers of Europe. As I have discussed, the survivors of the last rebellion of Gaelic Ireland – Red Hugh O’Donnell and Philip O’Sullivan Beare – at the

23 Arnold’s description of the redeemable split nature of the English race inescapably brings Thomas Moore’s split Erin to mind: “No people are so shy, so self-conscious, so embarrassed as the English, because two natures are mixed in them [at other times he speaks of three!] and natures which pull them such different ways. The Germanic part, triumphs in us, we are a Germanic people; but not so wholly as to exclude hauntings of Celtism, which clash with our Germanism, producing as I believe, our humour, neither German, nor Celtic (103). Arnold’s aim by promoting the study of Celtic literature was to make English people aware of their composite nature, which was wily pulling them apart, and enable them with this knowledge to unite their various tints into a
beginning of the seventeenth century turned to Spain, the stronghold of Catholicism and Counter-Reformation at the time, for military aid to re-conquer Ireland from the English. To reach his aim O'Sullivan Beare appealed to the Spanish monarch for help in terms of a “holy crusade.” As political oppression became allied with religious oppression in Ireland throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century, crusade rhetoric turned into a persistent feature of Catholic nationalist popular agitation. But Holy War/Land imagery was not exclusively used by Catholics. Yeats, for instance, speaking about cultural aspirations rather than political and military ones, suggested that “our Irish Romantic movement” “should make Ireland a holy land to her own people” again (qtd. in O'Driscoll 422). “Cyclops” also contributes to the stretching of the figure when Joe Hynes jokingly describes the battle around Dignam’s insurance as “Holy Wars” (12.765).

Thus, the proximity of Muhammad and Peter the Hermit can be seen as the parodic literalisation of Hynes’s remark and by extension of a widespread nationalist figure/topos. Muhammad, the founder of Islam, needs no commentary, but it is perhaps less known that Peter the Hermit has been preserved in popular memory as the leader of the first historical Holy Crusade to re-conquer the Holy Land from the “heretic” Moslems in the eleventh century. Peter the Packer, in turn, functions as a marker of the Irish Land Wars, as it was a nickname for Lord Peter O’Brien of Kilfenora, lord chief justice of Ireland at the end of the nineteenth century, who was “regarded as hostile to Land Leaguers and Irish nationalists”

harmonious whole. Arnold’s lesson in the restoration of individual integrity also projects a hegemonic healing process of the British Empire.

I have already discussed Kavanagh’s interpretation of 1798 in terms of a Catholic crusade. As Zimmermann observes, Irish street ballad poetry likewise called to holy wars throughout the nineteenth century. See the song “The Triumph of Liberty over the Heretics of England”: “Men in millions yet may perish / Ere the holy war is done, / But the freedom that we cherish / By out Pontiff shall be won. / Remember now the time’s approaching / When Roman all will firmly stand, / And heresy will we abolish / Then completely from the land” (45). The derisive Irish term Sassenach, later borrowed into English, as the citizen’s speech shows (12.1369) came into use after Cromwell’s conquest, and was the only word that meant both “Englishman” and “Protestant” (Zimmermann 44).

Holy war imagery was also used in anti-drink movements resurfacing in Ireland from the 1830s onwards. While Father Matthew’s 1840s teetotaller crusade was avowedly non-sectarian, in the 1870s the Catholic clergy began a sectarian “holy war against intemperance” (qtd. in Malcolm 294).
Joyce seems to prevent the clash of figurative and literal steels by inserting a third party in between Muhammad and Peter the Hermit. That it happens to be the bride of Lammermoor – Sir Walter Scott’s only genuinely tragic heroine, “preordained victim material,” as Gilbert Dhelps describes her (xix) – adds to the ironic interwebbings of meaning. The dynamics embracing the three of them parodically enacts the Irish nationalist construction of women as “sites of contestation” on the one hand, on the other hand ironically refracts the nationalist topos of Ireland as a helpless maiden awaiting rescue by her male champions, epitomised by the song “Dark Rosaleen.” While the passionate patriot lover of Mangan’s “Dark Rosaleen” avows to the beloved nation that he will “heal [her] many ills,” and restore her to her previous glory if necessary by way of violent upheaval, in Scott’s tragic love story Lucy, the heroine functions as “a rose mid tempest bending,” eventually falling victim to the struggle revolving around the threat of losing and hope of regaining ancestral fortunes and land. The only other instance when her story appears in Ulysses is in Bloom’s mind (as Donizetti’s operatic reworking of Scott’s novel) in “Hades”: “Last act of Lucia. Shall I nevermore behold thee? Bam! He expires. Gone at last” (6.852-53).

Counterparts

In colonial Ireland battles were fought for the land not only on figural, metaphysical, constitutional grounds or in rebellions, but in the everyday life of the countryside. From the 1870s onwards until the final settlement of the land question in 1909 Irish tenant farmers were in continual wars with their landlords claiming the possession of their lands, boycotting the paying of rents, fighting against evictions, and retaliating their egotistic fellow tenants who “did not toe the line.” Although removed from the Cyclopean Holy War scene, the Land Wars are inscribed into the Hero-list in the couple of Captain Moonlight and Captain Boycott (items 22-23). Their juxtaposition and formal coupling is highly ironic, since while the former was used as a penname in the Land Wars by agrarian secret societies threatening with retaliatory violence, the latter was a ruthless English agent, who became the first victim of the strategy that bears his name today. That in both the Holy War and Land War scenes both sides are represented can be related to the unclarified position of the citizen in the land question. While he poses as the grand protector of the Irish peasants and the poor (12.1150 and 12.1372), according to the narrator, he “daren’t show his nose” in Shanagolden, where “the Molly Maguires [are] looking for him to let daylight through him for grabbing the holding of an evicted tenant” (12.1314-16).

A major irony lurks also in the fact that as opposed to the tragic vision of The Bride of Lammermoor, Scott’s other novels point toward harmonious resolution. Although they are usually set in periods of conflict and national division, in the end extremes are purged and reconciled through the mediation of a minor character. How like the scenario in the Hero-list turned inside out.
Before Dark Rosaleen disappears at last from our focus, I will highlight one more dimension of her figure, resonant with Cyclopean/nationalist/masculine desires and fantasies. As Clark contends, in the nineteenth and early twentieth century feminine images of sovereignty underwent a major change: they became desexualised. While in pagan and medieval Ireland the sovereignty was embodied in sexually empowered women, and in the seventeenth and eighteenth century poets often rebuked women representing Ireland for harlotry, for giving themselves to brutish England, in Mangan’s society their purity/chastity could not even be called into question (170). This is perfectly demonstrated by Mangan’s “Dark Rosaleen.” In the process of transforming a Gaelic love song with frank sexual imagery into a national apotheosis, he sublimated the desired girl into an ethereal ideal, unreachable for her patriot lover, who calls her “my saint of saints,” “my virgin flower,” praises her “holy delicate white hands,” and pleads that she pray for him at home in her “emerald bowers” (4-5). While the earlier Irish versions express the yearning lover’s hope for sexual fulfilment, no fulfilment of any kind is envisioned in Mangan’s version.

According to the Irish philosopher Richard Kearney, the nineteenth century shift in the representation of Irish sovereignty could most probably be seen as an effect of English colonisation: “[t]he more colonially oppressed the Irish became in history the more spiritualized became the mythic motherland. [. . .] Woman became as sexually intangible as the ideal of national sovereignty became politically intangible” (119). Apart from this, however, as Kearney further speculates, it most probably also reflects “social stereotypes of

---

27 As Clark observes, “[t]he sovereignty of Ireland in pagan times was manifested as the goddess of the land who slept with the king in order to bring victory and prosperity to his people.[ . . .] The initiation rites of Irish kings show that the concept of the union of the king and Sovereignty lasted well into Christian times – in fact, until the sixteenth century.” (4-5). Conn of Hundred Battles (item 2 in the Hero-list) becomes legitimate king when he accepts the ale of kingship form a beautiful maiden in the Otherworld, while Niall of Nine Hostages (item 3 in the Hero-list) becomes king of Ireland when, accosted by an ugly hag for a kiss, he is even willing to have sex with her. The hag turns into a beautiful woman, reveals that she is Ireland’s sovereignty and foretells that with two exceptions no one will break his descendants’ supremacy in Ireland (MacCana 119-120). Well, even sovereignty figures can be mistaken, as Irish history and the Hero-list shows. While Niall’s descendants, the
Irish women as pure virgins and son-obsessed mothers” constructed by the “Victorian Gael” (119). Griffith claimed in 1903 that “Irishwomen are the most virtuous women in the world” (qtd. in Haslett 48). The misogynist citizen, who considers women’s sexual appetite to be the cause of all Irish misfortunes and valorises Thomas Moore’s killing of Sarah Curran’s libido into her patriot lover’s grave, is without a doubt a champion of such Victorian gender politics. The Hero-list, however, as if to restore a healthy balance, beside Dark Rosaleen also includes her counterpart, the Rose of Castile, a name that resonates with sexual innuendo throughout the “Sirens” episode.  

The Heroic Theatre

Although few things can be said with certainty about the Hero-list, it is clear from its genetic development that Joyce increasingly embellished it with a musical, fictional, and theatrical aura. He started this process at the same time as he began to infiltrate the list with the heroines. My explorations in the previous sections drew on the preliminary observation that the symbolic nature of the heroines in the Hero-list can be explained in terms of the nationalist practice of aestheticising women. Yet, the fact that the increasing fictionalisation, musicalisation, and theatricalisation of the list also produced several heroes beside the heroines suggests some more comprehensive dynamics at work.

As I have noted at the outset, with the dawn of Irish cultural nationalism in the 1840s, Irish history became increasingly homogenised into an ongoing tradition of heirloom and heroism. As several excellent cultural critics have recently demonstrated, this was mostly carried out by moulding Irish history according to the emotion-charged aesthetic of melodrama. In Seán Farrell Moran’s words, “Irish national history is much like a late O’Neills, were high-kings of Ireland for nearly six hundred years, O’Neill supremacy was irredeemable breached by Brian of Kincora (item 4) and soon afterwards the Norman conquest.
nineteenth-century melodrama: a tale of triumph and failure, heroes and fools, and noble sacrifice and shameless betrayal” (“Images” 174), and as Yeats lamented, “[a]ll the past had been turned into a melodrama with Ireland for blameless hero, and poet, novelist and historian had but one object, that we should hiss the villain [England], and only a minority doubted that the greater the talent the greater the hiss” (Autobiographies 206).

The melodramatic mode of imagination, a mode of emotional excess projecting a “polarised world of moral absolutes,” as Patrick Joyce describes it, manifested itself through diverse cultural channels: in patriotic ballads, Dublin newspaper rhetoric, illustrations and cartoons, nationalist monuments and commemorative rituals, melodramatic novels and short stories, and, not surprisingly, melodramas staged in the Queen’s Royal Theatre in Dublin.

After Dion Boucicault’s immensely popular pioneering trilogy of comic plays linking Irish history and melodrama – The Colleen Bawn: or the Brides of Garryowen (1860); Arrah na Pogue: or the Wicklow Wedding (1865); and The Shaughraun (1874) – the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century saw a proliferation of Irish political melodramas, both comic and tragic. Arrah na Pogue and The Colleen Bawn are readily recognisable in the Hero-list (items 62 and 65), but apart from them, several of the historical Cyclopean heroes, Father Murphy, Patrick Sarsfield, Henry Joy McCracken, Michael Dwyer, Wolfe Tone and Napoleon were also celebrated heroes, while the historical blemish, Francy

---

28 Cleopatra and Savourmeen Deelish form another such complementary couple. See Finnegans Wake: “heroticisms, catastrophes and eccentricities transmitted by an ancient legacy of the past […] our matter nation” (614.27-615.08).
29 While Yeats’s attitude to history was equally theatrical, to give voice to his different vision he aimed to “substitute for melodrama a nobler form of art” (Autobiographies 206). In a note to a late poem on the Easter Rising, he writes: “A nation should be like an audience in some great theatre – ‘in the theatre,’ says Victor Hugo, ‘the mob becomes a people’ – watching the drama of its own history . . . that sacred drama must to all native eyes and ears become the greatest of all parables” (qtd. in Watson 50). As Cheryl Herr, argues, however, Revival Theatre “had substantial debts to melodrama.” Yeats’s 1798 play, Cathleen Ní Houlihan also has melodramatic reverberations (Land 17).
30 Peter Brooks grasps the essence of melodrama in its excess (ix). Patrick Joyce is quoted in Owens (24). For a demonstration of the melodramatic nature of Dublin newspaper rhetoric see Watt (59-64). Curtis has described cartoons depicting Erin and Hibernia as “graphic mini-melodramas” (99). Gary Owens gives a comprehensive overview of how nationalist imagination constructed the Manchester martyrs within the narrative framework of melodrama.
Higgins, alias the Sham Squire, was also a hissed villain on the Queen’s Royal stage. Even the Village Blacksmith (item 21) can be seen as a melodrama hero, since P. J. Bourke’s *For the Land She Loved* (1915) opens with blacksmiths chorusing their pleasure: “now is our time to make the blades / That sets [sic] Our Ireland free” (313).

That Queen’s Royal melodrama strongly moulded the popular imagination in the Dublin of 1904 is clearly shown by the narrator’s description of the citizen’s ridiculous violent attack on Bloom at the end of “Cyclops”: “Gob, the devil wouldn’t stop him till he got hold of the bloody tin anyhow and out with him and Little Alf hanging on to his elbow and he shouting like a stuck pig, as good as any bloody play in the Queen’s Royal Theatre” (12.1843-46). Apart from this, the citizen’s figure resonates with Boucicault’s melodramas in more intricate ways, which I will explore in detail in Chapter Five, where I discuss the significance of melodrama for the episode at large. Here, I focus on how the Hero-list fractures the melodramatic construction of Irish history and Irish identity by mapping the dynamics surrounding Boucicault’s plays/heroines.

As Stephen Watt has noted, although Boucicault’s trilogy of comic plays shows his nationalist sympathies and a growing awareness of Ireland’s long struggle against England, they “advance an optimistic, inherently conservative myth of reconciliation” (63). The duet of the Colleen Bawn and Waddler Healy (items 65 and 66) in the Hero-list seems to target this fundamental feature of Boucicault’s plays. Although *The Colleen Bawn* is not an explicitly political and historical play, it deals with important Irish socio-political issues: land and the Irish “brogue.” While Hardress Cregan, the Anglicised Irishman forsakes his legal wife, Eily

---

31 Especially during the management of the English J. W. Whitbread between 1882-1907. Whitbread himself was a most prolific author of patriotic melodramas. His plays include *Wolfe Tone* (1898), *The Ulster Hero* [Henry Joy McCracken] (1902), *The Insurgent Chief* [Michael Dwyer] (1902), *The Sham Squire* (1903), *Sarsfield* (1906). P. J. Bourke’s *When Wexford Rose* (1910) valorises Father Murphy. W. G. Will’s *Royal Divorce*, Whitbread’s *Wolfe Tone* and *The Irish Dragoon*, and Frank Thorne’s *Napoleon the Great* romanticises Napoleon’s dealings with Irishmen, while Austin Strong’s *Exile* (1903) is a tragedy presenting Napoleon’s final days at St. Helena (Watt 58-60, De Burca 21).
O’Connor (the Colleen Bawn) in order to save his mother from being dispossessed of their family estate by the avaricious land-grabbing villain, Corrigan, the only historically grounded character in the play, Eily desperately tries to get rid of her shameful Irish brogue for the sake of her linguistically polished lover. The ending of the play, however, smooths out both these conflicts in the generic manner of melodrama: the villain Corrigan is defeated, the Hardress family keep their land, the lovers are reconciled, and Eily’s Irish brogue becomes universally accepted. How different a vision is suggested by the Colleen Bawn’s neighbour in the Hero-list. The Janus-faced Waddler Healy potentially moulds two figures from Irish history: Timothy Healy, the Judas of the Parnell myth, the most rabid anti-Parnellite, who, even when the Irish parliamentary party became reunited in 1901 a decade after the Parnell split, stayed adamant in his hostility (McBride 91), and the Very Reverend John Healy, archbishop of Tuam, who, as Gifford notes waddled in his gait (325). Apart from this minor bodily defect, the Very Reverend had a much bigger flaw in the eyes of Irish Catholic tenant farmers, as his nickname, “landlords’ bishop” suggests. While underlying Boucicault’s trilogy “resides the history of Ireland’s struggle and a mythology that Ireland can be unified socially, politically and religiously,” as Watt argues, the Cyclopean Waddler Healy embodies Ireland’s irredeemable social, religious and political splits all in one.

While the dynamics surrounding the Colleen Bawn counteract Boucicault’s melodramatic resolution of Irish historical issues, the dynamics around Arrah na Pogue refract his main aim to offer “counterrepresentations to especially loathsome Victorian caricatures of Irishmen” (Watt 64). In contradistinction to The Colleen Bawn, Arrah na Pogue, set in the

32 As Herr notes, blacksmiths, the providers of the principal weapons of the 1798 Rebellion, the pikes, “were often prime targets for military questioning, a fact emphasised in plays and narratives of 1798” (Land 57).
33 Waddler Healey’s neighbour Angus the Culdee reaffirms the contours of the historical bishop, who beside his support of Protestant landlords was keenly interested in the history of early Christian Ireland. He even wrote a book on St. Patrick. Angus the Culdee shares this passion, since he wrote the first festology of the Irish saints. Pity they could not converse because a temporal gulf of twelve centuries separates them. On Angus the Culdee’s further ironic resonances in the Hero-list and his function in Finnegans Wake see Christine O’Neill’s insightful article.
key historical period of 1798, more explicitly deals with Ireland’s history under colonial rule. The issue of the land, treated as a socio-economic problem in *The Colleen Bawn*, becomes explicitly politicised. The play begins with Beamish Mac Coul’s return from France, where he was exiled after his lands were confiscated. In the opening scene, Beamish waylays and robs the process server on the road at night – a minor act of revenge – to reward his loyal adherents and supporters, especially her foster sister, Arrah na Pogue, who is preparing for her wedding.

English law serving the colonial oppression of Ireland functions as one of the prime targets of ridicule throughout the play. The heroine’s Irish name, Arrah na Pogue, meaning “Arrah of the kisses” derives from her facilitating Mac Coul’s escape from prison by giving the key to his cell door in a kiss. In this light, the Hero-list’s wedding of Arrah na Pogue with Dick Turpin, the English highwayman especially notorious for robbing lawyers, can be seen as an ironic thematic echo of the play. The juxtaposition of Dick Turpin with Arrah na Pogue also counteracts the myth of reconciliation advanced by Boucicault. While at the end of the play Mac Coul escapes the grip of law, at the end of the ballad “Turpin Hero,” “Turpin is caught, and tried and cast, / And for a gamecock must hang at last” (Bauerle 129). Beyond these ironic thematic echoes, the couple is wrought with more subtle ironies.

As Perry L. Curtis has argued, as a result of the increasing threat of Fenianism in the 1860s and 1870s, when Boucicault’s trilogy was written, anti-Irish feeling was tangentially growing in Britain, which became marked by a shift in colonial stereotypes of the Irish. From “the humble and always entertaining Paddy,” the Irishman turned into a “more sinister, decidedly apish nationalist prepared to commit whatever atrocity necessary to liberate his country” (qtd. in Watt 71). That Joyce was aware of this phenomenon is clear from his Triestine article “Ireland at the Bar” (1907), where he laments that due to the misrepresentation of Irish people in the English press, “the public conceives of the Irish as highwaymen with distorted faces, roaming the night with the object of taking the hide of
every unionist” (CW 198). In the light of Joyce’s remark, John Nash has described the
enigmatic verbal exchange between the citizen and the entering Joe Hynes at the beginning of
“Cyclops” (12.129-40) as “the citizen perform[ing] an ironic mimicry of a highwayman”
(186). Yet, what he describes as a “highwayman’s question-and-answer formula,” Joyce
describes in his early drafts as “the password of the Ribbonmen” (Herring 186-87), a
nineteenth-century agrarian secret society harassing landlords and land-grabbing tenants. As a
third variant, the Cyclopean narrator comments on the citizen’s little playacting as “doing the
rapparee and Rory of the Hill” (12.134). This seems to complicate matters further, but the
narrator’s comment clarifies the confusion, since it blurs the distinction between Joyce’s clue
and Nash’s interpretation. While “rapparee” meant simply “robber, highwayman” in 1904,
this meaning was the degenerate offshoot of an earlier one. Throughout the seventeenth
century and the first years of the eighteenth the label “Rapparee” signified the outlawed
descendants of the native Irish aristocracy dispossessed of their lands by Cromwell, and later
by William of Orange, who did not leave for the Continent like the Wild Geese, but stayed at
home and harassed the newly established landlords (Beames 21-23, Williams 13). Beamish
Mac Coul’s act of robbery at the beginning of Boucicault’s play perfectly demonstrates the
nature of their activities.

Arrah na Pogue’s merry embrace with the Bold Soldier Boy, the “hero” of a comic
song by Samuel Lover, from the other side in the Hero-list can also participate in the subtext
of stereotypical constructions of Irishness, since Lover was one of Boucicault’s most
important sources for both The Colleen Bawn and Arrah na Pogue. “The Man for Galway”
(item 34 in the Hero-list), a comic song of debauchery by Charles Lever conjures up another
of his possible sources. Although Lover’s and Lever’s comically melodramatic works were
widely popular throughout the nineteenth century, Yeats had only contempt for them: “Lever
and Lover kept apart by opinion from the body of the nation, wrote ever with one eye on
London. They never wrote for the [Irish] people, and neither have they ever, therefore in prose or verse, written faithfully of the people,” since they represented Ireland as a “merry harlequin” (“Ballad Poetry” 162).\(^{34}\) That Arrah na Pogue appears arm-in-arm with a Lover hero and an English “hero” also enacts Boucicault’s similar strategic location, who like Lever and Lover, ever wrote with one eye on London.

**The Man That Broke the Line in the List**

Beside melodrama, Joyce also inscribed into the Hero-list the other major popular dramatic modes in turn-of-the-century Dublin: the pantomime and music hall variety show. As Cheryl Herr has remarked, all three were closely related: “the theatre of Joyce’s day was highly and self-consciously intertextual. Melodrama begot burlesque, pantomime begot extravaganza, pantomime quoted burlesque, and music hall interpenetrated the lot” (*Anatomy* 120).\(^{35}\) Joyce’s late interpolation of “The Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo” (item 35) – a music hall song he loved to sing himself – into the Hero-list enacts the music hall’s disruptive invasion of the Dublin dramatic scene at the end of the nineteenth century. Following the British practice, Irish pantomimes increasingly used variety turns that were not logically related to the plot, an instance of which was the interpolation of “The Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo” into the Gaiety Theatre’s 1892 production of *Sindbad the Sailor*, a pantomime. It has already been suggested that “the rapid style changes of *Ulysses* follow the rhythm of the halls with their nightly succession of ‘turns’ ” (Herr, *Anatomy* 189). By the same token, one could also see the all-pervasive “pattern disruptive principle”\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{34}\) As the manifesto of the Irish Literary Theatre suggests, the prime aim of the movement was “to show that Ireland is not the home of buffoonery and easy sentiment, as it has been represented, but the home of an ancient idealism” (qtd. in Harrington ix).

\(^{35}\) Boucicault’s *Arrah na Pogue*, for instance, was reworked into a burlesque under the title: *Arrah! No Brogue* (Herr, *Land* 66).

\(^{36}\) I have borrowed the label from Fritz Senn.
operating in the Hero-list in these terms, as the first evidently comic disruption in the Hero-
list is carried out by a music-hall performer.

Most first readers of “Cyclops” would agree that the most immediately evident comic
disruption in the list is effected by Goliath (item 17). Little does one suspect without doing
some digging into the turn-of-the-century dramatic scene that beside the Biblical Cyclops the
name can also conjure up one of the giants of the music-halls, especially in the company of
the turn-of-the-century pantomime and music-hall actor Horace Wheatley,\(^\text{37}\) and the
celebrated Irish actress of the eighteenth century, Peg Woffington.\(^\text{38}\) In his *Strength and How
to Obtain It*, the first manual of modern body-building, also found in Bloom’s personal
library, Eugen Sandow gives a vivid description of how he met a “veritable giant” in Germany
and how he trained the fellow, whom he named Goliath, to assist his public exhibitions of
strength in English and Irish music-halls. Since Sandow’s description of his companion
resonates so closely with Joyce’s description of the citizen as hero, it is worth quoting from it
in some length:

Imagine, if you can this tremendous fellow: his head as huge and grotesque as that of
any pantomime mask, with a nose the size of an ordinary fist. As for his fist, it would
have made more than three of mine, and when a five shilling piece was placed beneath
the ball of his finger, believe me it was impossible to see it. So large were his boots
that not only could I get both my feet into one, but I could turn entirely round inside.
And yet, despite his immense limbs and body, he was not an extraordinarily tall man.

\(^{99}\)

\(^{37}\) Jack the Giantkiller (item 76) also recalls one of the most popular pantomimes at the end of the nineteenth
century: *Jack and the Beanstalk*, ironically mimicked by Stephen in “Proteus.”
If the sudden turns and disruptions of the Hero-list follow the rhythm of the music-hall, the thematic motley of the list duplicates the practice of the pantomime, an amalgam of more serious and unrelated harlequinade episodes (Herr, *Anatomy* 131). Also, the presence of widely publicised contemporary “heroes” — Soggarth Eoghan O’Growney, Sir Thomas Lipton, John L. Sullivan — in a list of “heroes and heroines of antiquity,” beside complying with the citizen’s awareness of current issues discussed in the papers, can suggest another essential feature of the pantomime: its topicality. John L. Sullivan, the Irish-American heavyweight champion, was a celebrated hero in and around 1904. In 1903, *The Irish Times* dealt extensively with Sir Thomas Lipton racing his yacht, called “Shamrock I” (Radford 322). According to Timothy G. McMahon, Joyce’s inclusion of Soggarth Eoghan O’Growney (item 13) was especially topical, since throughout the months before Bloomsday, the language enthusiasts tried to raise O’Growney, described by D.P. Moran as the “father of the language movement” to near-martyr status (81).\(^39\)

Beyond such potential formal/thematic relevance of the music hall and the pantomime for the Hero-list, their presence becomes imbued with irony against the backdrop of cultural nationalist anxieties. The early drafts of the episode contain a scene, relevant in this respect, which does not appear in the printed text:

– Are you going to write that Xmas pantomime? Asked—[not yet clear who]

---

\(^{38}\) The whole contingent added at the same time – from Goliath to the Village Blacksmith – is imbued with a theatrical hue. As I have already noted, the Village Blacksmith can be seen as a melodrama hero, but he can also evoke the anvil chorus of Verdi’s *Il Trovatore*, as Donald Morse called my attention to it. Thomas Coneff, however, has remained the M’Intosh or the “mystery man” of the Hero-list. Try as I might, I have been unable to identify him.
Yes, by God, I heard about that. Brian Boru or Finn MacCool, isn’t it?

Well, says O’MB [O’Madden Burke], we are sick of those puling pantomimes with their music hall songs and girls in tights. (Herring 168)

O’Madden Burke’s vituperative remark succinctly describes the stance of Irish cultural purists with regard to these popular modes of entertainment. The shared scorn for the music-hall functioned as a thin thread that united otherwise conflicting groups of Irish cultural nationalists. D. P. Moran, Douglas Hyde, Yeats, and George Russell all despised the music-hall as the product of English mass civilisation that was a threat to indigenous Irish traditions. As Moran’s The Leader put it in 1900, music-halls served as “regular night-schools for Anglicisation [and] a powerful propaganda for the lowest and grossest moral standards” (qtd. in Schneider 69). That Joyce held a different opinion is clear from Stanislaus’s 1904 description of his brother: “Jim considers the music-hall, not Poetry, [sic] a criticism on Life.[. . .] he found the frank vulgarity of the music-hall less offensive than the falsity of most of the legitimate drama of his day” (qtd. in Bauerle 5). The citizen evidently casts himself as a guard of the cultural as well as the racial purity of the Irish nation. How sad that his ancestral credentials infect him from within.

39 That D. P. Moran played a central role in elevating O’Growney into a myth is especially relevant, since as has been claimed by some commentators – Fred Radford, Maria Tymocko, McMahon, Margaret O’Callaghan, Joan FitzGerald, and Willard Potts – Moran, an apostle of the new gospel of the Gaelic League, seems to have been as much a model for the citizen as Michael Cusack. According to O’Callaghan, the citizen is “an amalgam of what Moran despises and what Moran is” (qtd. in MacMahon 71). McMahon offers a most lucid and insightful analysis of Joyce’s reaction to Moran and his paper The Leader in Ulysses.

40 Part of it is worked into “Ithaca,” where we learn that one time Bloom planned to write a topical song “If Brian Boru could but come back and see old Dublin now” for the Christmas pantomime Sindbad the Sailor, which he never did (17. 421).
“The Man in the Gap”

The item that Joyce inserted last into the Hero-list, The Man in the Gap, pushing apart the merry rhyming couple of the Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo and the Woman Who Didn’t, 42 “brings us back by a commodius vicus of recirculation” to the beginning of the Hero-list, since at the dawn of Irish history, Cuchulin, the hound of Ulster fulfilled the honourable task of manning the gap of danger in defence of his native tribe.43 At the same time it also enacts a “delicious and oblique comment” on the citizen-hero’s location within the faults, fissures and heterogeneous layers of the unstable assemblage of the Hero-list, which, as my tour de force of subversive heroics has aimed to demonstrate, dismantles the integrity of the fragile inheritor from within and from underneath.

---

41 The citizen’s hyperbolic talk demonstrates the scornful treatment of the music-hall. When Lenehan suggests that Bloom has gone to gather in the shekels that he has won on the horse Throwaway, the citizen shows incredulity by saying: “– Is it that whiteeyed kaffir? Says the citizen, that never backed a horse in anger in his life?” (12.1552-53). As Herr traced down, the Whiteeyed Kaffir was a celebrated eccentric music-hall comedian (Anatomy 159). Since the music-hall melody inscribed into the Hero-list, “The Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo” is about a man who wins a lot of money by gambling, it can be seen as an ironic comment on the barflies’ conjecture about Bloom getting rich in that manner.

42 It also assumes the aura of sexual innuendo in “Oxen of the Sun,” where the malicious young blades suspect that instead of Mina Purefoy’s elderly husband “another than her conjugal had been the man in the gap” (14.895). The barflies in “Cyclops” likewise question Bloom’s virility (12.1656-57).

43 The Irish anthem “The Soldier’s Song” sings of the brave soldiers of Ireland “manning the gap of danger.”
Chapter 3

Contami-nation: Island of Cyclopean Saints

“We are what we are – mongrels pure”

Thomas Kinsella¹

The nationalist glorification of heroes, symbols of a unified national spirit is counterpointed by a major nationalist anxiety: the fear of contamination of the nation’s cultural and, possibly, but not necessarily, racial purity. In the previous chapter I noted how at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries otherwise conflicting groups of Irish cultural nationalists were united in their shared scorn for the music-hall, seen as one of the main English cultural threats to indigenous Irish traditions. The cultural nationalist desire to safeguard the cultural purity of the nation evidently relies on the Romantic conception of nationhood in terms of absolute cultural difference. Thus, in colonial Ireland the endeavour to set up barriers to Anglicisation began with the Young Irelanders in the 1840s, even though it found its most eloquent expression in Hyde’s seminal lecture “The Necessity for De-Anglicizing Ireland” in 1892. Half a century before Hyde Davis already argued that “Ireland must be unsaxonised before it can be pure and strong” (qtd. in Boyce 156).

In the course of the nineteenth century, race joined culture in the purist argument of cultural nationalism. Hyde’s clarion call to begin a wholesale crusade against corrupting English cultural influences was supposed to serve the regeneration of the Irish race. As Seán Farell Moran has argued, the idea of the “Irish race” – usually defined in contradistinction to

¹ Quoted in Kearney, *Postnationalist Ireland* (247).
the English race – was “almost universally accepted” by the 1890s Revivalists. As he further argues, however, at the close of the nineteenth century many people believed, not only in Ireland, that “race was the determining principle in the definition of any national identity” (Pearse 58). Yet, the popularity of a racial concept of the Irish national character as an anti-colonial means of resistance against Britain is not without irony, since the concept of race itself was “an extension of colonialism, rather than a repudiation of it” (Gibbons 156).

Joyce’s attitude to the racial purist stance has customarily been summed up with reference to his remark about Griffith’s Sinn Féin. While commending several aspects of both policy and newspaper, he condemned Griffith for “educating the people on the old pop of racial hatred” (Letters II 167). “Cyclops” critics have often commented on how Joyce caricatures exclusive nationalism defining nationality in racial terms in the citizen’s anti-Semitic attack on Bloom, supposedly in defence of the purity of the Irish nation. The episode dramatises the violence lurking in communal identity formation not only on a discursive level – in the barflies’, especially the citizen’s abject othering of Bloom – but also in the citizen’s use of physical force to rid the community of Bloom’s contaminating presence. While most critics emphasise Bloom’s role in countering this, Lloyd has argued that the episode counters the purist arguments of the discursive level formally as well. In Lloyd’s words, the episode “circulates not only thematically but also stylistically around adulteration, as the constitutive anxiety of nationalism. For while the citizen is militant against the hybridisation of Irish

---

2 Moran’s observation also suggests, however, that there were exceptions. As Gibbons has pointed out, the translator and scholar, Sigerson in a series of lectures beginning as early as 1868 “sought to remove the racial epithet ‘Celtic’ entirely from the cultural canon, arguing that Irishness incorporated the residue of several cultural or ‘racial’ strains, as befitted a country exposed to successive waves of invasion and internal strife over the centuries” (156).

3 While Manganiello, arguing for Joyce’s heart-felt support for Sinn Féin, allows for certain disparities between Joyce and Griffith, one case in point being the use of race as an index of nationality (127-29), Nolan sees this major difference of vision in Joyce and Griffith as one of the premises upon which she dissociates Joyce and Griffith (29).

4 See especially Cheng, Brian W. Shaffer, and Carol Shloss.
culture, the chapter itself dramatises adultery as the condition of colonial Ireland at virtually every level” (Anomalous 106).

In the previous chapter I explored how this major constitutive anxiety of nationalism is projected onto the central icons of nation formation, the heroes of the nation. In this chapter, I concentrate on how the discursive and physical violence in the name of the purity of the nation is counteracted on the formal level by a list of seventy-nine saints intruding upon the narrative space of Bloom’s othering. Reizbaum has recently offered a lucid reading of the dynamic interaction between the list of saints and its narrative context. Thus, owing to our partly shared focus, certain overlaps in her and my argument are unavoidable for the sake of the clarity of my argument. Nevertheless, since my reading examines the list through the conceptual lens of cultural nationalism rather than that of gender and sexuality – Reizbaum’s conceptual framework – I arrive at quite different insights.

God Bless All Here Save a Few

In the earliest notes for “Cyclops’ “Religion–Saints (Isle)” appears as number one in a list of some features or events, with “Saints” reappearing after “Arrival Martin” (Herring 129). In the printed text a list of seventy-nine saints follows soon upon Martin Cunningham’s arrival at Barney Kiernan’s, and the mock-religious interpolation describing a religious procession and the consecration of Barney Kiernan’s pub, which includes the list of saints, is most immediately triggered by Martin Cunningham’s toast and the others’ rejoinder:

– Well, says Martin, rapping for his glass. God bless all here is my prayer.

– Amen, says the citizen.

– And I’m sure he will, says Joe.
And at the sound of the sacring bell. . . (12. 1673-6)

The ensuing interpolation literalises and grotesquely swells Cunningham’s metaphorical toast, but it also functions, like most interpolations, as a complex “provective” prism refracting diverse thematic and rhetorical elements of the nameless narrator’s story. Thus, it also counteracts the xenophobic citizen’s attack on Bloom: “Saint Patrick would want to land again at Ballykinlar and convert us, says the citizen, after allowing things like that to contaminate our shores” (12.1672). Furthermore, the enumeration of seventy-nine saints participating in the religious procession – a sort of interpolation within the interpolation – can be seen as a grotesque visualisation of the citizen’s use of the much treasured nationalist epithet of Ireland as a punchline for his clinching ironic revelation of Bloom’s identity: “That’s the new Messiah for Ireland! says the citizen. Island of saints and sages!” (12.1642).

The comic effect of the list, which accommodates the canonised versions of the barflies – S. Alfred, S. Joseph, S. Leopold, and so forth. – and such saints as S. Anonymous and S. Synonymous is evident. But beyond this, the saintly catalogue engages in a complex and intricate way with the crucial thematic issue of identity – both personal and national – the problematisation of which is staged in multiple ways in the episode.

“What the Hell is He?”

Drinking and the act of blessing are associated a few lines earlier in the narrator’s disgust with Bloom, who is supposedly full of money after gathering all the shekels he won on the horse race, but is not willing to give them his blessing; that is, to stand them a drink. The verbal exchange between Cunningham, the citizen and Joe, in turn, can be seen as a performative elaboration of Ned Lambert’s potentially double-faced preceding question, which simultaneously conjures up the religious ritualistic aspect of the act of drinking, and its comic signification:

− Have you time for a brief libation, Martin? says Ned.
− Only one, says Martin. We must be quick. J.J. and S. (12.1668-9)

“Libation,” on the one hand, means the ritual of pouring out wine or oil upon the ground as a sacrifice to a god, but it can also signify an alcoholic drink or the act of drinking in a humorous way.
The mock-religious interpolation, including the list of saints, occurs in the text at the point when despite Bloom’s preceding declaration of his national and racial belongings, his identity – nationality, religion, virility – comes to figure in the discussion of the barflies as a multi-layered riddle.

– And after all, says John Wyse, why can’t a jew love his country like the next fellow?
– Why not? says J.J., when he’s quite sure which country it is.
– Is he a jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? says Ned. Or who is he? No offence, Crofton. (12.1628-32)

– Isn’t he a cousin of Bloom the dentist? says Jack Power. (12.1638)

– Do you call that a man? says the citizen.
– I wonder did he ever put it out of sight, says Joe.
– Well, there were two children born anyhow, says Jack Power.
– And who does he suspect? says the citizen. (12.1654-7)

This wholesale questioning of the coordinates of Bloom’s identity derives from Lenehan’s accusation that Bloom won money on the horse, Throwaway, which does not comply with the image most Dubliners have of him. Lenehan’s figuring of Bloom as a “bloody dark horse,” that is, inscrutable, unfathomable, having a secret life, is further strengthened by John Wyse Nolan’s Cyclopean “fact” that it was Bloom who “gave the [Hungarian] ideas for Sinn Fein to Griffith” (12.1574). Once rumours are unleashed, they have the tendency to authorise themselves in the course of their circulation, no matter how dubious that authority may always
“Cyclops” at this point, however, seems to promise an authoritative version of things beyond rumour: “— Well, it’s a fact, says John Wyse. And there’s the man now that’ll tell you about it, Martin Cunningham” (12.1586-7). As a man from Dublin castle, a representative of colonial rule in Ireland, he is supposed to be in the know. Cunningham’s efforts to pose as authority, however, repeatedly counteract this raised expectation, since his own words invalidate themselves, and as a result of this, rumour and authority collapse into each other.

— Isn’t that a fact, says John Wyse, what I was telling the citizen about Bloom and the Sinn Fein?
— That’s so, says Martin. Or so they allege.
— Who made those allegations? says Alf.
— I, says Joe. I’m the alligator. (12.1623-7)

Who the “they” may be is not explained, instead the issue trails off into a silly joke. A little later when Cunningham reveals Bloom’s Hungarian origins, which confirms his alleged role as Griffith’s advisor, the pronoun “they” changes into “we”: “— He’s a perverted jew, says Martin, from a place in Hungary and it was he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system. We know that in the castle” (12.1635). Just a minor change, but enough to undermine the credibility of the report. It is impossible to decide whether he personally knows that Bloom is “mucking up the show,” or he knows that others know. In a similar manner, when he tries to set nominal confusions around Bloom straight, his language counteracts his efforts, it fumbles and gets trapped by its own structures:

---

6 The best example of this process in Joyce’s writings is the emergence of Hosty’s “The Ballad of Pierce O’Reilly” in the second chapter of *Finnegans Wake* (30-42).
– Isn’t he a cousin of Bloom the dentist? says Jack Power.

– Not at all, says Martin. Only namesakes. His name was Virag. The father’s name that poisoned himself. He changed it by deed poll, the father did. (12.1638-40)

No matter how self-subversive Martin Cunningham’s authoritative statements are, the citizen sums up Bloom’s identity in the clinching ironic manner I have already mentioned: “That’s the new Messiah for Ireland! says the citizen. Island of saints and sages!” (12.1642), and a little later more threateningly: “A wolf in sheep’s clothing, says the citizen. That’s what he is. Virag from Hungary! Ahasuerus I call him. Cursed by God” (12.1666-7). My concern here is how the lengthy list of saints can be related to this dramatisation of the dissolution of Bloom’s identity and his stigmatisation as not authentically, originally Irish. Looking into the wider cultural assumptions that loom behind the citizen’s utterances identifying Bloom first ironically as a redeemer, then as a contaminating presence, which hinders the redemption of Ireland, highlights the interaction between the list and its narrative context.

**Island of Saints and Sages**

As Hutchinson in *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism* notes, the image of Ireland as a holy island – *insula sacra* – played an important role in the emergence of modern nationalist ideas of Ireland. The successive ethnic revivals – at the end of the eighteenth century, in the 1830s and 1890s – invariably appealed to the Gaelic past in their aim to recreate an authentic homogeneous national identity (49). However, while all these revivals shared a vision of Ireland as the homeland of a primordial civilisation, they looked to different aspects of the Gaelic past depending on their ideological purposes. Eighteenth century antiquarians and historians such as Charles Vallancey, Charles O’Connor, and Sylvester O’Halloran, and the “father” of the 1890s revival, Standish James O’Grady in *The History of Ireland* all located
the Golden Age of Ireland in its shadowy pagan past and “implicitly downplayed the
documented achievements of the Christian era” (Hutchinson 58). As opposed to this, the
representatives of the 1830s revival such as George Petrie, Eugene O’Curry, and John
O’Donovan, and numerous other succeeding Catholic antiquarians and historians, saw the
period of Celtic Christianity as the culmination of Ireland’s Golden Age, and beside the
heroism of the pagan martial period considered the achievements of the early Christian period
essential building-blocks of Irish nationality. In the 1890s, Eoin MacNeill, the chief architect
of the Gaelic League beside Father O’Growney and Hyde, celebrated St. Patrick as the
founder of the Irish nation itself. In MacNeill’s vision the Irish descended from a pagan
warrior civilisation, but it was St. Patrick who brought into being the Irish nation by infusing
into an already existing, but divided society the religious ethos of Christianity thus rendering
it a unique spiritual culture, the European centre of religious and secular learning.
(Hutchinson 123-27).7

Joyce himself appeared to pose as an advocate of this latter vision in his Triestine
lecture “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages” (1907). His rhetoric teems with nationalist
clichés: he describes Ireland in ancient times as “a true focus of sanctity and intellect
spreading throughout the continent a culture and a vitalizing energy,” and as “an immense
seminary, where scholars gathered from the different countries of Europe so great was its
renown for mastery of spiritual matters,” and from where Irish saints “carried the torch of
knowledge from country to country as pilgrims and hermits, as scholars and wisemen” (CW
154-55). To demonstrate his point he briefly surveys the activities of several of these
Christian heroes, some of whom like fiery Columbanus, St. Gall, St. Fiacre, and St. Fursey
appear in the Cyclopean list of saints as well. On the basis of such evidence, he claims that
“the Irish nation’s insistence on developing its own culture by itself is not so much the

7 Tymoczko in her overview of the press around 1904 notes that early Irish saints were widely discussed in
demand of a young nation [. . . ] as the demand of a very old nation to renew under new forms
the glories of a past civilization” (*CW* 157). However, in his usual Joycean manner what he
offers with one hand, he takes away with the other. Paradoxically, this initial proud and
sentimental glorification of his country’s past is counteracted by a more rational conclusion at
the end, denying the validity of such an appeal to the past in creating the future mostly
because of intermittent historical developments that cannot be undone or thought away. While
his rhetoric reinforces the cherished nationalist image of early Christian Ireland as the locus of
a pure Golden Age, he emphasises that the modern Irish nation and civilisation is “a vast
fabric [of racial and cultural hybridity] in which the most diverse elements are mingled,” and
in which “it is useless to look for a thread that has remained pure and virgin without having
undergone the influence of a neighbouring thread” (*CW* 165).

It is the utopian nationalist attempts to invent such a pure and virgin thread in the
image of early Christian Ireland that is caricatured in the citizen’s windy appeal to St. Patrick
to rid Ireland of the contaminating elements like Bloom – a Jew and of Hungarian descent –
and thus return Ireland to its Golden Age – to racial purity, that is a pristine, unadulterated,
uncontaminated origins. Reflecting/refracting this plea, the interpolation stages a grotesque
wish-fulfilment fantasy. As desired, the founder of the Irish church, St. Patrick appears but
rather like a “pedestrian straggler,” to use Senn’s words, deprived of his saintly title and
lagging behind the saintly mass by several lines: “And last, beneath a canopy of cloth of gold
came the reverend Father O’Flynn attended by Malachi and Patrick” (12.1726-8). His
companion, Malachi, equally decanonized, may refer to another Irish saint who lived seven
centuries after Patrick, and was mostly venerated for his efforts to return the – by his time –
corrupted Irish church to its original purity. The fact that he carried this out by introducing
Roman ecclesiastical discipline instead of Celtic Christianity introduced by Patrick, would not

---

Griffith’s *United Irishman*, O’Grady’s *All Ireland Review* and *The Irish Catholic* (237-54).
make them the best of neighbours. Their subservience to the fictitious Father Flynn, who, according to the comic song Bloom thinks of earlier during the day “would make hares of them [Trinity fellows] all” (8.713), that is, would make them ridiculous (by exposing their ignorance), in turn, casts another Malachi’s blasphemous shadow over the saintly gathering. In the context of this unholy trinity it is also worth noting Simon Dedalus’s indignant description of Mulligan in “Hades” – the earliest prophet of Cyclopean/citizen-like language in Ulysses: “That Mulligan is a contaminated bloody doubledyed ruffian by all accounts. His name stinks all over Dublin. But with the help of God and his blessed mother [. . .] I’ll tickle his catastrophe, believe you me” (6.63-8). Father Flynn’s figure is equally surrounded by the aura of contamination at his earlier appearance in Bloom’s mind envisioning communal kitchen years to come: “Rub off microbes with your handkerchief. Next chap rubs on a new batch with his. Father O’Flynn would make hares of them all” (8.712-3).

**Contami-nation**

Since most of the insights I offer in the rest of this chapter derive from my investigation of the genetic development of the Cyclopean list of “all saints, martyrs and confessors,” to facilitate the reader’s orientation I include it here:

---

8 A comment via email on my present argument.
S. Phocas of Sinope and
S. Julian Hospitator and (5)
S. Felix de Cantalice and
S. Simon Stylites and
S. Stephen Protomartyr and
S. John of God and
S. Ferreol and (10)
S. Leugarde and
S. Theodotus and
S. Vulmar and
S. Richard and
S. Vincent de Paul and (15)
S. Martin of Todi and
S. Martin of Tours and
S. Alfred and
S. Joseph and
S. Denis and (20)
S. Cornelius and
S. Leopold and
S. Bernard and
S. Terence and
S. Edward and (25)
S. Owen Caniculus
S. Anonymous and
S. Eponymous and
S. Pseudonymous and
S. Homonymous and (30)
S. Paronymous and
S. Synonymous and
S. Laurence O'Toole and
S. James of Dingle and Compostella and
S. Columcille and S. Columba and (35)
S. Celestine and
S. Colman and
S. Kevin and
S. Brendan and
S. Frigidian and (40)
S. Senan and
S. Fachtna and
S. Columbanus and
S. Gall and S.Fursey and
S. Fintan and (45)
S. Fiacre and
S. John Nepomuc and
S. Thomas Aquinas and
S. Ives of Brittany and
S. Michan and (50)
S. Herman- Joseph and
the three patrons of holy youth S. Aloysius Gonzaga and
S. Stanislaus Kostka and
S. John Berchmans and 
the saints Gervasius, (55) 
Servasius and 
Bonifacius and 
S. Bride and 
S. Kieran and 
S. Canice (60) 
of Kilkenny and 
S. Jarlath of Tuann and 
S. Finbarr and 
S. Pappin of Ballymun 
Brother Aloysius Pacificus and (65) 
Brother Louis Bellicosus and 
the saints Rose of Lima and of Viterbo and 
S. Martha of Bethany and 
S. Mary of Egypt and 
S. Lucy and (70) 
S. Brigid and 
S. Attracta and 
S. Dympna and 
S. Ita and 
S. Marion Calpensis and (75) 
the Blessed Sister Teresa of the Child Jesus and 
S. Barbara and 
S. Scholastica and 
S. Ursula with eleven thousand virgins.

The most striking feature of the lengthy list of saints is its heterogeneous nature.

Although several venerated early Irish saints march in the procession, they form only one component in the vast fabric of the list woven of saints from diverse countries and ages. True, most of the Irish saints are huddled up together forming a sort of Irish contingent – from S. Colman to S. Fiacre (items 37-46) – nevertheless several stray traces are mixed up with others in the saintly mass. A look into the list’s genetic development reveals a further irony: in the Little Review the list was made up of twenty-one saints altogether, and contained only one Irish saint bearing the Anglicized (contaminated) form of her name: S. Bride (item 58). Joyce augmented the list six times, and in the course of its evolution the list grew more and more Irish. It is worth noting that as opposed to the utter randomness of the final product, the chronological expansion of the Irish quality appears to reveal some kind of logic. In the first
round of augmentation following upon S. Bride, one of the first domestic founders of monasteries at Kildare, several other such saints appear: S. Kieran associated with Kilkenny, S. Jarlath with Tuam, S. Finnbarr with Cork. Their comic Malachian shadow is cast in the mysterious Pappin of Ballymun, who looks like a local saint for sure, but I have been unable to identify him. Furthermore, the neat equation between saints and places is upset by the introduction of S. Canice into the list producing the construct “S. Kieran and Canice of Kilkenny.” Both were important saints subsequently associated with Kilkenny as a result of historical developments. The next phase of augmentation, in turn, introduces the first representative of Irish monastic expansion abroad, right away in a double nominal form S. Columcille alias S. Columba, and the saint patriot S. Laurence O’Toole, bishop, later the patron-saint of Dublin, whose memory is cherished mainly for his heroic opposition to the foreign/English invaders in the twelfth century. The tendency to hibernicise the list proves steady, but it is only in the last round that Joyce adds the substantial Irish contingent containing, among others, several of those “carriers of the torch of knowledge from country to country” whom he praises in his Triestine lecture, such as S. Columbanus, S. Gall, S. Fursey, and S. Fiacre.

The initial list seems to be a random shuffling together of saints of diverse nature (martyrs and confessors), nationality (Spanish, Italian, Hebrew, Bohemian, English, Irish, Peruvian), descent (of noble or poor origin), and importance. Nevertheless, what all members of the initial list have in common is their apparent common origin in the pages of E. A. Greene’s *Saints and Symbols: A Companion of the Churches and the Picture Galleries of Europe* (1908) that Joyce, as Joseph Schork notes, bought in Zurich and had at his disposal at the time of writing “Cyclops” (189). All twenty-one can be found in Greene, whereas most of

---

9 S. Columcille’s nominal duplication is comically counterbalanced by his neighbour, S. James of Dingle and Compostella, which contracts two saints with the same name but of different nationality and significance: while
the saints inserted in the succeeding rounds cannot. Certainly, any attempt to reconstruct the
creative process itself would be a futile enterprise. Still, one cannot help imagining Joyce
laughing to himself in the process of transplanting the almost successive couple of S.
Bonifacius and S. Bridget alias S. Bride in Greene into his Cyclopean list. Furthermore, one
cannot help wondering whether it is due to the contaminating presence of her neighbour, the
English S. Bonifacius, the Apostle of Germany, that the only Irish saint at that stage in the list,
who is one of the three patron saints of Ireland, is signified by the Anglicized version of her
name, S. Bride. Interestingly enough, as the Hibernian component gains territory in the list
in the successive stages of augmentation, the female patron of Ireland reappears somewhat
later among the female saints – sandwiched between a penitent whore, S. Mary of Egypt, and
several virgins martyred in defence of their virginity – where lo and behold she regains her
Irish nominal purity, S. Brigid (item 51).

“S. Homonymous/ S. Paronymous/ S. Synonymous” II.

Brigid’s nominal duplication reflecting her translation into another culture is not
unique in the list. The third patron saint of Ireland similarly marches in a double nominal form
in the procession. While in Ireland he was known as S. Columcille, as the first pioneer of Irish
monastic expansion abroad this name became interchangeable with the Latin version, S.

the former was a locally venerated saint of the Irish town, Dingle, the shrine of the latter was one of the most
popular destinations of medieval pilgrimages in Europe.
10 That Joyce took names from Greene for his list can be clearly seen in the curious construct “the saints Rose of
Lima and of Viterbo.” The two have nothing in common – the former being a seventeenth century ascetic, the
latter a twelfth century saint venerated for her boundless charity – except the first tag of their names “Rose” and
the fact that one follows the other in Greene’s book.
11 The juxtaposition of S. Bonifacius and S. Bride can be motivated by a further potential irony: whereas the
former, as Greene describes him, “converted many to the faith, and cut down the great oak sacred to Thor,” the
latter’s convent was founded on the site of “a grove of oaks once sacred to idol-worship,” where she retreated
for solitude (52-53).
12 In the final list the penitent whore S. Mary of Bethany and S. Brigid cease to figure as neighbours, since at a
later stage S. Lucy comes in between them. As Dáithí Ó hÓgáin notes, however, S. Brigid to a limited extent is
also a hibernicised S. Lucy, since Irish hagiographers imported an element from the legends associated with
Lucy into those of Brigid: the act of blinding herself in defence of her virginal purity (23). A particularly
resonant detail in a Cyclopean context.
Columba. The comic highlighting of such nominal manipulations of the most venerated Irish saints can be seen as an ironic comment on the citizen’s denial of authentic Irishness to Bloom, partly grounded on Martin Cunningham’s revelation that his name is a translation of the father’s original Hungarian name, Virag. It is worth noting that in the case of the most widely venerated St Patrick the situation is even more complicated. Nothing is certain about his identity, the time of his mission, the date of his death, the exact location of his missionary work. According to some allegations, there were two Patricks, according to others the nominal duality, Patrick and Palladius, conceal the same identity. Palladius is generally considered to have brought Christianity to Ireland a century before Patrick without disseminating it to the degree that the latter did. This wholesale inscrutability surrounding St. Patrick is staged in the grotesque quarrel and final settlement of the exact date of Patrick’s death in the interpolated execution scene of the hero-martyr earlier in “Cyclops” (12.572-81).

The nominal manipulations of venerated Irish saints have wider thematic implications: they problematise the relationship between naming and identity in general. One could ask, for instance, which of the hundred and twenty five Irish S. Colmans are meant by the simple nominal label S. Colman in the list. Or which of the twenty Irish S. Senans by the name S. Senan. Early Christian Ireland earned its epithet “Island of saints and scholars” not only by the quality of her saints’ service to European civilisation, but also thanks to their sheer number – many with the same names. As Seathrún Céitinn (Geoffrey Keating) claimed in the seventeenth century, Ireland “needs not to boast what a multitude they were, because the foreign authors of Europe admit this, and they state that Ireland was more prolific in saints than any other country in Europe” (79). In a similar manner two centuries later the eminent hagiologist Father John Ryan argued: “Our race [. . .] has shown itself capable of producing in unique abundance the very highest type of which humanity is capable, the saint. Therein lies our chief claim to recognition and to glory as a nation” (qtd. in Butler 24). While Céitinn,
Victorian archaeologists, and Catholic hagiologists took the historicity of Irish saints for granted and their multitude filled them with national pride, it was the unique abundance of Irish saints that increased others’ suspicion as to their identity and historicity. In the eighteenth century Vallancey discarded them as Christianised deities, while Edward Ledwich disparaged them as “monkish fictions” (qtd. in Butler 18). According to the twentieth-century country scholar Hubert Butler, early Irish saints were “the Christian by-product of the dying art of ancestor-making” (27). Around the year when the scene in Barney Kiernan’s takes place, William Kirkpatrick Magee (alias John Eglinton) proposed the theory that the early saints were chiefly “bards cast loose from Druidism” (16). Such assessments of the Irish saints parallel the citizen’s revelation of Bloom’s identity: “a wolf in sheep’s clothing.” The list ironically comments on this judgement by getting carried away in a wholesale canonisation of the barflies including the dog and the owner of the bar, present only in name, the outsider Breen and his baiter Corny Kelleher, and the absent Molly Bloom, and Stephen and Simon Dedalus: “S. Simon Stylites and S. Stephen Protomartyr and S. John of God” (items 7-9) and “S. Martin of Todi and S Martin of Tours and S. Alfred and S. Joseph and S. Denis and S. Cornelius and S. Leopold and S. Bernard and S. Terence and S. Edward and S. Owen Caniculus” (items 16-26) and later fittingly among the female saints S. Marion Calpensis (item 75). Irony gives way to subversive nonsense at the point of the appearance of “S. Anonymous and S. Eponymous and S. Pseudonymous and S. Homonymous and S. Paronymous and S. Synonymous” (items 27-32). Yet, S. Anonymous could also be seen as the canonised version of all those whose nominal identity remains unrevealed throughout the episode like the citizen and the narrator or those whose straightforward nominal identification the barflies playfully avoid like Boylan. In a similar fashion, S. Pseudonymous subsumes all those who use names to conceal their identity. The unholy trinity of S. Homonymous and S.

13 Although they do not form part of this contingent, the allegorical saints ‘Brother Aloysius Pacificus and
Paronymous and S. Synonymous could be read, in turn, as the canonised versions of the nominal economies of the episode on the whole, and/or as a succinct self-reflexive summary of the possible modes of nominal confusion abounding in hagiography: the first referring to the large number of saints with the same name – too many Maries, a hundred and twenty-five S. Colmans, twenty S. Senans – the second to the phenomena of deriving several later saints from an earlier one – eighteen saints originate from S. Fintan, fourteen from S. Ciaran, eleven from S. Brigid – and the third to the nominal redundancies that we have seen in the case of S. Brigid and Columcille (Butler 20).

### Pannonian Saints

So far I have focused on some of those formal and thematic dynamics within the list that counteract the citizen’s utterances and the cultural assumptions behind them. Finally, I will focus on one particular move within the list that instead of the citizen targets Martin Cunningham’s voice of authority in the bar upon which the citizen’s stigmatising othering of Bloom lies. Among the canonised counterparts of the barflies only one appears in a double nominal refraction: S. Martin of Todi and S. Martin of Tours. Most of the bar saints were added at the same time, but S. Martin of Tours joined his namesake one stage later. The two Martins were two different saints who do not have much in common beyond their name and that their status as bishop. While the former was the last bishop of Rome venerated as a martyr, the latter was “one of the first holy men who was not a martyr to be publicly venerated as a saint” (Attwater 234). Martin of Tours, Christ’s successful soldier, the father of

---

14 See the muddle of Maries in the four Gospels and in cultural memory, which is exposed in the mismatched neighbours in the list: S. Martha of Bethany and S. Mary of Egypt. Bloom thinks of Martha and Mary of Bethany earlier during the day, but in the Cyclopean list instead of her sister Martha of Bethany is accompanied by a penitent whore, who, just like her sister, was often confused with Mary Magdalene.

15 Joyce’s handwriting shows that he vacillated between the two. First he wrote Martin of Tours together with the other canonised barflies, then he crossed it out and replaced it with Martin of Todi. At the next stage he inserted the originally intended Martin of Tours keeping the other as well. (Groden, Archive 222, 230).
monasticism in France, the reputed wonder-worker outshines his Italian namesake, who supported the lost cause of the holy Roman faith in the Byzantine Empire. Martin of Tours also has the advantage that “his story is woven very closely into Irish hagiography and legend” (Butler 144). He is said to have been the uncle of St. Patrick himself, St. Columcille found his wonder-working Gospel on Martin’s breast after his death, and at least ten Irish saints are reported to have visited Tours. Yet, the glorious Martin also has a minor defect: although he was of Celtic stock, he was born in what today is Szombathely, Hungary, the birthplace of Rudolph Virag, Bloom’s father. If this should discredit him in the eyes of the barflies, the hagiographic fact that he is the patron of penitent drunkards would surely make them restore his glory.
Chapter 4

Making Hope and History Unrhyme: Cyclopean Figures of National Salvation

Jesus this song you wrote
The words are sticking in my throat
Peace on Earth
Hear it every Christmas time
But hope and history won’t rhyme
So what’s it worth?
This peace on Earth.

“Peace on Earth,” U2

Hope and/or History

These lines from a recent song by the Irish rock band U2 are reminiscent of Stephen Dedalus’s silent comment on history in “Aeolus”: “a nightmare from which you will never awake” (7.768), and of Bloom’s outburst later in “Cyclops”: “Persecution [. . .] all the history of the world is full of it. Perpetuating national hatred among nations [. . .]. Force, hatred, history, all that. That’s not life for men and women, insult and hatred” (12.1417, 1481-82).

1 To begin a chapter in a PhD thesis with the lyrics of a contemporary rock band may seem absurd. Nevertheless, my gesture relates to my concerns in this chapter and throughout the thesis, since I also examine how Joyce comically exposes the use of popular music for nationalist propaganda in colonial Ireland. The fact that much of the best Irish popular music today is concerned with historical and political issues continues – consciously or unconsciously – a long-standing tradition in Ireland to use popular music as a means of creating the political and historical awareness of the masses.

The idea of unrhyming hope and history in the lyrics of the song is probably borrowed from Seamus Heaney’s translation of Sophocles’s play, Philoctetes into The Cure at Troy. Chorus: “History says, don’t hope / On this side of the grave. / But then once in a lifetime / The longed for tidal wave / Of justice can rise up, / And hope and history rhyme. / So hope for a great sea change / On the far side of revenge. / Believe that a future shore/ Is reachable from here. / Believe in miracles / And cures and healing wells” (77).

2 A pessimistic revision of the previous “nightmare from which I’m trying to awake” (2.377).
Bloom contrasts love with hatred and history. In the song it is hope, associated with the Christian Redeemer, that figures as the opposite of history, which suggests that the wounds, ruptures, and divisions of history are unredeemable. This dichotomy, however, can dissolve with a redefinition of the chameleon-like concept of history. It can be re-figured into the *locus* of unity, thus a harbinger of hope and a prophet of salvation. Nationalist historiography – often allied with the medium of popular music in the form of political ballads – propagated such a vision in colonial Ireland. As Spoo contends, Irish nationalism advocated a theistic, predictive, or what Hayden White calls “organicist” view, which tended to see Irish history exclusively in terms of the furtherance or hindrance of the *telos* of national deliverance (126).  

Anderson has argued, borrowing Walter Benjamin’s terms, that it was the superseding of the medieval concept of “Messianic time” (seeing the future as the fulfilment of the promise of the past) with that of “homogeneous, empty time” (marked by cross-time and temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar), that facilitated the imagining of the nation (24). Ironically enough, nationalist imaginings of history tend to revert to the medieval mode of imagining time, since they endow the past with the role of prophesying the future.

Here, I explore how “Cyclops” offers a comic critique of such an ideological figuration of history. In particular, I examine how the text weaves and unweaves two powerful images of national salvation in popular history: the “Tree of Liberty,” popularised mostly in ballads, and the image of the “Red Hand,” which became associated with messianic prophecies in the twelfth century and is still in circulation in Northern Ireland. To better illuminate the subversive ideological implications of their employment in the text, I will

---

3 According to Hayden White the “Organicist” view of history is “oriented toward the determination of the *end* or *goal* toward which all the processes found in the historical field are presumed to be tending” (16). Anderson also argues that “[n]ationalism thinks in terms of national destiny” (149). In Chapter Two, I have already discussed how in the light of this *telos* Irish history became homogenised into an ongoing heirloom and tradition of greatness and heroism.
briefly outline the emergence and spread of the mode of nationalist historiography that facilitates the reconciliation of hope and history.

**The Prophet of the Future**

As noted in Chapter Two, with the emergence of the Romantic concept of nationhood, history became endowed with the mythic role of “creating an imagined community with a common identity” (Whelan, “United” 273). For the German originators of this ideology, this essential national spirit was located in language. In Ireland, however, this neat identification was thwarted by the fact that there were two language communities, Irish and English, and Irish had already by 1800 ceased to be the dominant language of culture or even the principle language of the majority. Thus, as Lloyd contends,

> Where the German nationalist’s identity is guaranteed by his language, [...] the Irish nationalist revitalises a relation to history that might have represented only death and division, finding in it both the lesson and promise of unity. Charles Gavan Duffy summed the case up retrospectively: “Rightly understood, the history of Ireland abounded in noble lessons, and had the unity and purpose of an epic poem [...]. The true lesson they [the national annals] taught was that Irishmen were enslaved because they were divided.” (*Nationalism* 68)

> “Rightly understood” history, as the literary analogy shows, means a highly emplotted history designed to be permeable across the poetic and historical imagination divide, which as Lloyd argues, “ceases to be political insofar as it ceases to register struggle and conflict and
becomes a process that produces a unity that transcends actual division” (*Nationalism* 71).

The present, in turn, comes to be seen only as a moment in a continuously evolving narrative of the nation, thus the rewriting of present discontinuities functions as a token of a future national regeneration. As Hyde argued in 1892, “What we must endeavour never to forget is this, that the Ireland of today is the descendant of the Ireland of the seventh century” (4). However, what Duffy and other leaders of the Young Ireland movement lamented most was exactly that people had forgotten, were ignorant of their national past, therefore unready for deliverance. The primary aim of the Young Irelanders, therefore, was to lift the veil from the past and offer it to the masses, thus educating them while increasing their historical and political awareness. As noted in Chapter Two, in order to achieve their goal they recruited the cultural ally of the political ballad. In Davis’s prescription, the historical ballads making up a projected “ballad history of Ireland” “will commonly be narrative in [their] form, but not necessarily so. [. . .]. [The writer of historical ballads] is ‘called’ by destiny to tell to men the past, the present and the future in words so perfect that generations shall feel and remember” (122). The historical vision embodied in Davis’s ballad “A Nation Once Again,” the citizen is reported to sing in one of the interpolations (12. 917-22), is paradigmatic of all other Young Ireland ballads. The title foreshadows the organicist message, repeatedly reinforced by the passionate plea of the variations on the first refrain: “And Ireland, long a province, be / A NATION ONCE AGAIN.” It offers a grand anachronistic vision of nationhood as an unbroken arc stretching from ancient past to future. Even though in the present Ireland is reduced to the status of a province, it once was a nation, which justifies its claim to regain that ancient status. Although God’s will is implicated in the nationalist project, “For freedom

---

4 According to Whelan, the United Irishmen, the bearers of the European Enlightenment, repudiated history for its potentially destabilising effect (“United” 270). By contrast, Thuente suggests that the United Irishmen preceded Thomas Moore and the Young Irelanders in romanticising, aestheticising history (*Harp* 97).

5 All the verses end in this catch-phrase printed invariably in capital letter in the 1882 edition of *The Spirit of the Nation*. 238-9.
comes from God’s right hand,” it is “righteous men” emulating unselfish heroes of the past who are the token of a future national regeneration.

As Leerssen notes, Davis’s project to smooth out the ruptured, uneven course of Irish history into a coherent narrative came to full fruition decades after Davis’s death with A. M. Sullivan’s *The story of Ireland; or A narrative of Irish history, from the earliest ages to the present time, written for the youth of Ireland* (1867), which became part of the school curricula (Remembrance 151). Consequently, such teleological imaginings of Irish history became standard both in popular history surfacing, for instance, in street ballads, the folk counterparts of educated Anglo-Irish ballads, and written templates of nationalist thought such as Standish James O’Grady’s *History of Ireland*, a source of inspiration for the advocates of the Celtic Renaissance in the 1890s. Although O’Grady’s history reaches back into the far off mythic-heroic origins of Irish history, his eyes are cast forward: “As compared with the history of Greece, that of our own land is of course a small thing, its real greatness lying in the promise of the future, not in the actualities of the past; of which future, that far off mythic age is a prophecy” (59).

**Frustrated Teleology**

The dense texture of “Cyclops” resists such teleological master narratives of Irish nationalism. Gibson has already thoroughly examined how the episode offers a “sustained assault” on the discourse of Revivalist historiography in the 1890s in general, and O’Grady’s *History of Ireland* in particular, but he does not dwell on their organicist aspect. G. J. Watson, has argued that *Ulysses* in general “presents a powerful critique of this unholy alliance of romanticism, nationalism, and aestheticised history” (52) and that
The very forms of *Ulysses*, in their working to preserve indeterminacy and openness, and in pluralistic techniques that involve parallax, the stereoscopic vision, invite us to reflect [...] on the monocular vision of the sacred march of Irish history endemic in the nationalist imagination. *Ulysses* implicitly as well as explicitly challenges that vision. (55)

According to Spoo, the “frustration of teleology” becomes so pervasive a pattern in *Ulysses* “that it might be regarded as a master trope within the novel” (121). Yet, there seems to be some critical agreement that sequential narrative is most seriously challenged in the “Cyclops” episode first, and, as Rodstein argues, “[i]f sequential narrative is broken, perhaps the notion of progress toward one great goal is also disqualified” (184). The episode leaves no stone unturned to disqualify this notion.

As noted in Chapter One, the episode in general stages a wholesale formal intervention into Irish cultural nationalist projects to create coherent, linear, univocal narratives of the nation. The narrator’s linear story-telling is incessantly disrupted by parodistic mimicries of written discourses. Although the narrator’s story and the interpolations are not entirely unrelated, the interpolations usually get carried away in their own elaboration, the effect of which is that the reader fumbles to get back to the story. This constant frustration of a narrative line on a formal/stylistic level is duplicated by the thwarted action of the episode. Joe Hynes enters Barney Kiernan’s pub to give the citizen the “hard word” about a meeting of the cattle traders, but as the narrator informs us, “So Joe starts telling the citizen about the foot and mouth disease and the cattle traders and taking action in the matter” (12.831) only in the middle of the episode. Even then it is brought up only to be immediately brushed aside by a discussion of the Gaelic sports revival. Likewise, John Wyse Nolan’s later attempt to report to the citizen on the city hall meeting about the Irish language
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trails off into the citizen’s racial onslaught on English “syphilisation.” (12.1191). Bloom’s desperate attempts to express his opinion are ruthlessly cut short by the citizen.\textsuperscript{6} The longest interpolation allegedly describing the execution of a hero-martyr becomes so encumbered in the elaboration of the preparations and the circumstances that the hero-martyr’s execution never takes place. The genetic development of the episode clearly shows that Joyce, repeatedly augmenting his text, consciously and increasingly worked on the undoing of its linearity. The saturation of the episode with disrupting and distracting effects implicitly work contrary to the “monocular vision of the sacred march” of history adhered to by the barflies, suggesting instead that history is a series of irrational ruptures, much as Nietzsche and Foucault imagine it.\textsuperscript{7}

“A\textsuperscript{nd} Will Again”

Apart from such an abstract critique, “Cyclops” resists nationalist teleological master narratives in more specific ways. At some point in the wavering pub talk the barflies articulate a windy anticipation of the future regeneration of Ireland’s lost glories.

\begin{itemize}
\item And our eyes are on Europe, says the citizen. We had our trade with Spain and the French and with the Flemings before those mongrels were pupped. Spanish ale in Galway, the winebark on the winedark waterway.
\item And will again, says Joe.
\item And with the help of the holy mother of God we will again, says the citizen, clapping his thigh. Our harbours that are empty will be full again, Kinsale, Galway, [ .
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{6} Bloom’s attempts are usually interrupted after his introductory “What I mean is . . .” When, at the end of the episode, Bloom becomes the target of collective malice in the pub, the fierce-tongued narrator sums up his essence succinctly: “A mean bloody scut” (12.1760).
And will again, says he, when the first Irish battleship is seen breasting the waves with our own flag to the fore, none of your Henry Tudor harps, no, the oldest flag afloat, the flag of the province of Desmond and Thomond, three crowns on a blue field, the three sons of Milesius. (12.1302-10)

What could bring about this national regeneration is left unclarified, it is only the retrospective light of another “prophetic” utterance coming from the citizen a little later that can partly illuminate this one:

− We’ll put force against force, says the citizen. We have our greater Ireland beyond the sea. They were driven out of house and home in the black ‘47. . . But those that came to the land of the free remember the land of bondage. And they will come again, and with a vengeance, no cravens, the sons of Granuaile, the champions of Kathleen ni Houlihan. (12.1372-5)8

So the citizen cherishes the hope that Ireland will be liberated with Irish-American, probably Fenian help from “those mongrels,” the English, which, in his vision, would automatically

7 See Foucault’s The Archaeology of Knowledge calling into question the sacralised vision of history manifest in linear, teleological constructions of history, in general, and his analysis of how Nietzsche critiqued such a vision of history in “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.”

8 Granuaile or Granu Wail was a widely celebrated hero in street ballads and rebel songs throughout the nineteenth century. She was a sort of popular cultural counterpart of Kathleen Ni Houlihan. While in the songs the sons of Granuaile figure as the token of Ireland’s salvation the son of the historical Grace O’Malley, upon whose figure the ballad hero was based, was “a commander of note on the side of the English, in Connaught, in the reign of Elizabeth.” The mother, Grace, daughter of a Mayo chief, was noted for her piracies and constant naval harassment of the English while married to an Irishman, but after the death of the first husband and her second marriage to sir Richard Burke, “she became reconciled to the government, and with her followers, assisted the English forces in Connaught” (McCarthy 122).
result in the revival of Ireland’s ancient glories. It is important to note, however, that it is not the citizen who utters the first “prophetic” cry but Joe Hynes. Only then does the citizen snap the word from the other’s mouth, repeating and elaborating on the introduced theme “like a duet in an opera.” This narrative incident suggests that there are some shared assumptions, hopes growing beyond any individual mind, or to reverse the perspective, some collective constructs internalised by individual minds at work here. Prophecies formed part of the paraphernalia of patriotic agitation for centuries. They were a common currency in Gaelic Ireland (Ó hÓgáin 120-60, Leerssen, *Mere Irish* 178-89), and owing to their power over the populace, they were repeatedly deployed even after the dawn of the modern nation at the end of the eighteenth century. The United Irishmen consciously utilised them (Whelan, “United” 282); Daniel O’Connell, commonly known as the Liberator, whipped up messianic expectations in his Catholic Emancipation and Repeal campaigns (Hutchinson 107); while Parnell was widely identified with Moses, since he brought Ireland in sight of the Promised Land (Spoo 123).

The citizen’s “prophecies” repeat widespread *topoi* of nationalist teleological master narratives. The former fits the *topos* that a national regeneration equals a return to the pristine, unadulterated origins – the sons of Milesius being no other than the Celts – while the latter enacts a *topos* going back to the seventeenth century, according to which the agent of national deliverance should be expected from abroad. Only the well of salvation changed from Spain in the seventeenth century, to France in the eighteenth century, and then again to America in the nineteenth. The expectation that the agent of national deliverance would come from Spain emerged at the dawn of the seventeenth century when, after the collapse of the old Gaelic

---

9 As MacDonagh observes, the national scapegoating of the English goes back to Wolfe Tone, who blamed England as “the never-failing cause of all our political evil.” Consequently, revolutionary nationalism throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century regarded Tone’s primary aim of “breaking the connection with England” as the *telos* of their struggle, and lacked any social, political, and economic projects for an independent future (29).
order, Red Hugh O’Donnell, one of the leaders of the last rebellion of Gaelic Ireland – the Moses of Gaelic Ireland – fled to Spain to gather forces there and return to save the land from the increasingly aggressive English colonisers. As Dáithí Ó hÓgáin notes in *The Hero of Irish Folk History*, “the political reality through all of the sixteenth century had meant that Spain was the foreign power most likely to offer assistance” (137), but apart from this, Irish hopes were also fed by mythological history. According to the twelfth-century *Leabhar Gabhala* (*The Book of Invasions*),

Gaelic people had originally been brought to Ireland by the sons of *Mil Easpaine*. They had come directly from Spain, and the name *Mil Easpaine* originally meant “the Soldier of Spain.” This precedent in pre-history became the cultural expression of Irish resistance to England in the sixteenth century – Spain, from which the Gaelic people had come, would not allow them to be destroyed in their hour of need. (Ó hÓgáin 137)

The Milesian myth became especially widespread with Seathrún Céitinn’s (Geoffrey Keating) influential *Foras Feasa ar Eirinn (History of Ireland)* (1634). An early draft of “Cyclops” (V. A. 8.) clearly shows that Joyce was aware of Keating’s role in the dissemination of the myth. An embryonic version of the scene depicting the barflies’ prediction of the future regeneration of Ireland reads:

[. . .] when the first Irish battleship is seen breasting the sea with the green flag at her helm.

– That’s a long way off, says – [not specified who]

– Long or short, it’ll come, says Cusack. Our history that Geoffrey Keating wrote, as an outlaw, hiding in the fastnesses of the Galtees is not finished yet. What did John
Mitchell say: the last conquest of Ireland perhaps. Do you think we will remain hands in their (our) pockets? (Herring 172)

Cusack, at a later stage denominalised into “the citizen,” explicitly refers to Keating’s history, and its organicist message. Keating drew on Gaelic mythological history – describing the succeeding waves of pre-historic invasions, the sons of Milesius arriving last – to write a history of Ireland with the aim of refuting English colonial representations of the Irish past. In a similar manner, the citizen refers to Keating’s seventeenth-century history to validate a present project: the last conquest of Ireland, that is the reconquest of Ireland from the English. In the published version the explicit reference to Keating becomes sublimated into a reference to “the three sons of Milesius,” and the telos of Ireland’s liberation gets transubstantiated into a revival of Ireland’s mythic origins. Ironically enough, however, the citizen’s grand vision of a unified telos is undermined by Keating’s history itself, the bulk of which is taken up by a description of how the succeeding generations of the descendants of the three sons of Milesius – Eibhear, Eireamhon and Ir – too numerous to be enumerated, slaughtered each other in a self-perpetuating struggle for dynastic supremacy. Thus, while the citizen envisions the revival of a Golden Age by a return to the beginning, Keating’s History reveals the violence and injustice, unrelated to any English oppression, lurking within these apparently redemptive origins.

“Europe Has its Eye on You”

The text further engages with topoi of national salvation in even more intricate ways. It stages a not readily visible subtextual and intertextual drama weaving and unweaving two images of national salvation in popular history. The idea of a future national regeneration
crops up after the citizen’s woeful enumeration of Ireland’s lost commercial glories culminating in his plea to save the yet remaining trees of Ireland:

– Save them, says the citizen, the giant ash of Galway and the chieftain elm of Kildare with a fortyfoot bole and an acre of foliage. Save the trees of Ireland for the future men of Ireland on the fair hills of Eire, O!

– Europe has its eye on you, says Lenehan.

The fashionable internationable world attended *en masse* this afternoon at the wedding of the chevalier Jean Wyse de Neaulan [. . .] with Miss Fir Conifer of Pine Valley. [. . .]

– And our eyes are on Europe, says the citizen. We had our trade with Spain [. . .].

– And will again, says Joe. (12.1262-1299)

The citizen’s backward-looking nostalgic mood literally ramifies into a hopeful anticipation of the future through an interpolated parodistic tree wedding refracting the citizen’s plea and Lenehan’s potentially double-faced remark. Robert Scholes, MacCabe, Sandquist, and Senn have already explored the rhetorical function of this interpolation in some detail. In the context of the *topos* of national deliverance, however, it can yield and/or assume new shades of meaning.

Lenehan’s remark introducing the tree wedding can be seen as a gateway to a politically charged symbolism through its striking resemblance to a line of an Irish street ballad probably from the second half of the nineteenth century entitled “Ireland’s Liberty-Tree.” Since no Joyce song book and collection of annotations I have consulted points out the significance of this song, it is worth quoting in full to place the line in context:
A tree has been planted in Ireland,
And watered with tears of the brave;
By our great grandsires it was nourished,
Who scorned to be held like the slaves.
The trust they transported to their children,
To keep it until they were free
And yearly the plant has grown stronger,
‘Tis called “Ireland’s Liberty-Tree.”

Chorus:

Protect, then, the tree, sons of Erin,
Its branches from traitors keep free,
Though Martyrs before ye have perished
‘Neath Ireland’s famed Liberty-Tree.

Its roots in the ground firmly woven,
Unshaken by threatening alarm,
Its branches will wave over the patriot
Who dies for his country in arms.

*The eyes of the world are upon it,*

*And millions beyond the blue sea*

*Are eagerly waiting to gather*

*Beneath Ireland’s Liberty-Tree.*
Brave Emmet, Fitzgerald and Grattan
Have died in defence of the tree,
While Sheil and O’Connor predicted
That the plant would see Ireland free.
Then deem not those patriots dreamers,
Their prophetic vision could see
That properly nourished, no power
Could harm Ireland’s Liberty-Tree.

Let each son of Erin contribute
Whate’er in his power doth lie;
The pure blood of Ireland’s Martyrs
Gave it strength, and it never shall die.
Then gather beneath its broad branches,
All ye who dare strive to be free,
And heaven will surely protect those,
Who guard Ireland’s Liberty-Tree.
(Zimmermann 255, emphasis added)

The second half of the second stanza resonates so closely with the discussed passages of “Cyclops” that one cannot but suspect that Joyce had the song in mind when he put the words into Lenehan’s mouth. As Georges-Denis Zimmermann in his dissertation on Irish political street ballads and rebel songs between 1780-1900 observes, liberty trees – real trees planted in the native soil with symbolic implications and verbal trees planted in the patriotic ears through songs – were widespread in the popular culture of Ireland for almost a century. It
was the United Irishmen who introduced the symbolism of the liberty tree in Ireland at the end of the eighteenth century “mainly because it was a part of the new patriotic ritual developed by the French Republic” (41). As Zimmermann describes, in France arbres de la liberté appeared in 1790 and soon became very popular. The custom then spread throughout Europe and must have reached Ireland early, since already in 1792 patriots of Ulster declared themselves “protectors of this Tree” (41). In this context the transformation of the bridegroom’s Irish name into a French variant, Jean Wyse de Neaulan, and the fact that the tree wedding takes place in France assume a new significance.  It is worth noting, however, that in this song, written in the second half of the nineteenth century, the connection between France and the Liberty Tree is severed. The origin of the tree remains obscure, all that the song says is that the tree has been passed on by Irish ancestors, has been watered by the blood of Ireland’s martyrs and it is the millions beyond the blue sea – the Irish-American descendants of the roughly one million Irish who emigrated to America during the famine years – who will gather beneath the tree. All this fits in nicely with the citizen’s martyrlogy (12.481, 12.498-500), his slighting the French (12.1386), and his prophecy of the resurrection of Ireland achieved by aid from America.  “The eyes of the world” of the song, however, become narrowed down to “the eyes of Europe” in “Cyclops.” In contradistinction to the nineteenth century vision, at the end of the eighteenth century in the United Irish songbooks the French dimensions of the Liberty Tree were an indispensable element. France was either presented as the origin of the tree or the land which is expected to plant or revive Ireland’s

---

10 Senn has already mapped out other potential implications of the French aspect of the tree wedding (“Ramifications” 168).

11 There is a topical development in the use of the image of the Liberty Tree. While the songs in Paddy’s Resource, the United Irish songbooks, claim that the tyrants’ blood nourishes the tree, in the later nineteenth century version the tree feeds on martyrs’ blood. Lines from a song in Paddy’s Resource: “May the branch of Freedom flourish. / Say in Ireland will it thrive? / Tyrants’ blood its roots must nourish.” The chorus of “Plant, Plant the Tree” (1790’s): “Plant, plant the Tree, fair Freedom’s Tree, / Midst danger, wounds and slaughter, / Erin’s green fields its soil shall be. / Her tyrants’ blood its water.” The nineteenth century vision of the regeneration of the tree thanks to the nourishing blood of martyrs culminates in Yeats’s “Red Rose Tree” (I am indebted to Donald Morse for the last remark).
liberty tree. In one version of “The Wearing of the Green,” a ballad, which crops up later in Circe, Irish hopes of redemption connected to France get embodied in the figure of Napoleon: “O may the wind of Freedom soon send young Boney over, / And we’ll plant the Tree of Liberty upon our Shamrock shore; / O we’ll plant it with our weapons, while the English tyrants gape / To see their bloody flag torn down to green on the gape” (Zimmermann 169). In “Cyclops,” however, the eighteenth and early nineteenth century hope of salvation from France is evoked only to undermine the current hope of salvation from America. Ned Lambert’s reaction to the citizen’s prophecy of help coming from over the sea conjures up the ghost of vain hopes related to France a century earlier, thus ironically counteracting the citizen’s grandiose gesture: “We are a long time waiting for that day, citizen, says Ned. Since the poor old woman told us that the French were on the sea and landed at Killala” (12.1377-8). This remark is a clear-cut reference to the double failure of the French to help the Irish in 1796 and 1798 on the one hand, and on the other hand to the eighteenth century optimistic version of the story presented in a ballad, “The Shan Van Vocht,” one version of which starts with the joyful news that “The French are on the sea! says the Shan Van Vocht,” and ends with the prophecy that “Yes, old Erin will be free, and we’ll plant the laurel tree, / And we’ll call it Liberty, says the Shan Van Vocht” (Zimmermann 133). The first allusion (or even conscious reference) to “The Shan Van Vocht” in Ulysses appears in Telemachus soon after the old milkwoman – who in Stephen’s mind assumes symbolic dimensions as the personification of Ireland – mistakes the Irish language for French.

“The Chieftain Elm of Kildare”

The milkwoman is not the only character who reveals an ignorance of her native culture. Commentators have been puzzled by the citizen’s blunder, “the chieftain elm of Kildare,” not being able to decide whether the fact that Joyce left the phrase uncorrected
through various phases of the creative process was due to his intentions, lack of attention or of knowledge (see Gifford 352). Considering Joyce’s vast encyclopaedic knowledge it could be concluded that he must have known that the tree associated with Kildare and St. Brigid – “the Mary of the Gael,” who marches in a double nominal form in the procession of saints later in “Cyclops” – was not the elm but the oak. Legend has it that St. Brigid founded the first monastery in Ireland on the site of her vision under an oak tree, hence the name: “Kill daoire,” meaning “the church of the oak” (Greene 53). So the case can be dismissed as a “Cyclopean fact,” one of the several miscarriages of a fabled memory that the citizen piles on in his list of Irish commercial glories. Thus, it can remain a blunder for blunder’s sake, functioning as yet another marker of the citizen’s ignorance of his own native culture. Nevertheless, further digging in the symbolic field of the Liberty Tree imbues the mistake with some other potentials.

As Zimmermann argues, the immediate and long-standing fascination of Irish popular imagination with the symbolism of the Liberty Tree must have been due to its correspondence to an old tradition of tree worship: “Sacred trees, or bili, were planted to commemorate the inauguration or the death of a king and to cut down those of the enemy was one of the greatest triumphs which could be achieved. When the republican custom was adopted by the United Irishmen, some trees were still held in great veneration” (42). Against this cultural backdrop the citizen’s mistake is even more puzzling. Keeping in mind his biases towards America, however, Zimmermann’s description of the origin of liberty trees ascribes ironic significance to the blunder: “Liberty Trees had appeared in America during the decade 1765-1775 as symbols of the opposition to ‘English tyranny,’ the first being an old elm in Boston, from which the Sons of Liberty hanged effigies of unpopular officials” (41). Although Zimmermann states that there is no evidence that the United Irishmen heard of the American
Liberty Trees, Whelan’s *Fellowship of Freedom: The United Irishmen and 1798* opens with a drawing of “The Tree of Liberty” and beside it the United Irish Catechism of 1797:

- Question: What is that in your hand?
- Answer: It is a branch.
- Question: Of what?
- Answer: Of the Tree of Liberty.
- Question: Where did it first grow?
- Answer: In America.
- Question: Where does it bloom?
- Answer: In France.
- Question: Where did the seeds fall?
- Answer: In Ireland.
- Question: Where are you going to plant it?
- Answer: In the Crown of Great Britain.

This sequence unmistakably marks the route of the Liberty Tree from America via France to Ireland. So the citizen’s blunder could be seen as similar to the old milkwoman’s confusion of Irish with French or, in this context, as being in line with Bloom’s slip of the tongue – “the wife’s admirers” (12.767) – implying the citizen’s thirst for revenge, thus anticipating his prophecies. The question whether the planting of the image of the elm tree in the text was due to authorial intentions conditioned by an awareness of the politically charged nature of the image or whether it has assumed a politically charged relevance in “Cyclops” due to a meaning creating context applied by one possible reading cannot be decided. But it does not have to be.
“Lamh Dearg Abu”

The foregrounding of the theme of national deliverance in the citizen and Joe Hynes’ duet is predicted by yet another image appearing in an interpolation shortly before the citizen’s nostalgic mood sets in: “He [Lenehan] said and then lifted he in his rude great brawny strengthy hands the medher of dark strong foamy ale and, uttering his tribal slogan Lamh Dearg Abu, he drank to the undoing of his foes, a race of mighty valorous heroes, rulers of the waves, who sit on thrones of alabaster silent as the deathless gods” (U.12.1210-14). The chapter is conspicuously saturated by explicit and coded references to drinking and drinks, but this passage archaising Lenehan’s act of drinking brings the act into a close-up, giving a detailed description of the process, particularly focusing on the hand: “then lifted he in his rude great brawny strengthy hands.” The image of Lenehan’s drinking hand in turn is duplicated in the Irish “tribal slogan”: Lamh Dearg Abu. Lamh means “hand” and dearg “red” in Irish, so the phrase can be translated as “Red Hand to Victory.” As part of a tribal slogan, it conjures up the family crest of the O’Neills, the most illustrious of ancient Irish dynasties, from which the symbol of the whole province of Ulster was derived. The hand was a widespread heraldic symbol in Gaelic Ireland, but the image of the red hand was of particular importance even after the collapse of Gaelic civilisation, and has accrued a particular semiotic richness throughout the centuries up to our own times.

As Ó hÓgáin observes, it was a native Irish custom to add the epithet lamhdearg – probably implying a warrior’s slaughterhouse hand – to the names of certain great warriors

12 Like most Cyclopean stylistic disruptions, this mock-heroic interlude fractures a monocular utterance: it duplicates the citizen’s racial onslaught on the English: “Their syphilisation, you mean, says the citizen. To hell with them! The curse of a goodfornothing God light sideways on the bloody thicklugged sons of whores’ gets! No music and no art and no literature worthy of the name. Any civilization they have they stole from us. Tonguetied sons of bastards’ ghosts” (12.1197-1201). In both cases the English are represented as the number one enemies of the Irish, only in the sham archaic register the “tonguetied sons of bastards’ ghosts” transfigure into “a race of mighty valorous heroes, rulers of the waves.” In a similar manner some kind of bottle – at this point not clear what – turns into “the medher [Irish for wooden cup] of dark strong foamy ale.”
As a later development, in the midst of the twelfth century contest for dynastic supremacy between Gaelic septs and families, this warrior-epithet assumed the overtone of messianism. For six hundred years up to the eleventh century the O’Neills of Ulster had possessed the semi-sacred symbolic title of high-kingship, associated with Tara, to the exclusion of other dynasties. O’Neill supremacy was, however, broken when a “rank outsider,” Brian Boru of Munster, wrested the high kingship from Malachi II in 1002. Although after Brian’s death Malachi regained the title, after his death the O’Connors ousted the O’Neills again, and until the Norman conquest leaders of Gaelic septs and families tried unsuccessfully to exert their power over their opponents. Under the double threat from within and without – other Gaelic dynasties gathering momentum and foreign conquest – the O’Neills enrolled prophecy as a mythic mode of propaganda. In a twelfth century text entitled Buile an Scail (“The Vision of the Phantom”), written by a supporter of the O’Neills, it is prophesied that during the reign of a mysterious figure named Aed Engach (Aed also meaning “red”) great wonders will happen. Another prophecy from the same century – when the O’Connors were holding the high-kingship – claims that “A red-hand will come over Croghan [the royal centre of the O’Connors in the province of Connaught] in Ireland of the terrible coups – the Aodh Eangach from Conn’s half [the Northern half of the country, O’Neill territory],” who will win the battle of Tara. There were several attempts to fix the identity behind the name Aed or Aodh Eangach, but it stubbornly remained a floating signifier. As Ó hÓgáin observes, however, it was exactly through its unyielding mystery that the name could fulfil its function since

13 Fritz Senn called my attention to “Conn’s half” signifying the province of Ulster as it appears in Finnegans Wake 475.6.
the custom of flattering individual leaders of the O’Neills by claiming that the lauded one is the long prophesied Aodh Eangach continued right down to the final overthrow of the family in the seventeenth century. In this way, generation after generation of poets kept alive the notion that the dynasty could yet produce a great warrior who would banish misfortune and restore a golden age of O’Neill dominance. Thus Aodh Engach was a hypothetical figure who, it was hoped, would one day be incarnated. In the meantime, his function was to boost the sept’s morale. (126)

After the Norman conquest the messianic prophecies were given a new focus. From the thirteenth century onwards their employment in the contest for dynastic supremacy gradually gave way to assisting the struggle for survival of the native culture. Although the red hand image or later a red birthmark, and the figure of Aodh Eangach were also borrowed by other septs, especially by the O’Connors and the O’Donnells, to propel their individual fortunes, still they increasingly became associated with the underlying motive of expelling the common English foe (Ó hÓgáin 158). The image of the red hand was so powerful that it has survived into the twentieth century. It was still in circulation as a patriotic image in Joyce’s time appearing in the national press and figuring in patriotic poetry. As an image originating in Ulster during the time of the Home Rule debates it was appropriated by unionist mythology as Frank McGuinness’s play Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme staging unionist myths at the time of the first world war demonstrates. Today it functions as the name of a splinter group of the paramilitary Ulster Democratic Association.

14 See the Dublin Penny Journal 19 April 1902 featuring a poem “The Red Hand of Ulster” by one Minna Irving (45). The poem describes how Hugh O’Neill, the leader of the last rebellion of Gaelic Ireland beside Red Hugh O’Donnell, cuts off his hand on board ship and throws it to the shore of Ulster, thus asserting his right over the land following ancient tradition. There is no evidence that Joyce knew the poem, but it is worth noting that some lines curiously resonate with Joyce’s use of the red hand image: “Look! Yonder lies the pebbly strand; / straight on, my sturdy crew, / And everyone shall drink to-day / His fill of mountain dew. / O, for the brawny arms we left / Beneath the salt blue sea! / Pull or the banshee weird shall wail / This very hour for me” (emphasis added).
Joyce’s method of embedding this ideologically overcharged image into “Cyclops” deflates the messianic message of the image in multiple ways, and thus ironically suggests that the barflies are “a multitude of prostrate bugs [who] await a national deliverance,” themselves impotent as agents of their beloved country’s salvation. What is most conspicuous is the conflation of this messianic image, a symbol of salvation of Ireland, with drink, labelled earlier in the episode as “the curse of Ireland” (12.684). While after the Norman conquest the red hand image signalled the freedom of Ireland from the English foe, Ireland in 1904 accommodated efforts to achieve the freedom of the land from another kind of foe: “Ireland sober is Ireland free” (12.692). On the other hand, the association of a messianic image with drink is fitting in the context of Barney Kiernan’s pub, lying outside the “scene of action,” where the only means of salvation from the worries of the scene of action remains drinking. What is not so readily visible is that the sham archaic interlude also dramatises the spectral nature of the image. The stylised echo of the act of drinking precedes the actual act, since Lenehan gets to ordering a drink only after the citizen’s peroration about the future salvation of Ireland:

– Hear, hear to that, says John Wyse. What will you have?
– An imperial yeomanry, says Lenehan, to celebrate the occasion.
– Half one, Terry, says John Wyse, and a hands up. Terry! Are you asleep?
– Yes, sir, says Terry. Small whisky and bottle of Allsop. Right, sir. (12.1317-20)

Conversely enough, Lenehan’s coded name “imperial yeomanry” for a bottle of Allsop beer, made in Ulster featuring a red hand on its label, could not be more English. It is equally ironic that a Gaelic messianic prophecy becomes associated with Lenehan – one of the few nominal

---

15 Joyce’s metaphoric description of Triestine irredentists before the first world war in his prose poem Giacomo
outsiders whose names do not become graced by a Cyclopean ornamentation indicating noble Irish descent. Finally, the appearance of the red hand image is juxtaposed in the text with the lamentation of a rank outsider’s victory. Following the interlude archaising Lenehan’s act of drinking and preceding the citizen’s prophecies, an English horse race, the Gold Cup becomes foregrounded in the narrative with Lenehan bemoaning the unexpected victory of a “rank outsider,” Throwaway. It was exactly a “rank outsider’s,” Brian Boru’s victory that indirectly led to the emergence of the O’Neill red hand messianic prophecies in the first place.

“Ben Bloom Elijah”

To sum up, the subversive subtextual-intertextual drama unfolding around the image of the Tree of Liberty, emblem of regeneration, and the Red Hand, symbolic agent of salvation deflates the barflies’ windy rhetoric prophesying Ireland’s redemption, in particular, and nationalist teleological master narratives, in general. Furthermore, it ironically counteracts their xenophobic, anti-Semitic stigmatisation of Bloom as a false Messiah and their mockery of Jewish messianic hopes. Thus, the grandiloquent closing scene describing ben Bloom Elijah prophet’s ascension “to the glory of the brightness at an angle of fortyfive degrees over Donohoe’s in Little Green street like a shot off a shovel” not only comically refracts the barflies’ attacks on Jewish teleology, but also the generically identical Irish nationalist historiography transubstantiating history into hope.

Joyce, set in Trieste, also succinctly sums up the Irish scene in Barney Kiernan’s (8).

16 In Chapter One I discussed in detail a possible reason why the episode teems with nominal distortions, names turned into visible markers of an Irish lineage. Beside Lenehan, it is only the loony Breen, Boylan, “the traitor’s son” (12.998), Bob Doran, and the castle people who are an exception to this rule. Bloom is the only one whose initial reassuringly Irish appellation “O’Bloom” is followed by an array of parallactic readjustments of his name fitting the discursive contexts, a sort of nominal dramatisation of his riddling identity.

17 According to Hans Kohn, modern nationalism took three concepts from Old Testament mythology: “the idea of a chosen people, the emphasis on a common stock of memory of the past and of hopes for the future, and national messianism” (qtd. in Brennan 59).
Chapter 5

“As Good as Any Bloody Play in the Queen’s Royal Theatre”: “Cyclops” as Performance

In the preceding chapters I focused on how “Cyclops” ironically re-inscribes crucial discursive formations of Irish cultural nationalism – the projection of the Irish past as a Golden Age of heroes and/or saints, and as the prophet of the future. In this final chapter, somewhat shifting the emphasis, I will concentrate on how the episode portrays the cultural processes and deploys the cultural media through which discursive formations emerge and become building blocks of national identity.

Homi Bhabha re-conceiving the concept of the modern nation from a post-colonial perspective distinguishes two basic movements operating in the symbolic processes producing the nation: “the continuist, accumulative temporality of the pedagogical and the repetitious, recursive strategy of the performative” (297). The discourse of the pedagogical projects the people as historical objects, whereas the discourse of the performative constitutes them as subjects of a continual process of signification: “[t]he scraps, patches and rags of daily life must be repeatedly turned into the signs of a national culture, while the very act of the narrative performance interpellates a growing circle of national subjects” (297). Bhabha’s aim is to undermine the totalising boundaries of the nation by emphasising that there is a fundamental split between these two movements, with the latter destabilising the authority of the former. My aim here is to inquire into how “Cyclops” as an act of narrative performance achieves a similar effect by subversively enlisting the three main cultural media repeatedly

---

1 Bhabha evidently borrows Althusser’s notion of ‘interpellation’ describing the process of the constitution of the subject through “Ideological State Apparatuses” – social institutions embracing the domains of religion, education, culture, familial relations, and so forth – “the production of new consciousness in the spectator” (qtd. in Cairns 13).
used in colonial Ireland to interpellate a growing circle of national subjects: the newspaper, the popular ballad, and drama.

These three crucial cultural agents of nation formation in colonial Ireland were closely related to one another. The newspaper and the ballad became moulders of a national consciousness hand-in-hand at the end of the eighteenth century and their alliance persisted into the twentieth. In the 1790s the United Irishmen initiated the use of both to politicise the masses, to “bring the republic to the village” (Whelan, “United” 129). In the 1840s the Young Irelanders turned both into veritable educational tools to heighten the political and historical awareness of the people. The theatre joined the newspaper and the ballad in the nation-building project somewhat later in the second half of the nineteenth century, but had come to occupy centre stage by the beginning of the twentieth. Just as newspapers disseminated ballads throughout the nineteenth century, later nationalist theatrical events alloyed drama with patriotic music. Newspapers, in turn, popularised and assessed nationalist performance practices. The leading turn-of-the-century cultural nationalist newspaper, Griffith’s *United Irishmen*, featured a running commentary on the Dublin theatre scene between 1899 and 1902, important formative years of the Irish dramatic movement. A 1901 notice enthusiastically proclaimed that since “the Irish language has been heard on the stage of the principal metropolitan theatre, and ‘A Nation Once Again’ has been sung within its walls” “hope is strong with us once more” (Fay 71).

If the newspaper, the ballad, and drama functioned as crucial and interrelated sites of nation formation, they were also the major sites of cultural contests where heterogeneous imaginings of cultural identity were acted out. Just as Ireland’s idea of the nation was
multivalent, so was the ideological location of ballads, newspapers and theatre practices. As is well-known, the Abbey Theatre, founded in 1904, declared itself Ireland’s “national theatre,” and has become inscribed as such in Irish theatre history. As Mary Trotter has recently argued, however, the Abbey was established in the midst of proliferating nationalist performance activities all purporting to create a sense of cultural identity among the Irish people countering the colonial representations of Ireland on the English stage (xiii-xiv). The Queen’s Royal Theatre, one of the three major commercial theatres in turn-of-the-century Dublin, explicitly rivalled the Abbey in its claim to be “the home of Irish drama” (Trotter 35).

“Cyclops” conjures up all three key cultural sites of performing the nation, acknowledging and at the same time comically counteracting their interpellative force. The newspaper informs this episode not only on the narrative but also on the formal level, the chapter teems with allusions to patriotic ballads, and it has an overall performative character, made explicit in the unnamed narrator’s description of the citizen’s ridiculous frustrated act of violence at the end of the episode as “as good as any bloody play in the Queen’s Royal Theatre” (12.1845-46).

“Hanging over the Bloody Paper”

“Cyclops” is the most newspaper saturated chapter of Ulysses even though “Aeolus” is set in a newspaper office. At the opening of the episode the narrator draws attention to the

---

2 Already the United Irishmen recognised the theatre’s potential in identity formation. As Wolfe Tone declared in the “Prospectus” for the short lived Dublin United Irish newspaper, the National Journal, although the primary mission of the paper was political, the “lower departments” of poetry and drama, in which Tone himself was avidly interested, would also be important subjects, because, “though of less consequence” than political reform, poetry and drama “are not without their use, as affecting the manners, the taste and even the amusements of the people” (qtd. in Thuente, Harp 107). The establishment of a national theatre was among the unfulfilled cultural projects of the Young Irelanders (Boyce 162).

3 Seamus de Burca, the son of P. J. Bourke, the manager and playwright of the Queen’s Royal after 1907, has described the Queen’s Royal in the period between 1880-1907 as the “Irish National Theatre,” “the mother of Irish theatre” (1).
“load of papers” assisting the citizen in “working for the cause” (12.122-23). The characters in Barney Kiernan’s directly refer to a variety of newspapers and journals, such as the *Freeman’s Journal*, the *Irish Independent*, *Stubb’s Weekly Gazette*, *National Police Gazette*, *The Times* and the *United Irishman*, and discuss current news in the papers: the Canada swindle case (12.1084), the “revelations that’s going on in the papers about flogging on the training ships” of the English navy (12.1331), an African royalty’s visit in England (12.1510), and Roger Casement’s report on imperial inhumanities exercised in the Belgian Congo (12.1542). As Nash has observed, “whenever newspapers are referred to in this chapter, it is always in a national, racial or imperial context” (180). Apart from such thematic colouring, “Cyclops” “is the most newspaper like episode in *Ulysses*” formally as well. (Rose xxiv). As was noted long ago in “Cyclops” criticism, several of the parodic interpolations are composed in mimicry of journalistic discourses, even though there is no unanimous agreement among critics as to which interpolations and what kinds of discourses. What concerns me here is how “Cyclops” comically refracts the process of the newspaper’s participation in nation formation.

As Anderson has argued, it was the appearance and spread of print culture, especially the flowering of the novel and the newspaper in the eighteenth century, that lay the basis for the birth of the imagined community of the nation. Print culture introduced new ways of conceiving of human relationships and a new sense of temporality. In Anderson’s imagining, the “embryo of the nationally-imagined community” was formed by “fellow-readers,”

---

4 Anne Fogarty called my attention to the all-pervasive performative nature of the episode at the 2001 Trieste Joyce Summer School.
5 In French’s words, “the chapter contains a newspaper in miniature” (148). Hayman and Topia have drawn up two differing catalogues of the discourses parodied in the Cyclopean interpolations.
6 Anderson establishes several material and formal links between the novel and the newspaper. Both are located in a “homogeneous, empty time” “marked by temporal coincidence and measured by clock and calendar” (24). The main organising principle of both is juxtaposition. “Reading a newspaper is like reading a novel whose author has abandoned any thought of a coherent plot” (33). Furthermore, arguing that “the book was the first modern-style mass-produced industrial commodity,” he describes the newspaper as an “‘extreme form’ of the book, a book sold on a colossal scale, but of ephemeral popularity” (34).
connected through print “in a secular, particular, visible invisibility” (44). From the eighteenth century onwards newspaper reading has become a paradoxical “mass ceremony.” Although it is “performed in silent privacy, in the lair of the skull,”

each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others of whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion. Furthermore, this ceremony is incessantly repeated at daily or half-daily intervals throughout the calendar. What more vivid figure for the secular, historically clocked, imagined community can be envisioned? (Anderson 35)⁷

Compelling though it is, Anderson’s performative model accounts only partially for the case of Ireland. The thesis that the newspaper facilitated the imagining of the nation through mass ceremonies performed in silent privacy neglects the fact that in colonial countries like Ireland such private ceremonies were also complemented by collective ceremonies where the printed word became vocalised in the presence of the communicants. This practice reinforced a crucial function of the newspaper for insurgent nationalisms born out of anti-colonial struggles, in contradistinction to the newspaper’s significance for forms of nationalism aiming to stabilise already existing states, depicted by Anderson’s model.

When the United Irishmen, following the example of revolutionary France, began to use the press in Ireland as “the seminal architect of the arena of public opinion,” besides widely disseminating their newspapers – the *Northern Star* (1792-1797) and the *Press* (1797) – to be read in privacy, they also frequently read them aloud to the people after mass, in pubs or in the streets. (Whelan, “United” 275-79, Thuente, *Harp* 89). When in 1795 the
government began to suppress their political activities they established reading societies, book
clubs, drinking clubs, often meeting in pubs, where they disseminated their radical ideas
(Whelan, “United” 281). The Young Irelanders, who also carried out their nation-building
campaign mainly through their newspaper The Nation, were less wont to go out and read to
the people, yet, they revived the United Irish tradition of establishing reading rooms, and on
the pages of The Nation constantly evoked points of physical concretion, person-to-person
contact and unmediated person-to-person information exchange. As Leerssen has observed,
The Nation functioned as a “virtual historical and social concourse, a meeting place, a forum
in the Latin root sense of the word.” It built libraries, “repeal reading rooms,” remembrance
halls and salons in ideas and discourse (Remembrance 149).

“Cyclops” dramatises this cultural practice by portraying the citizen not only as an
avid reader of newspapers, but also as an enthusiastic oral performer of the printed word of
his “paraphernalia papers” to his pub audience. Close toward the end of the episode he reads
out a satirical skit (supposedly) from Griffith’s United Irishman about the Alaki of
Abeakuta’s [sic], visit in England, which comically exposes diverse channels of English
imperialism: trade, translation, the bible, ceremony and etiquette (12.1514-33). The Nigerian
royalty’s, the Alake of Abeokuta’s visit was a historical event reported by several British
newspapers, among others The Times, one of Joyce’s chief sources for “Cyclops.” Although
Griffith did write similar parodies for his United Irishman, the skit in “Cyclops” is a parody
composed by Joyce with the aid of the reports in The Times (Nash 189). Thus, Joyce in a way
participates in Irish nationalist narrative practices, when he recasts an imperialist written act

---
7 In the early morning of 16 June 1904 Bloom also partakes of this paradoxical modern mass ceremony, even if
in the least sacred place of the household.
8 As Whelan observes, in the 1790s “public houses loomed large in loyalist perception of sedition” (“United” 292). Even though by 1798, the year of the rebellion, the United Irishmen had eschewed the use of pubs as meetings places laying great stress on avoiding excessive drinking, their earlier practice was revived later by the Fenians and the Land Leaguers, who used the pub as a principal organising centre (Whelan, “United” 293, Malcolm 193, 262). As Lloyd wittily puts it, “One might say that the largely teetotal Fenian leaders knew how to swim in the water of the people, even if, like fish, they abstained from drinking” (“Counterparts” 141).
of narrative performance aiming to interpellate British subjects in a mass ceremony performed in silent privacy into an anti-imperial oral act of narrative performance aiming to interpellate Irish subjects in a mass ceremony performed collectively.

The citizen’s other reading performance in the opening of the episode, however, functions as a backlash on the Irish scene, since it destabilises the vision of Irish newspapers as the bastions of the national struggle against British imperialism. By reading out names from the “births,” “deaths,” and “marriages” columns of the Irish Daily Independent the citizen demonstrates to his audience to what a great extent a national paper, “founded by Parnell to be the workingman’s friend,” as he puts it, has become Anglicised (12.221)

A further irony is wrought by the fact that the citizen’s public exhibition of himself as a reader of national newspapers is counterpointed by Alf Bergan’s and the publican Terry’s silent perusal of another “national” newspaper, The National Police Gazette. As the frustrated narrator “blue mouldy for the want of another pint” describes the inattentive publican: “Hanging over the bloody paper with Alf looking for spicy bits instead of attending to the general public” (12.1321-22). As opposed to the many Irish newspapers which, to various degrees and in various manners, participated in the shaping of a sense of Irishness, The Police Gazette represents the kind of cheap periodical against which cultural nationalists in turn-of-the-century Ireland led a fierce crusade. As George Russell lamented in 1900,

A few ignoramuses have it in their power [...] to train the national mind according to British ideas [...] and are trying to obliterate the mark of God upon a nation. It is not from Shelley or Keats our peasantry derive their mental nourishment, now that they are cut off from their own past. We see everywhere a moral leprosy, a vulgarity of mind creeping over them. The Police Gazettes, the penny novels, the hideous comic

---

9 Tymoczko gives a comprehensive survey of the turn-of-the-century popular press scene (229-54).
According to the diagnosis of D. P. Moran, the editor of the Irish Ireland newspaper, The Leader, “a great evil was threatening us [. . .] Ireland was feeding on a questionable type of British reading matter,” that is, cheap English periodicals (34). Like Russell and Moran, Hyde urged the Irish people to “set our face sternly against penny dreadfuls, shilling shockers, and still more the garbage of vulgar English weeklies like Bow Bells and the Police Intelligence” (10). All three crusaders identify England as the source of the evil flood of the cheap periodicals corrupting the Irish nation. By contrast, the paper that in “Cyclops” feeds or corrodes its Irish readers’ minds with smutty, violent and racist stories and images – an adulterous wife caught in action by the husband (12.1168-74), a “picture of a butting match” and of a lynching incident with the caption “Black Beast Burned in Omaha, Ga” (12.1322-28) – is American with an Irish immigrant editor (Gifford 348). Furthermore, the highlighting of a racist scene victimising a black man in a paper which supposedly corrupts the Irish nation, draws attention to a major irony lurking in Griffith’s choice of name for his nationalist newspaper. While the United Irishmen, the conscious bearers of the Enlightenment ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity abhorred slavery, and their newspaper, the Northern Star, regularly featured anti-slavery propaganda (Thuente, Harp 90-91), Griffith, who railed against the English oppression of the Irish, supported black slavery (Nash 191).

**Cyclopean Unisonance**

In his vivid depiction of the nationally imagined community, Anderson complements his image of the paradoxical mass ceremony performed by newspaper reading communicants with another “image: unisonance,” “the echoed physical realization of the imagined
community,” in other words, the experience of the simultaneous singing of nationally significant songs like national anthems (145). As he observes, “How selfless this unisonance feels! If we are aware that others are singing these songs precisely when and as we are, we have no idea who they may be, or even where out of earshot, they are singing. Nothing connects us all, but imagined sound” (145).

If music has the power to weld national communities through imagined sound, it has even more power to do so by acts of communal singing. And if music functions as one of the most important cultural channels of nationalism in general, it played a particularly important role in colonial Ireland. As Davis argued in the preface to the immensely popular Young Ireland songbook, *The Spirit of the Nation*: “Music is the first faculty of the Irish, and scarcely anything has such power for good over them. The use of this faculty and this power, publicly and constantly, to keep up their spirits, refine their tastes, warm their courage, increase their union and renew their zeal is the duty of every patriot” (1). The United Irishmen preceded the Young Irelanders in this recognition, since they consciously created the genre of the political ballad by “assuming the role of the poet, historian and philosopher” (Thuente, “Literary” 47) and writing words for old Irish and Scottish airs, a practice carried on by successive generations well into the twentieth century. Both the United Irishmen and the Young Irelanders published their ballads in their newspapers first, later anthologising them into songbooks – *Paddy’s Resource* and *The Spirit of the Nation* respectively – repeatedly published owing to public demand. As Whelan notes, the “content of these ballads was not their only revolutionary message. Failure to join in the chorus of a popular radical song was a sure sign of disaffection from the popular cause. Songs had a symbolic as well as ideological freight” (“United” 284).

“Cyclops” resonates with political ballads, they mostly form part of the citizen’s discourse on history. Yet, no communal act of singing takes place in the pub. The only
instance of singing occurs in an interpolation reporting a discussion “on the revival of ancient Gaelic sports and the importance of physical culture [. . .] for the development of the race” (12.899-901). What merits attention and praise, however, is neither the content of the song, nor the symbolic nature of the act of singing, but the superlative quality of the citizen’s one-man show:

the vocalist chairman brought the discussion to a close, in response to repeated requests and hearty plaudits from all parts of a bumper house, by a remarkably noteworthy rendering of the immortal Thomas Osbourne Davis’ evergreen verses (happily too familiar to need recalling here) A Nation Once Again in the execution of which the veteran patriot champion may be said without fear of contradiction to have fairly excelled himself. The Irish Caruso-Garibaldi was in superlative form and his stentorian notes were heard to the greatest advantage in the timehonoured anthem sung as only our citizen can sing it. His superb highclass vocalism, which by its superquality greatly enhanced his already international reputation, was vociferously applauded by the large audience amongst which were to be noted many prominent members of the clergy as well as representatives of the press and the bar and the other learned professions. The proceedings then terminated. (12.913-26)

Although no ballad is sung in the pub, the citizen’s oral performances enlisting several of them dramatise the interpellative force of the genre. He begins his discoursing on Irish history with an enumeration of the heroes and martyrs of the cause of Ireland’s liberation, evoking the United Irishmen through a reference to the Young Ireland ballad “The Memory of the Dead” – “who fears to speak of ninetyeight” – and framing Robert Emmet and his fiancée, Sarah Curran, in Thomas Moore’s Irish melody “She is Far from the Land” (12.481, 12.500).
This gesture highlights the ballad’s agency in national commemorative ceremonies creating and perpetuating the collective memory of the nation. The citizen’s ensuing aggressive gesture to silence Bloom demonstrates his thorough internalisation of the message of the song: “– The memory of the dead, says the citizen taking up his pintglass and glaring at Bloom” (12.519-20). Although the Young Irelanders regarded drunkenness in general as one of the curses put on the Irish by English colonisation, this particular Young Ireland ballad represents drinking as a patriotic communal act of commemoration:

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

Thus, the citizen by “taking up his pintglass and glaring at Bloom,” consciously or unconsciously, enacts the message of the song, while Bloom “with his knockmedown cigar putting on swank with his lardyface,” as the narrator describes him, evidently does not act according to the tacit rules of the citizen’s “booze-patriotic” commemorative ritual. His attempt to disrupt it by “–You don’t grasp my point, says Bloom. What I mean is . . .” elicits

10 “Writing in The Nation in January 1843, Davis described Irish drunkenness as ‘the luxury of despair – the saturnalia of slaves’; Irish temperance on the other hand, was ‘the first fruit of deep-sown hope, the offering of incipient freedom’ ” (Malcolm 131).
11 The song toasts the memory of the United Irishmen, many of whose songs were drinking songs toasting “the Rights of Man” (Thuente, Harp 43).
another aggressive gesture on the citizen’s part: “– Sinn Fein! says the citizen. Sinn fein amhain! The friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us” (12.522-25). The citizen’s use of the title of the Young Ireland ballad as a war-cry against Bloom seems to be dictated by his own impulses. His use of the slogan, Sinn Fein, and its variation, Sinn Fein Amhain, in a similar manner, however, enacts the message of the ballads bearing these titles, once again proving the citizen’s thorough internalisation of the ballad vision of nation formation. Both songs urge fellow patriots to make Ireland a “Nation once again” by fighting for their rights and, as the second song puts it, “Win back your own again, tear off the Thraldom’s chain; / On on, the war-cry is Sinn Fein Amhain” (Bauerle 452-53).13

The citizen’s performance clearly demonstrates the particularly strong interpellative force of political ballads for the Irish imagination, and Bloom’s role evidently is to counteract the citizen’s ballad moulded attitudes and utterances.14 Yet, on a subtextual level, they destabilise themselves from within as well. If ballads were repeatedly used as cultural weapons in the long war against colonialism, their ideological function altered according to the strategic locations of their creators. The United Irishmen and the Young Irelanders used ballads to further the militant tradition of rebellion against the English. As the poetic preface to Paddy’s Resource proclaimed, the songs’ aim was “To fan the patriotic flame, / To cherish the desire of fame / To bid the Irish Youth aspire, / To emulate the noble fire / Which dissipates the tyrant’s bands, / And Freedom gives to injur’d lands. . .” (qtd. in Thuente “Literary” 47). Likewise, in the 1840s the Young Irelanders declared that “[w]e furnish political songs to stimulate flagging zeal” (qtd. in Zimmermann 79). As opposed to this,

12 I have borrowed the phrase from Zack Bowen (“Music” 48). Although Bowen discusses several features of the Cyclopean booze-patriotic ritual, he does not examine the dynamics I am highlighting.
13 The citizen’s use of “The Memory of the Dead” in a militant, threatening manner can also be seen as the enactment of a widespread nineteenth-century cultural practice. As Thuente notes, by the time the second edition of The Spirit of the Nation came out, the song “had become something of a battle cry” (Harp 217).
14 Bloom also functions in a similar way in “Sirens,” where the disruption of the patriotic aura of Ben Dollard’s performance of the political ballad, “The Croppy Boy” is achieved mainly by its representation through Bloom’s mental filter. I elaborated on this in “The Political Ballad in Ulysses.”
Thomas Moore, denying the revolutionary power of ballads, applied the strategy of weeping for his country hoping that this would make the master weep and pity the oppressed as well. Thus, the Thomas Moore reference in the citizen’s list of martyrs is fitting, since Moore’s song “She is Far From the Land” tells of Emmet, who “had liv’d for his love, for his country he died,” and the misery of Sarah Curran, the exiled fiancée of the martyred hero. However, the citizen’s juxtaposition of a slightly misremembered line – “the friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us” – from another backward-looking self-pitying Thomas Moore melody, “Oh, Where is the Slave So Lowly,” bemoaning Ireland’s fall and the departure of her defeated heroes, with the war-cry Sinn Fein Amhain, pointing towards the “future when Ireland is free,” ironically counteracts his enthusiasm.

The citizen’s enlisting of ballads in his “booze-patriotic ritual” is delicately framed by the augmentation of his characterisation by allusions to ballads likewise linking patriotic sentiment with drinking. As the narrator informs us in the opening of the episode, beside “his load of papers,” the citizen’s paraphernalia comprise the dog Garryowen and what the narrator calls “his cruiskeen lawn,” meaning “little full jug.” As Zack Bowen pointed out long ago, the name of the dog echoes an eighteenth century “popular Irish roistering song” (Musical Allusions 212) celebrating the roving boys of Garryowen, a rough suburb of Limerick city, who break the law for the sake of living out the pleasures of drunken aggression. The song, however, also has a more patriotic variant seething with “the hatred of a royal race,” which, outlawed by the Treaty of Limerick in 1691, is still fired by the hope of
revenge and “winning her [Garryowen’s] old glories back.” In conclusion, the song advocates living “for Ireland’s cause alone” lighting the night “with song and story” (Healy 45-46). That is exactly what the citizen, at least according to the narrator’s description, is doing in his gloryhole: “working for the cause,” whatever that may be, and as his utterances show, the night of Irish history is lit for him by song and story. The *cruiskeen lawn* likewise echoes another eighteenth-century “patriotic example of the poetic literature of Erinn” – at least it is classified as such in Sigerson’s 1907 anthology, *Bards of the Gael and Gall* – in which drinking is described as a patriotic act of an exile waiting for a national deliverance from outside. Another fitting description of the citizen’s acts and hopes.

In addition to this, the dog’s name and the *cruiskeen lawn* function as potential signposts of further musical and theatrical allusions, which tie in neatly with the narrator’s description of the citizen’s ridiculous frustrated act of violence toward the end of the episode as “as good as any bloody play in the Queen’s Royal Theatre” (12.1845-46). The performance of “The Cruiskeen Lawn” – another version of the song celebrating drinking (without any patriotic overtones) – by the heroine in Dion Boucicault’s Irish melodrama *The Colleen Bawn* was an all-time favourite with Queen’s audiences (de Burca 90). In the company of the *cruiskeen lawn*, Garryowen also echoes another song embedded in

---

15 The first instance of the citizen’s playacting – his enigmatic verbal exchange with the entering Joe Hynes (12.129-40) – is commented on by the narrator as “doing the rapparee and Rory of the Hill” (12.134). The rapparees were exactly those native aristocrats outlawed by Cromwell and later by William of Orange, whose glory the patriotic version of “Garryowen” foretells to restore. (See “The Heroic Theatre” section of Chapter Two for a more detailed discussion of the ironic aura of the citizen’s role as a rapparee). The narrator’s comment on the citizen’s playacting also resonates with music: “The Rory of the Hill” evokes two patriotic ballads – one by the Fenian balladeer, Charles J. Kickham, the other a street ballad. Both celebrate a “rough and ready roving” peasant hero fighting against despotic landlords. “The Irish Rapparees,” written by the Young Irelander Charles Gavan Duffy, celebrates the “faithful,” “fearless,” “angry,” “roving” Rapparees, whose “jewel” in the song is Rory.

16 The song opens with an address to the “sons of noble Erin.” The speaker declares that he has “tidings of high daring / To brighten now your faces pale and wan.” Before letting them know, however, what the good tidings are, he invites his addressee to “pledge them in a cruiskeen lawn,” as he does at the end of each ensuing stanza laying out the tidings, namely that the speaker met in “exile dark and dreary” “friends that never failed,” and foretells that “with troops the frank and fearless, / To win our Freedom peerless” will come soon. The song ends with the glorious foresight of the time when the “tribe who would destroy all / Our rightful princes royal” will be gone, and “The Gael shall live in gladness, / And banished be all sadness” (Sigerson 272).
Boucicault’s play, “Oh, Limerick is Beautiful,” sung by Myles-na-Coppaleen, the charming peasant rascal of the play. Despite its deceptive title, the song praises the beauties of a girl called the Colleen Bawn, who lives in Garryowen. *The Colleen Bawn* together with *Arrah na Pogue*, another of Boucicault’s Irish melodramas, feature in the Hero-list. In Chapter Two, I discussed how the dynamics surrounding the two plays/heroines in the list fracture the melodramatic construction of Irish history and Irish identity. In the rest of this chapter, I will inquire into the relevance of drama, especially melodrama for the episode at large.

**The Queen’s Royal “Cyclops”**

Notwithstanding the enduring significance of the ballad and the newspaper, by the turn of the century the theatre had grown into the most important cultural agent of nation formation in Ireland. The idea of using the theatre in nation-building was, of course, not unique to the Irish. In numberless other contexts, the theatre has played a significant role in affirming imperial notions of nationhood just as much as in countering imperial representations of colonial societies. What makes the Irish case special, however, is the diversity and intensity of political performance in turn-of-the-century Ireland, as Trotter has recently argued (xiii). According to Trotter, the Abbey Theatre’s retrospectively created exclusive glory as the national theatre of Ireland occludes the fact that the Abbey emerged in the midst of proliferating nationalist performance practices. Various nationalist organisations – Hyde’s Gaelic League, Maud Gonne’s *Inghinidhe na hEireann* (The Daughters of Erin), Patrick Pearse’s school, St. Enda’s – “developed theatre companies to create a sense of cultural identity among the Irish people outside the colonial definition of Ireland already well established on the English stage” (Trotter xiii). Political energy ran so high in turn-of-the-
century Dublin that even one of the three profit-oriented theatres, the Queen’s Royal Theatre, joined in this nation building project by producing Irish melodramas. The Queen’s Royal rivalled the Abbey and its predecessor, the Irish Literary Theatre, in their claim to be the national theatre of Ireland, and in a way rightly so, since it repeatedly staged performances to raise money to support nationalist enterprises. In 1899, it put on a benefit matinee performance of Whitbread’s *Wolfe Tone* to raise money for the Tone memorial fund (Trotter 67) – a noble gesture of no avail, as a passing remark in *Ulysses* reminds us (10.377-79). As Trotter contends, “[t]he plays on Irish themes at Dublin’s ‘house of Irish drama’ [the Queen’s] were both admired and reviled by the nationalist community, but they were inevitably part of the discourse of political performance in turn-of-the-century Dublin” (35).  

If the nationalist community’s attitude to the Queen’s Royal was ambivalent, it gets an unambiguously ungenerous treatment in “Cyclops.” The one explicit reference to it, the narrator’s description of the citizen’s gesture of “getting hold of the bloody [biscuit] tin,” running out to hurl it after Bloom with “little Alf Bergan hanging on to his elbow,” all the while “shouting like a stuck pig” in terms of a play in the Queen’s Royal theatre exposes the feature that made the nationalist community revile Queen’s Royal performances most: their love of sensational situations and overblown style of acting, or “insane clowning,” as Frank Fay, theatre critic and future Abbey actor put it in one of his outraged notices in 1899 (33). A few lines earlier the narrator comments on the citizen’s acts explicitly in terms of clowning: “Arrah, sit down on the parliamentary side of your arse for Christ’s sake and don’t be making

---

17 When in 1803, the year of Emmet’s rising, the English felt under the threat of a French invasion, Shakespeare’s *Henry V* was performed in several London theatres. As the English newspaper, the *Morning Post* commented, “under the circumstances of the moment” the play was “well adapted to light up an emulative flame of glory in the breasts” of those who had fought in the French wars (qtd. in T. Webb 317).
a public exhibition of yourself. Jesus, there is always some bloody clown or other kicking up a bloody murder about bloody nothing. Gob, it’d turn the porter sour in your guts, so it would” (12.1792-95).

The narrator’s gesture of likening a Cyclopean scene to a play in the Queen’s Royal Theatre, beyond its immediate relevance also conjures up several other aesthetic, ideological and social features of Queen’s Royal performances that the episode comically exposes and re-negotiates: the melodramatic construction of Irish history and contemporary events, the use of stage Irish figures, and the audience’s integration in meaning production. I will focus on this last aspect first.

a) “All the Ragamuffins and Sluts of the Nation”

That the low-bred, vulgar narrator describes the citizen’s ridiculous gesture, or rather the duet of the citizen and Alf Bergan, in terms of a Queen’s Royal play caricatures the kind of audience that attended the theatre as much as the quality of its productions. While the Abbey aimed to function as a national theatre by providing plays of high aesthetic value for an imaginative elite, keeping away the rabblement by its notoriously high entrance fees (Trotter 71), the Queen’s Royal was a national theatre through its affordability and accessibility to all classes (Trotter 41). Even among the three commercial theatres of Dublin – The Theatre Royal, the Gaiety and the Queen’s Royal – the Queen’s Royal was the “most proletarian, […] and its drama came to reflect the aesthetic desires and political beliefs of its

---

18 While Yeats, George Moore and Frank Fay reviled the Queen’s Royal performances as such, Synge and O’Casey acknowledged their indebtedness to them, especially Boucicault’s plays. They made no secret of having attended the Queen’s Royal (Herr, Land 17). In 1904, after seeing Boucicault’s The Shaughraun there, Synge commended the “naïve humour” of such characters like Conn the Shaughraun, even if he condemned the “absurdity of the plots and the pathos” of Boucicault’s plays (qtd. in de Burca 12). O’Casey already as a boy was memorialising familiar passages from Shakespeare and Boucicault (Kraus 45). Among nationalist Dublin newspaper “Bloom’s” paper, The Freeman’s Journal remained the Queen’s Royal’s faithful supporter.
mainly lowbrow, working-class and middle-class audience” (Trotter 59).19 Beside the “insane clowning” of the actors, it was the “terrible lack of refinement” (Fay 23), and the rowdy, unruly behaviour and sensation-seeking of the audience, especially the gallery gods, that merited the most scorn of the critics of popular theatre.

The Queen’s Royal audience customarily “responded to the action on stage, thus becoming part of the performance event” (Trotter 41). Compared to some accounts of the emotionally heated behaviour of the theatre’s historical audiences as cheering, hissing, shouting, gesticulating, swearing, hooting, and singing along with the actors, the “Cyclops” narrator’s depiction of the collective accompaniment of the citizen’s clowning and Bloom’s rescue by Martin Cunningham loses its hyperbolic quality:

And all the ragamuffins and sluts of the nation round the door and Martin telling the jarvey to drive ahead and the citizen bawling and Alf and Joe at him to whist and he on his high horse about the jews and the loafers calling for a speech and Jack Power trying to get him to sit down on the car and hold his bloody jaw and a loafer with a patch over his eye starts singing *If the man in the moon was a jew, jew, jew* and a slut shouts out of her:

– Eh, mister! Your fly is open, mister! (12.1796-99)20

---

19 Peter Kavanagh in his classic study, *Irish Theatre* (1946) dismisses Queen’s Royal performances in general, noting that the plays “appealed to that section of the public for whom the wolfhound and the round tower were the highest and purest symbols of Ireland” (qtd. in Herr, *Land* 13). The citizen-hero at the beginning of the episode is seated “at the foot of a round tower” (12.151) and Garryowen is described as a wolfhound in a later interpolation (12.715).

20 The labelling of the female participants of the grotesque scene as “sluts” can also be read as a hyperbolic comment on the allegation that Queen’s Royal performances provided the “supplementary entertainment” of “easygoing ladies” (*Irish Press* qtd. in Watt 49). According to G. B. Shaw, “respectable people then did not frequent it, as it served not only as a theatre for crude melodrama but as a market for ladies who lived by selling themselves” (qtd. in Watt 49).
While Trotter interprets the disruptive behaviour of the Queen’s Royal audience solely in terms of the audience’s off stage performance of their allegiance to the patriotic Irish sentiments enacted on the stage – they cheered the Irish hero and hissed the British villain, and sang along when a character on stage sang a patriotic song – Seamus de Burca also reports such instances of unruly behaviour on the part of Queen’s Royal audience that would be hard to account for in terms of patriotic sentiment. On one particular occasion the gallery gods disrupted a Hamlet performance by repeated calls for a comic song such as the one sung by “the loafer with a patch over his eye,” rendered topically relevant, in the “Cyclops” passage (12).21

b) “What Is Your Nation?”: The Stage Irishman

According to current critical agreement, Queen’s Royal performances, beginning with Boucicault’s trilogy of Irish plays – The Colleen Bawn: or the Brides of Garryowen (1860); Arrah na Pogue: or the Wicklow Wedding (1865); and The Shaughraun (1874) – functioned as important anti-colonial weapons appropriating and inverting derogatory stereotypes of the Irish people created and perpetuated on the English stage (Herr, Land 13, Watt 48-88, Trotter 37-70). Yet, this unanimous assessment has been distilled in hindsight. In turn-of-the-century Dublin critical responses split over the question whether the Queen’s Royal Irish melodramas in general and Boucicault’s plays in particular debunked or perpetuated imperialist stage stereotypes. This interpretative instability was manifest also in that Boucicault’s comic Irish plays and comic Irish characters were immensely popular both with London and Dublin audiences.

As Boucicault claimed, it was his “vocation to abolish” the “clowning character known as the ‘Stage Irishman,’ ” “dancing around the [English] stage in an expletive manner,

21 “If the Man in the Moon were a Coon” was an American popular song (see Gifford 378).
and indulging in ridiculous capers and extravagances of language and gesture” (qtd. in Watt 52). His success, however, was not universally acclaimed. According to R. B. Graves, Boucicault’s abolition of the stage Irishman’s motley is largely a self-deception, since his comic Irishmen – Myles-na-Coppaleen in *The Colleen Bawn*, Shaun the Post in *Arrah na Pogue*, and Conn in *The Shaughraun* – are indistinguishable form their foppish predecessors (Watt 52). Stewart Parker’s *Heavenly Bodies* (1986), projecting an imaginary struggle between Boucicault and his alter ego onto the stage, portrays the clash between Boucicault’s pronounced intention and the disparaging voice of his critics. His alter ego accuses Boucicault of having “flattered the daylight out of them [the English] with your silver-tongued charming [Irish] peasant rascals” (134). In support of this vision, a phantom Queen Victoria – whose appreciation of Boucicault’s plays is part of historical record (FitzSimon 98) – appears on stage and praises him for showing “us our Irish subjects in the manner that renders them most beloved to us” (124). Boucicault, by contrast, defends himself by claiming – not in the presence of Queen Victoria – that “Myles-na-Coppaleen has stronger teeth than any vampire […]. This age has made a mockery of all my aspirations” (125).

As Watt and Trotter have persuasively argued, the conflicting interpretations of the effect of Boucicault’s stage Irish figures can be explained in terms of their inherent ambivalence. As Trotter puts it, Boucicault’s Irish melodramas “contain several potential meanings depending on the audience member’s geographical and ideological position within the British Empire” (37). In Watt’s words, they “constitute chameleon-like responses to the historical situation of colonial rule, possessing elements of both containment and resistance and thereby appealing to audiences of various political sympathies” (53). Thus, while English audiences and the English press promoted apolitical readings of Boucicault’s implicitly or

---

22 Boucicault was not the first to challenge the imperialist version of the stage Irishman. Such efforts go back to the mid-eighteenth century when Charles Macklin, actor and playwright, set the same goal for himself. Leerssen
explicitly political plays and read his stage Irish figures as affirmations of imperialist stage Irish stereotypes, the enthusiastic contingent of Boucicault’s Dublin audience celebrated his love of Ireland and his inversion of the stupid and unreliable imperialist icon into a charming and patriotic stage Irishman. Yet, Boucicault’s unenthusiastic Irish critics hurled the same accusation of clowning and buffoonery at his “charming” stage Irish figures that he levelled at the imperialist version. In Parker’s play Boucicault’s alter ego accuses him of having “been a clown all along and a false one at that” (104) and nicknames him “Paddy the Clown” (134), the name the imperialist version of the stage Irishman was known by.

“Cyclops” comically exposes the multivalence of Boucicault’s stage Irishmen. The musical/theatrical jumble in the citizen’s narrative introduction at the opening of the episode blending patriotic notes with echoes of Boucicault’s melodrama, The Colleen Bawn, strengthens the patriotic aura of the citizen as stage Irishman. However, while the dog’s name associates the citizen with Myles-na-Coppaleen, Boucicault’s stage Irishman, who beside being the agent of song and comedy, also has heroic potentials, the motif of the cruskeen lawn associates him with the victimised, helpless heroine of the play, which evokes the imperialist construction of the stage Irish Paddy as childlike, helpless, feminine. So does the narrator’s description of the citizen’s acts in terms of clowning at the end of the episode. The narrator’s figuring of the citizen as a derogatory stage Irishman, however, enacts the case of

gives a detailed analysis of Macklin’s strategies of subverting the stage Irishman from within and their impact (Mere Irish 132-60).

23 If comic Irishmen on the English stage, continually reshaped in accordance to the shifting anxieties of the English concerning the Irish throughout the centuries, but invariably feeding an English sense of superiority to the Irish, were conniving, fractious, shiftless entertaining drunkard servants speaking with a brogue, Boucicault’s stage Irish “underdogs” “react to material disadvantages and social discrimination neither with angry rebellion nor with servile submission but with the laughing generosity of the truly superior, [. . .] who make up for their faults [for instance their ‘partiality for the running stream’] by tolerance, helpfulness and unselfishness” (Heinz Kosok qtd. in Trotter 55).

24 Myles sings the song “Oh, Limerick is Beautiful” extolling the beauty of the Colleen Bawn living in Garryown, and Eily, the Colleen Bawn of Boucicault’s play, sings “The Cruiskeen Lawn.” Myles becomes elevated into a hero by rescuing the helpless Eily from the murderous grip of the villainous Danny Mann.

25 As Trotter notes, the childlike, emasculated Paddy ruled supreme on the Victorian stage until the rise of Fenianism. Then it gave way to the type of the “hypermascuine, savage,” childish Paddy (46).
the kettle and the pot: if the citizen acts in the manner of one, the narrator speaks like one, in his excitement piling on “arrah,” “gob,” “begob,” the linguistic staples of the stereotype.26

The subtextual drama conjuring up the figure of the stage Irishman and its chameleon-like semiotic valence that overarches the episode also penetrates the middle. Piqued by Bloom’s meddling with the notion of nationhood, the citizen hurls the question at Bloom: “What is your nation if I may ask?” (12.1430), in response to which Bloom asserts his Irishness: “— Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland” (12.1431). It needs little effort to hear behind the citizen’s provocative question that of the pugnacious Captain Macmorris, who in Shakespeare’s Henry V bursts into a disparaging torrent about his own nation: “What ish my nation? Ish a villain, and a bastard, and a knave, and a rascal? What ish my nation? Who talks of my nation?” (69). As Declan Kiberd has argued, it is in Shakespeare’s “rudimentary portrait” of Captain Macmorris that one can “find those traits of garrulity, pugnacity and a rather unfocused ethnic pride which would later signalize the stage Irishman – along with a faintly patronizing amusement on the part of the portraitist that the Irish should be touchy on the questions of identity” (13).27 The way the citizen points the question at Bloom reveals a “touchiness about the question of identity.” Thus, on a subtextual level, through his own question the citizen becomes associated with the prototype of all later imperialist stage Irishmen. Nevertheless, the question that in Shakespeare’s play introduces an imperial wish-fulfilment fantasy – the colonised recognising himself in the imperial mirror – becomes in “Cyclops” somewhat modified and turns into a weapon in the mouth of the citizen, which can also be read as the enactment of how the imperialist symbolic construct of the stage Irishman

26 Holloway hailed J. W. Whitbread’s melodrama, Wolfe Tone, performed first in the Queen’s in 1900 by noting that “it is a step in the right direction to try to create a new type of true Irish play without too much of the ‘arrah-begorra’ element in it, so inseparable from the old form of Irish drama [English stage Irish plays], where everybody, from the highest to the lowest, spoke with the vulgarest brogue (often mingled with a Cockney accent) (qtd. in Herr, Land 9).
justifying colonial oppression was turned into a weapon in the Irish anti-colonial struggle.28 That it is pointed at Bloom, not an Englishman is evidently wrought with irony. Bloom’s answer, in turn, extracts the poison tooth of both symbolic constructs, since by defining nationality solely in geographical terms, which comes close to post-colonial definitions of nationhood, it points beyond the symbolic realm of both the colonial and the anti-colonial, which gave birth to them.

c) “Cyclops” as Post-colonial Melodrama

As observed in Chapter Two, the melodramatic construction of Irish history on the Queen’s Royal stage was not a unique or isolated phenomenon in turn-of-the-century Dublin. Rather it participated in a mode of discourse that manifested itself through diverse other cultural channels: patriotic ballads; Dublin newspaper rhetoric; illustrations and cartoons; nationalist monuments and commemorative rituals; melodramatic novels and short stories. As several excellent cultural critics have recently demonstrated, as a result of the all-pervasive framing of Irish history and contemporary Anglo-Irish relations according to the emotion-charged aesthetic of melodrama, for the majority of people in turn-of-the-century Ireland history was melodrama.

Melodrama as a “structure of imagination,” in Patrick Joyce’s words, deals in a “polarised world of moral absolutes, in which reality [is] rendered as a Manichean struggle of good and evil in their countless expressions” (qtd. in Owens 24). As Garry Owens further argues, melodrama offers “symbolic reassurance that there [is] a moral purpose in the world:

---

27 George Russell argued that Shakespeare’s Henry V was “the first [manifestation of the] imperial mood in English literature and the begetter in millions of men’s minds of like moods” (qtd. in O’Driscoll 418). Yeats also believed that Shakespeare’s Henry V played an important role in shaping imperial consciousness (O’Driscoll 418).

28 If Boucicault’s stage Irishmen function potentially as such weapons, allowing both English and Irish audiences to interpret them to their liking, later Queen’s Royal historical melodramas by Whitbread, such as Wolfe Tone and The Ulster Hero, project features of the imperialist version of the stage Irishman – effeminacy, shiftlessness, scheming – onto the British villain (Watt 69, 83).
that the wicked would be punished, the worthy rewarded and a general condition of lost innocence restored” (24). Evidently, in the Manichean scenario of Irish anti-colonial melodrama, Ireland was cast as the hero as opposed to the English villain, inverting the Manichean scenario of imperialist discourse, which dehumanised and vilified the colonised.

That the citizen champions the Irish version of the Manichean scenario of Irish history is evident. His binary structure of imagination has been amply commented upon. Likewise, as I discussed in Chapter One, the logic of binary opposition seems to drive the action of the episode at large continually staging clashes between the citizen and Bloom and leading to their “grand” altercation at the end. The fact that most critics have discussed the episode in binary terms – citizen versus Bloom, usually hissing the former and cheering the latter – demonstrates the seductive power of the melodramatic logic the chapter seemingly imposes. Critical responses condemning the citizen often also duplicate the emotional melodramatic excess of the citizen’s utterances.29

Such reductive readings of “Cyclops,” however, ignore the complex narrative structures, the stylistic exuberance and the subversive subtextual dramas interwebbing the episode, which undercut the binary imagination and thus the possibility of a melodramatic resolution in the end. In Chapter One, I discussed how despite the fact that critical discourse mostly applies a bipolar structural model to facilitate some kind of hermeneutic grasp on the episode, the interpolations show a puzzling heterogeneity that resist such reduction. Here, as the final act of my inquiry into “Cyclops” as performance, I focus on how the ending of the episode stages a subversive mimicry of melodramatic resolution intersecting both the narrator’s description of the grand altercation between the citizen and Bloom, and the interpolations.

29 See especially Hayman, Ellmann, Cheng.
The ending of “Cyclops” is scripted in several ways according to the generic conventions of melodrama. The fact that the finale has been customarily read as the dynamic focus of the episode, as Reizbaum notes (“Saints” 168), proves that Joyce, like all true melodramatists, was a master of climax, or rather that he was a master mimic of melodramatic climax. As Michael Booth observes, “[t]he strong curtain ending an act or the play is absolutely essential to melodramatic technique” (158). Beyond the citizen’s sensational act of physical violence, numerous other elements producing this climax also echo tropes of melodrama: Bloom’s sensational escape – his last minute rescue by Martin Cunningham – the use of mood music – “a select orchestra of Irish pipes” playing Come Back to Erin and Rakócsy’s March [sic] (12.1827-28) – and of natural spectacles accompanying the escape in one of the interpolations, also the motif of an earthquake in another, and Bloom’s tableau-like apotheosis at the very end. However, while escapes/rescues in melodramas suggest that there is a moral purpose in the world delivering the good from the grip of evil, the way it is constructed in “Cyclops” garbles a clear-cut demarcation line between good and evil. By an ironic gesture of fate, the Cyclopean deux at machina figure saving Bloom from the fury of the citizen is Martin Cunningham, who earlier in the episode functions as the dubious voice of authority upon which Bloom’s abject othering by the barflies lies. The intertextual echoes of Boucicault’s melodramas in “Cyclops” also lend an ironic dimension to the rescue scene. While all three of Boucicault’s charming peasant rascals assume heroic proportions by rescuing the innocent from the villains, in “Cyclops” it is the figure imbued by the aura of a Boucicaultian hero, the citizen, from whom Bloom has to be rescued. Yet, Bloom is no innocent sufferer of the other’s malice. He also brings trouble upon himself by provoking the

30 As Trotter notes, Queen’s Royal performances were highly spectacular, they used Irish landscapes as a backdrop to heighten the audience’s pride in their country.

31 While the name of the dog associates the citizen with Myles-na-Coppaleen of The Colleen Bawn, the dog itself as a faithful companion of the citizen evokes Conn the Shaughraun. The depiction of Conn and his dog was a popular illustration of Boucicault’s third comic Irish play.
citizen in a manner that duplicates the citizen’s attitudes he counteracts before. While at the beginning Bloom disrupts the citizen’s booze-patriotic commemorative ritual conjuring up illustrious names to demonstrate a sense of national belonging, at the end he plays the same game.\textsuperscript{32} The citizen “plunges back into the shop” to grab the biscuitbox to “crucify” him, after Bloom, carried away by fury, has flung a list of illustrious names in the citizen’s face to prove the worth of his supposedly Jewish identity: “− Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza. And the Saviour was a jew and his father was a jew. Your God.”\textsuperscript{33}

When Martin Cunningham remonstrates that “He had no father,” unconquerable Bloom goes on: “− Well, his uncle was a jew, says he. Your God was a jew. Christ was a jew like me” (12.1804-09). Bloom almost acts as if he wanted to become a martyr for a cause he does not believe in, as he later admits to Stephen in Eumaeus.\textsuperscript{34}

Thus, the roles of villain and hero, evil and good are irredeemably entangled. Nevertheless, the inclusion of an earthquake in the scenario implicates a villain. Natural catastrophes like forest fires, avalanches, floods, volcanic eruption and earthquakes were popular elements of English, even if not of Irish melodramas. As Booth argues, they functioned not only as symbolic markers of the upheaval of civil and natural order, but they were often used to vanquish the villain (161). The earthquake, reported in an interpolation as the consequence of the citizen’s shot, demolishes “all the lordly residences in the vicinity of the palace of justice [. . .] and that noble edifice itself, in which at the time of the catastrophe important legal debates were in progress” (12.1865-67). Several Irish historical melodramas by Hubert O’Grady and J. W. Whitbread performed at the Queen’s Royal cast the representatives of law as the scheming villains to be punished in the end (Watt 69).

\textsuperscript{32} Although Hayman notes the irony in Bloom’s gesture, this does not refrain him from envisioning the end of the episode as “Bloom’s first step toward the possible recovery of his self-possession and manhood” (251).

\textsuperscript{33} The dubious valence of these names for authenticating Jewishness has been pointed out by Gifford, and more recently by Reizbaum.
The very end of the episode can also be subsumed within the semiotic field of melodrama. If on the story level the conflict remains unresolved, on the stylistic level the ending welds some kind of reconciliation, since Bloom’s parodic apotheosis – ben Bloom Elijah ascending “amid clouds of angels” “to the glory of the brightness” – is brought to a close in the narrator’s stylistic register – “like a shot off a shovel.” While Bloom’s near-martyrdom caricatures the climax of Irish heroic melodramas dominating the stage of the Queen’s Royal at the turn of the century, the final stylistic gesture parodically acts out an opposing myth that the resolution of Boucicault’s earlier comic plays project. As Watt has argued, although Boucicault’s comic plays show his nationalist sympathies and a growing awareness of Ireland’s long struggle against England, they “advance an optimistic, inherently conservative myth of reconciliation” (63). Thus, in a paradoxical way, the multivalent encoding of the ending of the episode according to conflicting symbolic constructs of the powerful anti-colonial cultural tool of melodrama undercuts rather than sustains the possibility of a clear-cut victory in “Cyclops.”

34 As Bloom reports the incident to Stephen in the Cabman’s shelter: “He called me a jew and in a heated fashion. So I without deviating from plain facts in the least told him his God, I mean Christ was a jew too and all his family like me though in reality I’m not (16.1082-85).

35 Several of Whitbread’s historical plays end with the grossly sensational execution of national martyrs. Boucicault’s later tragic play Robert Emmet (1884) also follows this pattern. In the final tableau Emmet is shot dead in the act of prayer.
Nothwithstanding the fact that the post-colonial turn in Joyce criticism has already produced some valuable revisions of previous grossly reductive critical assessments of Joyce’s representation of Irish nationalism in “Cyclops,” the discursive context of Irish cultural nationalism has further refined and redefined our vision of the chapter’s representational politics. My novel archaeological reading strategy has aimed to show, through highlighting several hitherto ignored or scarcely dwelt on recesses of the text, that “Cyclops” resists the critical urge, present even after the post-colonial turn, to force its ideological message into neat political allegories. My reading strategy suggests instead that nationalism in “Cyclops” functions as a vast and ludicrous heterogeneous net that no one can transcend, chariot or no chariot, and this way “Cyclops” foreshadows the representational politics of *Finnegans Wake*. 
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