Inspiration at the Eleventh Hour: The Nationalist Revisions of James Joyce, Seán O’Casey, and William Butler Yeats

Barry Devine
University of Miami, seveneccles@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations

Recommended Citation
https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations/1372

This Embargoed is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact repository.library@miami.edu.
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

INSPIRATION AT THE ELEVENTH HOUR: THE NATIONALIST REVISIONS OF JAMES JOYCE, SEÁN O’CASEY, AND WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS

By

Barry Devine

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the University of Miami in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Coral Gables, Florida
May 2015
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

INSPIRATION AT THE ELEVENTH HOUR: THE NATIONALIST REVISIONS OF JAMES JOYCE, SEÁN O’CASEY, AND WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS

Barry Devine

Approved:

________________                    _________________
Patrick A. McCarthy, Ph.D.             Joel Nickels, Ph.D.
Professor of English                  Associate Professor of English

________________                    _________________
Renée A. Fox, Ph.D.                M. Brian Blake, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of English          Dean of the Graduate School

________________
Michael Groden, Ph.D.
Distinguished University Professor Emeritus
University of Western Ontario
This project is a genetic study of the process by which James Joyce, Seán O’Casey, and William Butler Yeats expressed their support for Irish independence through their art. Based in the techniques of genetic criticism, I consider how each author developed, revised, and altered his text over time in order to create the works of literature that placed them among the greatest authors of the twentieth century. I am particularly interested in the development of Irish nationalism in their works and the socio-historical circumstances that inspired them. Using genetic methods as a tool to analyze the manuscripts, notes, drafts, and revisions, I investigate how these writers conceived, revised, and finally presented their nationalist ideas in their texts. Chapter One investigates Joyce’s drafts and revisions for Ulysses and reveals that he added nearly 300 references to Irish nationalism in just the final months of his seven-year project. Chapter Two looks at the once-lost text of O’Casey’s The Cooing of Doves and reveals that previous assertions about its influence on The Plough and the Stars were incorrect. The text instead reveals that Plough is almost entirely new material, but that the influence of the earlier play upon the latter is much more extensive than previously thought. Chapter
Three investigates Yeats’s drafts and revisions as he developed an overtly political persona through his poems between the Easter Rising and the establishment of the Irish Free State and also analyzes the political implications of his chosen methods of publication. This peek into the writing process of the three authors reveals the passion each held for his home country and the struggle they went through in order to let their positions be known.
For Heleana

la miglior fabbra
Acknowledgements

In an introductory seminar for my Master of Arts program at University College Dublin, several faculty members gave short presentations about their particular field of critical expertise. Luca Crispi was the last presenter, but his presentation on textual studies and genetic criticism captured my attention like no other, and the influence of that fifteen-minute slideshow has only grown. After issuing a stern warning to me that spending hours deciphering manuscripts and looking for patterns that may or may not be present is not for everyone, Luca took me under his wing and guided me through the process of manuscript analysis for a seminar paper. He then agreed to advise my Masters thesis and introduced me to James Joyce’s recently discovered notebooks held at the National Library of Ireland. With unflagging support and guidance, Luca helped me to successfully complete my thesis and encouraged me to return to the U.S. to pursue my Ph.D. and continue the work we had started together. Luca has since remained a guiding presence in my doctoral research. I am truly grateful for all of his help over the past seven years.

Since coming to the University of Miami I have been the beneficiary of tremendous help from the staff, faculty, and from my fellow students. I am grateful to Joel Nickels for his patience in allowing me to pursue my own interests during two separate seminars and for letting me know when my work was not quite hitting the mark. He has encouraged me to work harder and to see my research in a broader perspective. I am thankful for the help of Renée Fox, John Paul Russo, Frank Palmeri, Pamela Hammons, Brenna Munro, and Gina Maranto for their guidance as I made my way...
through the program. I have been the beneficiary of the daily assistance of Vince Oller, Heidi Abella, and Nancy Brady at the Richter Library in finding the resources I needed to complete this project.

I am most grateful for the encouragement and support I have received from my dissertation director, Patrick A. McCarthy. He has remained enthusiastic about my project from its conception and has poured over every word of this dissertation many times. His immeasurable wealth of knowledge has led me to resources I would not have found on my own and has pointed me in directions I may have never considered. Above all his generous nature and sense of humor have made my years at the University of Miami not just successful but also an immense pleasure. I could not have asked for a better supervisor and mentor.

I would finally like to thank my family for their love and support as I chose to go on yet another crazy adventure, this time into academia. My parents have always been my soft place to land, and whether they know it or not, they have helped me through the inevitable difficulties of embarking on a doctoral program. No one has helped me more than my wife, Heleana. She has been a constant reminder that it is far more important to be a good person than to be successful, but that both are possible if we make the right choices.
Table of Contents

Abbreviations                                      vii
Preface: Reverent Curiosity                        1
Chapter One: Innuendo of Home Rule                 17
Chapter Two: “’Scuse me mister. I thought you was an Irishman.”  98
Chapter Three: “The great gloom that is in my mind.” 141
Afterword: The Future of Ireland’s Literary Past   200
Appendix A: Nationalist Additions in *Ulysses*      208
Appendix B: Correspondences between the casts of *The Cooing of Doves* and *The Plough and the Stars* 215
Works Cited                                          216
Abbreviations


Accursed who brings to light of day
The writings I have cast away!
But blessed he that stirs them not
And lets the kind worm take the lot!

— William Butler Yeats (VP 779)

Preface
Reverent Curiosity

Jon Stallworthy begins his preface to Between the Lines: Yeats’s Poetry in the Making (1963) by addressing the warning expressed to readers of the above poem, which Stallworthy also selected as his epigraph.

I am afraid that Yeats would have deplored my choice of subject. He would probably have regarded me as the magician at a children’s party regards the inevitable small boy who explains to his friends that ‘of course the top hat has a false bottom’. I must therefore, in all humility, offer the case for my defense. (n.p.)

As Stallworthy defends the methodology of his investigation of Yeats’s writing process, he also addresses the newness of his approach. “There may be some who question the ethics of this,” he concedes. “If, however, the motive is reverent curiosity, and the result an enlarged understanding of the man and his work, I submit that the end justifies a slight irregularity in the means.” In essence he is arguing that Yeats’s own preferences regarding his rejected documents are not as important as the benefits that come from their study as long as that study is executed with respect for the work in question. Despite this defense,
he is still hesitant from the start and goes so far as to ask for divine protection against Yeats’s curse before he begins to reveal the poet’s tricks to his fellow party-goers. He follows his epigraph of Yeats’s poetic plea to let his unpublished material remain so with a plea of his own for the benefit of himself and his readers as they embark on this forbidden mission. Below the poem lies the only other text on the epigraph page—“Lord, have mercy upon us.”

Much has changed since 1963. The use of manuscripts, drafts, and notes has emerged from the shadows of ethical ambiguity to become an accepted method of literary investigations and criticism. Research into the works of James Joyce, particularly *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, has led the industry in this type of textual criticism. Great efforts have been taken to make all of Joyce’s pre-publication materials, or *avant textes*, available to scholars in order to facilitate such investigations. In the 1970s the sixty-three volume *James Joyce Archive* made available facsimile editions of Joyce’s manuscript material otherwise only accessible via libraries scattered across the globe. Hans Walter Gabler’s 1984 *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition* provided researchers with a tool for seeing how these various manuscripts, drafts, and revisions all came together. More recently the still unfinished “*Finnegans Wake*” *Notebooks at Buffalo* project began publishing, not only the drafts, but also transcriptions and details about Joyce’s source material. In his preface to *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake*, Michael Groden notes, “by the time the project is completed, scholars will have much more convenient and usable versions of the notes to work with than Joyce’s undigested and notoriously difficult-to-read handwritten pages” (ix). This “convenient and usable” material has already produced
a tremendous amount of scholarship, and there is still a great deal yet to be published.¹ Beginning in 1982 Cornell University Press began to publish all of Yeats’s existing manuscripts from the National Library of Ireland and other repositories in a similar project. *The Cornell Yeats Collection* provides facsimiles and transcriptions of Yeats’s notes and drafts that greatly facilitate investigations into his equally difficult-to-read handwritten documents.

Not all authors, however, have been lucky enough to receive this sort of critical attention, and, as a result, their scattered notes and drafts either remain accessible only in various libraries, or locked away in private collections. Occasionally a notebook or set of drafts will show up at an auction and will be made widely available to the public, but these instances are rare. For the most part, the *avant textes* of most modern writers remain available only to those with the means to travel widely and the desire to spend countless hours deciphering notes originally intended only for the eyes of their author.

The goal of this investigation is to make use of the above Joyce and Yeats resources as well as the recently rediscovered text of Seán O’Casey’s lost play, *The Cooing of Doves*, to reveal the processes by which the three authors expressed their nationalist views through the revisions and to analyze the political views each projected through his work. Wim Van Mierlo explains that, “contrary to popular and ‘romantic’ ideas of inspiration, no work ever comes into being completely *ex nihilo*. The author’s productive work exists within a network of external influences” (n.p.). All of the authors

---

¹ As of the date of this study, *The “Finnegans Wake” Notebooks at Buffalo* project has been abandoned due to legal proceedings regarding the copyright status of previously transcribed material. Brepols Publishers of Turnhout, Belgium has no present plans to continue with the series.
under investigation were witnesses (either first-hand or from afar) to the events leading up to and including World War I, the Irish War of Independence, the Irish Civil War, and the formation of the Irish Free State. All three authors supported the idea that the Irish people should be free to govern themselves, but each had his own unique vision of what that type of “home rule” should look like. The issue of Irish self-determination preceded Joyce, Yeats, and O’Casey by hundreds of years. Many uprisings were staged over the generations, and all were successfully defeated by the powerful British military. While not witness to the beginning of this process, all three men were steeped in its history and were witness to the end of it, and all three documented their perspectives in their writing.

The Achievement of Home Rule

Although it had its roots in the seventeenth century, it was not until the late 1800s, and after the idea of complete independence seemed impossible, that the Irish Home Rule movement began to gain a measure of effective political support. Earlier attempts to weaken or repeal the 1801 Act of Union between Ireland and Great Britain had all proven fruitless. Daniel O’Connell fought tirelessly to give the majority Catholic population a voice in their own government, which he achieved in 1829. He then attempted to force

---


3 While it would be decades before the movement adopted the phrase “Home Rule,” the movement began in earnest with the 1798 Rebellion led by Theobald Wolfe Tone’s United Irishmen. Inspired by the revolutions in the United States and France, the rebels attempted to take control of Ireland back from the British by force. The rebellion lasted three months and resulted in the most violent uprising in Irish history with many atrocities committed by both sides. After quashing the rebellion, the British government implemented the Act of Union in 1801 officially making Ireland part of the British Empire and subject to all of its laws (Hegarty 168-172; See also Jackson 1-8 for a concise summary of the Home Rule movement).
repeal of the Act of Union and organized several large-scale rallies that he called “Monster Meetings” throughout the country.4 These rallies grew in size at each event, regularly attracting hundreds of thousands of protesters, until the final meeting planned at Clontarf was cancelled by British Prime Minister, Robert Peel. Peel ordered warships to the coast near Clontarf and sent cavalry in to prevent the protesters from assembling.

O’Connell stuck to his policy of non-violence and called the meeting off, to the great disappointment of his followers. In 1843 O’Connell was arrested and jailed for sedition. Failing health led to his withdrawal from politics and to his death four years later.

O’Connell’s failure to bring about Home Rule resulted in a politically splintered Ireland by the early twentieth century. Several groups had formed seeking either the Dominion-type Home Rule espoused by O’Connell or complete independence from Great Britain. Existing political and militia groups like the Irish Republican Brotherhood (formed in 1858) began to attract more support, and new groups like the Irish Volunteers, the Irish Republican Army, the Gaelic League, and the Gaelic Athletic Association promoted the ideas of an Irish culture and heritage separate from England. While some groups advocated violent rebellion and others advocated peaceful resistance, they all agreed that the people of Ireland should be free from oppression and that the 1801 Act of Union was unjust. Despite their common nationalist interests, however, these political groups parted ways when it came to issues like the use of violence, the protection of the poor and lower class, and what type of system should replace the current one. Occasionally some of these groups worked together toward their shared goals and joined

---

forces for political gain, but they were more frequently at odds with each other socially, politically, and even artistically.

Most Irish people found themselves in alignment with one of these groups or another, and Irish authors were no exception. James Joyce, Seán O’Casey, and William Butler Yeats each either expressed sympathies with individual nationalist figures or groups or actively joined their ranks, but they varied greatly in their level of involvement. Joyce was frequently tight-lipped about politics, but made it clear through his fiction and public speaking that he was firmly opposed to British intervention in Irish politics. Despite his agreement on some issues, Joyce refused to align himself with any particular group. O’Casey was far more politically vocal, and joined several nationalist groups, moving from one to another over several years, writing and speaking out for the rights of the poorest Irish citizens. Yeats joined the ranks of a few such groups, but, like Joyce, was often reserved in politics, and eventually withdrew from all of them. As tensions grew, however, he set his reservation aside and let his positions be known through his writing.

Although Joyce had not lived in Ireland since his self-imposed exile in 1904, he kept a very close eye on Irish politics. He supported the Home Rule legacy of Charles Stewart Parnell and the contemporary efforts of Arthur Griffith, although, unlike Griffith, he was opposed to violence of any sort in the pursuit of those goals. Joyce was frequently critical of the Irish people and the government in his early years living in Europe. After the start of World War I, he was forced to stay out of politics entirely in order to ensure the safety of his family when he moved to Switzerland where he had to remain neutral.
Once the war was over, and he moved away from Switzerland, he began to express his political opinions once again through his fiction.

Seán O’Casey grew up in the poorest part of Dublin, and his sympathies remained with the people he knew and loved from his old neighborhood. He joined James Larkin’s labor movement, and at one time or another, belonged to just about every nationalist organization in Dublin, but became disillusioned with each one almost as quickly. He spoke out tirelessly in support of Irish workers, and focused his energy on supporting their interests as opposed to fighting against the interests of the English. O’Casey’s early career was entirely devoted to politics and labor issues. It was not until he was nearly forty years old that he decided to turn to the theater as a means of expressing his political messages.

William Butler Yeats, even though he was of distant English descent, considered himself proudly Irish and sided firmly with the native Irish on the issue of Home Rule. In an effort to bridge the cultural gap and unite all Irish people, Yeats used ancient Irish history, mythology, and folklore as a vehicle for drumming up support for Irish independence in a movement that became widely known as the Irish Literary Revival. His formation of the Abbey Theatre with Lady Augusta Gregory as a venue for staging only Irish productions was a step toward this goal. His early poetry and plays projected Irish patriotism through the ancient stories as a metaphor for current events. His efforts were wildly successful and attracted the attention of people from all of the nationalist

---

5 When W. B. Yeats’s wife, George, was pregnant with their second child, Michael, the family made sure that she would be in Ireland for the birth of their first son. Yeats’s sister, Lily, erroneously commented in a letter to her father that her brother Jack was the only Yeats born outside of Ireland for two hundred years—her sister Elizabeth was also born in England (G. Lewis 146).
camps, who subsequently used the images of his stage characters, Cathleen ni Houlihan and Cuchulain as nationalist symbols. As the tensions grew and the war was set in motion between Ireland and England, Yeats became much more explicit about his opposition to the British government, and he dropped the ancient figures nearly completely from his work in favor of more realistic imagery. More privately, however, he also expressed his fears that the upper-class life he aspired to would no longer be possible in a free Ireland.

Revisions of a Revolution

That all three authors used their writing as a means to express their political positions is unquestionable. The degree of struggle and the amount of effort they each expended in order to get the message right, however, is an aspect of their work that only becomes clear when looking into their composition and revision processes. All three authors put a great deal of effort into making sure that their message was present in their work. The three, however, used very different methods of revision to achieve their goals.

Joyce’s revision was almost invariably a process of accretion. He would take a previous draft and add material to it from notes that he had gathered and sorted into notebooks. He almost never took material out once it was part of the draft. Sometimes it would take years for a note to find its way from a note card to the text of the novel, but Joyce used his notebooks as a source for inspiration at every occasion and frequently added new material to previously written text, often at the great displeasure of his printer.

---

6 The glaring exception to this pattern is the composition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Joyce initially wrote a long and detailed account of his semi-fictional childhood and early adult years of which only a fragment survives today as *Stephen Hero*. He abandoned the project in favor of the far more focused and economical novel that exists today.
Critics have often joked that Joyce never finished *Ulysses*, he just ran out of time. The crafting of his political messages followed the same pattern and evolved slowly, but instead of taking years, many of these additions were added in just the final six months before publication.

O’Casey’s revision process for *The Plough and the Stars* was a massive undertaking. He took a previously rejected one-act play that never made it past the typescript stage, and, years later, expanded it into a full-length, four-act play. He took the relatively strong political content of the short play and amplified it to such an extent in the finished product that audiences rioted in the theater during its opening week. O’Casey grew bolder in presenting his politics on stage through his revisions, and he used the revision process as a vehicle for brazenly expressing his disagreement with what many Irish citizens considered to be an unimpeachable act of patriotism—the 1916 Easter Rising.

Taking a far more subtle approach to political content, Yeats chose his political messages carefully. While he frequently took a strong position on political issues, he was very careful about the language he used to present that position. Sometimes he would obscure his original intent with figurative language, while other times he would use plain words. Yeats used his revision process as a means to polish the language of a message, but never to alter the message itself. Once he developed the main concept of a political poem, he did not alter the basic intent, but made careful and deliberate alterations to the mechanics and language of the presentation.
A Brief History of Genetic Criticism

The scrutinizing of an author’s notes, drafts, and revision documents in order to discover new avenues of investigation that follow the text through the process of creation is a subfield of textual studies called genetic criticism. The term is often credited to Louis Hay in 1977 as derived from the French term *critique génétique*, although the use of the term “genetic” in reference to the genesis of a text had been in use since at least the early 1970s. The goal of the genetic critic is, in part, “to restore a temporal dimension to the study of literature” (Deppman, Ferrer, and Groden 2). This temporal element brings to life the process of creation, and it allows the reader to see the writer at work.

[Genetic critics] prefer to draw attention to [a work’s] unsettled nature … They attempt to understand the writing as a process rather than reduce its complexity, as is done in a traditional critical edition. What this approach can yield is an enhanced awareness of the tension between completeness and incompleteness and a revaluation of the work’s progress. (Crispi and Slote 37)

Instead of focusing attention on the end result of the writing process, genetic critics work alongside the process as an observer of the documents that will eventually become the end result. They focus on the fact that writing is not a teleological process wherein an author simply puts fully formed ideas on the page, rather it is a process of creative trial and error filled with moments of inspiration and periods of struggle. Van Mierlo suggests that “the author as a solitary romantic genius that is familiar from most forms of literary history may not be something we want to return to … the author, after all, does not stand

---

7 Vikey Doyen’s 1973 dissertation at Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, was entitled *Fighting the Albatross of Self: A Genetic Study of the Literary Work of Malcolm Lowry*, which demonstrates the use of the term previous to Hay in 1977.
outside the ‘communications circuit’. It is both the creative process and the author’s role in that communications circuit that genetic scholars hope to reveal.

In “Joyce and the Case for Genetic Criticism” (2006), Jed Deppman justifies the use of prepublication and source materials, or avant textes, from the perspective of the critic as a reader:

Most geneticists are zealously committed to close reading, even more than the New Critics were: we love our texts so much that we want to know what they were like as children. So we read texts, but also avant-textes, and when we get to know those, it turns out that we want to read about their childhoods, too: the sources of the sources of the sources... and there is no natural endpoint [...] The result, of course, is that as we geneticists affirm and pursue this hermeneutical regress, we shake the text itself [...] And the final paradox is that, shaken or not, the "text" is still there, even if it has been expanded to include prepublication and source materials; it originally inspired and continues to justify our love of close reading.

The avant textes provide the source material for uncovering texts “as children.” They also uncover the temporal element behind the writing as well as the critical connection to what Hay broadly calls “the socio-historico-cultural circumstances,” which, in turn, provide “an interpretable textual dialectic between mind and culture” (qtd. in Deppman). In other words, genetic critics can use the avant textes as a means of connecting the writing process with the personal and cultural circumstances under which the work was created.

That said, there is still little consensus among genetic critics in terms of objectives and methodology. Groden notes:

It takes time and endurance to read and decipher the manuscripts, to work out the relationships among them and to identify sources, to determine what critical approach(es) or theoretical model(s) might be appropriate, and maybe reach some conclusions. The goal might be to show how the published text came into being or to demonstrate how the earlier documents can illuminate the published
text, or it might be more a matter of studying the writing process itself. There are many kinds of genetic criticism. ("Preface" ix-x)

The question of what to do with this new-found knowledge resulting from the research leads to the different approaches. Genetic critics are often at the mercy of the source material and rely on the findings to help determine their direction. Deppman expresses his hope that one day “perhaps a critic […] might write a Genetic Discourse or Archive Discourse on the model of Gérard Genette’s Narrative Discourse” that would provide genetic scholars with a “powerful set of basic concepts and descriptive vocabulary for the resplendent flora and fauna of the archive” (n.p.). In the absence of such a guidebook, genetic scholars must continue working within a nebulous field with uncertain expectations.

The Chapters

My approach to the avant textes addresses all three goals as stated above by Groden: to look into the genesis of the text, to illuminate the writing process, and to look into the writing process itself. I am also deeply invested in Hay’s “socio-historico-cultural circumstances,” which, when considered in conjunction with the avant textes, provide the reader with a glimpse of the author at work both in the moment of creation and in the real-life conditions that inspired that moment. My investigation into the prepublication materials of Joyce, O’Casey, and Yeats will include a temporal explanation of each author’s unique writing process to the extent that it can be determined, as well as an exploration of the conditions that led each to his own moments of inspiration. Each
chapter will look into the social, historical, and cultural backgrounds of the authors as they relate to the text(s) in question, and each chapter will scrutinize the available notes, manuscripts, drafts, etc. in an effort to see the works as they were transformed from ideas into artistic expression. In the case of Yeats, my investigation will also extend to the act of publishing as well as writing, as this was often crucial to both his creative and political mission.

Chapter One, “Innuendo of Home Rule,” will look at Joyce’s very late revisions as he completed the final chapters of *Ulysses* and revised the earlier ones in order to meet his self-imposed deadline of February 2, 1922. This time period corresponds with the ending of the most violent period of the war with England and the drafting of the treaty that ensured Ireland’s independence. During these final months, Joyce made notable changes to the text of *Ulysses*, including the addition of headlines in the “Aeolus” episode, death imagery in “Hades,” and food references in “Lestrygonians.” At this same time he was also adding hundreds of references to Ireland’s revolutionary struggle. This pattern only becomes clear when viewed from the perspective of Joyce’s notes and revision documents, which reveal themselves to be powerful political statements from a writer who had been famously silent on the matter for many years. Joyce’s revisions contain many references to nationalist groups and revolutionary figures who either played a role in the struggles of the past, or who would only later become important figures in the revolution. He also included many references to nationalist symbols as well as references to several historical events that would not take place until years after the
events of the novel. Chapter One will look carefully into all three of these categories as well as Joyce’s involvement with politics and his methods of revision.

Chapter Two, “‘Scuse me, mister. I thought you was an Irishman,” looks into the composition of and history of scholarship regarding Seán O’Casey’s most popular play, *The Plough and the Stars*. This is one of the rare cases in which a document thought to be lost turned up at an auction and set all previous scholarship on its head. The lost document was a typescript for the one-act play *The Cooing of Doves*, which O’Casey submitted to the Abbey Theatre and never got back. The play was never staged. For decades afterwards scholars proposed theories about the extent to which *The Cooing of Doves* was an influence on *The Plough and the Stars*. Most theories were based on O’Casey’s own comments and letters to and from employees at the Abbey Theatre, and most theories agreed that the influence was limited to the infamous second act of *Plough* that takes place in a pub. It would seem that these were reliable sources, but once the lost typescript was found, all of them were proven to be wrong. This chapter will look at this newly-discovered document as an early draft of what O’Casey would later develop into all four acts of his most famous play and the revisions he made to the story, setting, and characters.

Chapter Three, “The great gloom that is in my mind,” follows William Butler Yeats as he developed and strengthened his public political persona via his poetry. Like many Irish citizens, Yeats was horrified by the executions of sixteen Irish revolutionaries after the 1916 Easter Rising; also, as with many Irish citizens, this event inspired him to speak out in favor of the rebels and their efforts to secure independence from England.
Even with a new-found inspiration to write about the atrocities of the English response to the Rising, Yeats kept much of his new political poetry to himself until tensions between the two countries reached a point at which he could no longer hold his tongue. Between 1916 and 1928 Yeats fused his interests in poetry, politics, and philosophy into a series of poems that spoke to the Irish nationalist experience of the Easter Rising, the Irish War of Independence, and the Irish Civil War. Yeats used his fame and clout as a public figure to express his strong political messages through publication in small political newspapers and magazines, and in two major collections of his poems, *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921) and *The Tower* (1928). This chapter will investigate Yeats’s writing process via his manuscripts and early publications for each poem and will demonstrate his concerted effort to present a powerful, yet poetic and thoughtful image of the Irish experience to the world. It will consider his modes of publication as political acts on their own. Yeats understood that his choice of publishing outlets was nearly as important as the messages he was presenting in his poems.

I will conclude this study with a discussion of the great untapped resource of literary manuscripts, and I will address the minuscule extent to which I have utilized this resource in my investigation. There are several large-scale research projects currently being undertaken in Europe regarding modernist manuscripts and other *avant textes* of various writers, and I will point to areas where this new research will open new avenues for critical study. I will then look to the future of this investigation and my plans for future projects I have formulated in the process of my current research.
Stallworthy’s spirit of “reverent curiosity” continues to motivate genetic scholars in their efforts to better understand the authors and their works. Learning what our favorite works of literature were like “as children” and how their authors nurtured them into great literature is my primary motivation for the following chapters. Instead of playing the role of the boy who spoils the magician’s tricks, I hope to play the role of an observer who is fascinated by the magic.
There can be no question of the artistry of this man, of his strange originality, and of the rich tragic and comic poetry that blossoms in all that he has written.

—Sean O’Casey on James Joyce

Chapter One
Innuendo of Home Rule

I. Background

“Wonder have I time for a bath this morning. Tara street. Chap in the paybox there got away James Stephens, they say. O’Brien” (U 4:489–91).

As Leopold Bloom thinks about stopping at the baths on Tara Street before attending the funeral of his recently departed friend, his mind jumps to the name of the man who takes the money there—J. P. O’Brien. Bloom certainly knows enough about Irish political history to know the name James Stephens, and he also remembers that there was an O’Brien associated with Stephens. There were in fact two O’Briens associated with him, but neither assisted in his escape, and neither was the man who collected money at the bath house. While Bloom’s mistake is innocent enough

---

8 Letter from O’Casey to R.T. House, 15 Aug. 1939 (see Murray 500).

9 Gifford 80.

10 James Stephens was the founder and leader of the Irish Republican Brotherhood who escaped from custody in Dublin’s Richmond Prison with the help of a hospital steward and a band of Fenians waiting outside the prison walls (Ramón, 184–89).

11 William Smith O’Brien (1803-1864) participated with Stephens in an attack on the Tipperary police barracks in 1848. He was tried and sentenced to death for treason, but received a commutation and full pardon, after which he left politics altogether. James Francis Xavier O’Brien (1828-1905) met Stephens in America in 1858 and was also sentenced to death after returning to Ireland and participating in the 1867 Fenian uprising in Cork. His sentence was likewise commuted and he later became a member of Parliament and supporter of Parnell (Gifford 80).
considering that the jail break he is referring to took place the year before he was born, it
is the fact that the mere thought of the baths made him think of the name O’Brien and the
inaccurate information he received about the man’s role in Irish history that draws the
reader’s attention.

Readers of *Ulysses* who first encountered the “Calypso” episode in the American
literary magazine, *The Little Review*, in June 1918 were not treated to this erroneous little
anecdote. In that version, Bloom’s thoughts for that paragraph end after he considers
taking a bath. Joyce added the detail about O’Brien later—much later, in fact. It was not
until August of 1921, more than three years after it appeared in *The Little Review* and as
Joyce was preparing the novel for publication, that he decided to make Bloom’s thoughts
turn to the father of the Fenian movement, James Stephens, by way of a rumor about the
“chap in the paybox” (*UCSE* 134: 14-15). Further examination of the documents Joyce
used in his revision process for *Ulysses* reveals that this instance of adding nationalist
ideas to the narration and to his characters’ thoughts is not an isolated incident; there are,
in fact, hundreds of other examples throughout the novel that were added during the final
months before the novel was published.\(^\text{12}\) From the decades of existing textual studies of
Joyce’s writing, we know that he rarely added anything that was not first collected in his
notebooks, which, on the surface, indicates that this political transformation of the novel
was something that Joyce had planned in advance of the revisions. As Ireland was
nearing the end of its long struggle for independence from England, Joyce changed the
largely apolitical Bloom readers got to know in *The Little Review* into a Dubliner who

\(^{12}\) A complete list of additions related to nationalist ideas can be found in Appendix A.
supported many nationalist ideas and yet rejected others, and one whose mind frequently leaps to names and places important to Ireland’s eventual political victory over England. However, as Joyce’s friend Arthur Power points out, “he did not believe in planning it all beforehand on the classical formula, for, as he said, ‘the good thing comes in the writing—words create’” (98). So although Joyce may have collected hundreds of words and phrases in his notebooks, he did not know precisely how he was going to integrate them into the novel. In other words, Joyce’s revisions, despite the many notes he had gathered to assist him, were part of his creative process; he was still actively crafting the novel right up to the final edits.

This chapter will examine the novel’s transformation in detail and will highlight several more instances in which Joyce added nationalist thoughts and ideas to the text as they fall into three broad categories: anachronisms, nationalist and revolutionary groups, and Irish patriotic symbolism. The chapter will look into the chronological process of Joyce’s editorial changes including his use of notebooks, drafts, and the printer’s proofs. As Michael Groden observes, the novel was not written in isolation. “Joyce’s writing took place within a context of personal, social, cultural, and national and international political events” (Ulysses in Focus, 125). This chapter must also consider this context as it had an impact on Joyce’s writing process. These elements of context can also be examined from different perspectives that provide Joyce’s writing and revisions with nearly endless points of perspective for analysis. In their examination of the “Renaissance spirit” in Joyce’s works, editors Daniel Ferrer, Sam Slote, and André Topia note that “Joyce is perhaps the author par excellence of perpetual decontextualization. No single
perspective can do justice to such a multi-faceted writer” (2). They intend for their work to be seen as a single perspective among the multitude that all work together to “do justice” to Joyce’s artistic vision. In much the same manner, this examination will provide only part of a single perspective of Joyce’s work on *Ulysses*—the nationalist perspective. It will provide a clearer picture of both the process by which Joyce altered the characters of *Ulysses* to reflect his own complicated nationalist ideology and his creative process. Of the 294 additions listed in Appendix A, this chapter will cover only 33 representative examples. This leaves a tremendous amount of material available for future research.

II. James Joyce and Nationalism: Shifting Perspectives

The earliest criticisms of *Ulysses* came before its publication in 1922. Critics like Richard Aldington attacked Joyce for misusing his talents. Aldington claimed that “When Mr. Joyce, with his marvellous gifts, uses them to disgust us with mankind, he is doing something which is false and a libel on humanity” (338). Other critics, however quickly came to Joyce’s defense. The truths of mankind that so disgusted Aldington became the launching points for the defense of Joyce by Ezra Pound and T.S. Eliot. Eliot addresses Aldington directly in “*Ulysses*, Order, and Myth” (1923): “Whether it is possible to libel humanity … is a question for philosophical societies to discuss; but of course if *Ulysses* were a ‘libel’ it would simply be a forged document, a powerless fraud” (122). Eliot here suggests that Joyce’s novel is “simply” an accurate reflection of real life, and that if *Ulysses* is a “libel on humanity” then our daily actions as humans are
also libels, such that taken in a different context they “would never have extracted from Mr. Aldington a moment’s attention.”

In his “Paris Letter: *Ulysses*,” (1922) Ezra Pound addresses the fact that *Ulysses* had been banned in the United States and then defends Joyce’s graphic descriptions of bodily functions and course language:

Bloom’s day is uncensored, very well. The foecal analysis, in the hospital around the corner, is uncensored … The anthropologist and sociologist have a right to equally accurate documents, to equally succinct reports and generalizations, which they seldom get, considering the complexity of the matter in hand, and the idiocy of current superstitions. (*Pound/Joyce*, 199)

Pound, like Eliot, considers *Ulysses* to be a document that captures the realism of life in the early twentieth century and compares it to a scientific observation. While this may be a bit disingenuous on Pound’s part considering the less-than-scientific descriptions of bodily activities Joyce includes in the novel, Pound also addresses the fact that the offending passages are so deeply buried as be useless to those who would seek them out for prurient interests: “Is any one, for the sake of two or three words which every small boy has seen written on the walls of a privy, going to wade through two hundred pages on consubstantiation or the biographical bearing of Hamlet?” (199). Both critics, once they have dispensed with the negative criticism, begin to defend *Ulysses* in terms of its style and scope.

Eliot laments, “[a]mongst all the criticisms I have seen of the book, I have seen nothing … which seemed to me to appreciate the significance of the method employed” (120). He goes on to point out the oddity of this blatant omission: “One might expect this to be the first peculiarity to attract attention; but it has been treated as
an amusing dodge, or scaffolding erected by the author for the purpose of disposing his realistic tale, of no interest in the completed structure” (120-21). Eliot claims that Joyce’s use of experimental techniques and “the mythical method” is “a step toward making the modern world possible for art” (124). In other words, Eliot is placing Joyce in the wider context of artistic expression on the world stage, as a metropolitan modernist. Pound also asserts that *Ulysses* adds to “the international store of literary technique” (196). He compares Joyce to Henry James and Marcel Proust and claims that Joyce’s descriptions are “conveyed with a certitude and efficiency that neither James nor Proust have excelled” (197). He goes on to address the experimental aspects of Joyce’s modernism in comparison with his older contemporaries, and states that Joyce employed such acrobatics, such sheer whoops and hoop-las and trapeze turns of technique that it would seem rash to dogmatize concerning his limitations. The whole of him, on the other hand, lock, stock, and gunny-sack is wholly outside H.J.’s compass and orbit, and outside Proust’s circuits and orbit. (197)

By focusing on Joyce’s technique in his defense, Pound is also establishing Joyce as a metropolitan modernist whose work has clear, international artistic and political implications. “He has presented Ireland under British domination … [and] by extension he has presented the whole occident under the domination of capital” (198). It is curiously the latter extension of this statement by Pound—that his art has international, if not universal implications—that future scholars clung to in their assessment of Joyce’s works for the next half century. The former part of the statement that focuses specifically on Ireland’s political turmoil seems to have been glossed over or forgotten by an entire generation of scholars and critics.
One exception to this near unanimous impression of Joyce as a metropolitan modernist was Wyndham Lewis. In his *Time and Western Man* (1927), Lewis dedicates an entire chapter to Joyce in which he launches several in-depth criticisms of Joyce and his style of modernism for which Joyce would later retaliate via several parodies of Lewis in *Finnegans Wake*. Part of his characterization of Joyce, however, was an observation of Joyce’s position within Irish politics: “Joyce is neither of the militant ‘patriot’ type nor yet a historical romancer. In spite of that he is very ‘irish.’ [sic] He is ready enough, as a literary artist, to stand for Ireland, and has wrapped himself up in a gigantic cocoon of local colour in *Ulysses*” (95). Lewis notes that Joyce was not in political alignment with either Sinn Féin or the literary revival movement, but that he was, before all else, an Irishman. He further insists that Joyce’s Irishness is “one of the fundamental questions of value brought about by his work,” or in other words, that Joyce’s particular political position as an Irishman was of central importance to his artistic vision (95). The fact that this observation was essentially buried among heavy, and often less than kind, criticism makes it unsurprising that it was largely ignored by Joyce scholars for over fifty years.

The first generation of dedicated Joyce scholars was led by Stuart Gilbert and Frank Budgen, both of whom knew Joyce personally and conferred with him on their books. Gilbert’s *James Joyce's Ulysses* (1930) was a path through Joyce’s sometimes impenetrable stylistic techniques for many first-time readers of the novel, and for others their only way to experience the novel due to its being banned in several countries. Budgen’s book, *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses* (1934), is a semi-fictionalized account of his relationship with Joyce and the creation of the novel, and Joyce actually
had a fair amount of input into its composition. Like Pound and Eliot, Gilbert also
champions Joyce’s technique over his content:

The meaning of *Ulysses*, for it has a meaning and is not a mere
photographic "slice of life"— far from it—is not to be sought in any
analysis of the acts of the protagonist or the mental make-up of the
characters; it is, rather, implicit in the technique of the various episodes, in
nuances of language, in the thousand and one correspondences and
allusions with which the book is studded. Thus *Ulysses* is neither
pessimist nor optimist in outlook, neither moral nor immoral in the
ordinary sense of these words; its affinity is, rather, with an Einstein
formula, a Greek temple, an art that lives the more intensely for its repose.

(8-9)

As with his predecessors, for Gilbert Joyce’s modernism was the novel’s primary
attribute, the source of its meaning and significance. Secondary to technique for Gilbert
came the realism with which Joyce allowed his characters to interact with their
surroundings, and Irish politics was merely part of that realism and nothing more. Gilbert
states that “[c]ivic and national politics played a prominent part in Dublin life and
hovered in the background of nearly every conversation” (17). He believes, however,
that Joyce isolated himself from this influence and expressed an “ironical
indifference” (19). He writes, “the author of *Ulysses*, in this as in other matters, shows no
bias; he introduces political themes because they are inherent in the Dublin scene” (18).
In other words, Gilbert believes that Joyce’s only reason to include political issues in
*Ulysses* was as a method of accurately expressing the views of people who live there and
not due to any beliefs that Joyce held himself.

Budgen describes the years leading up to the publication of *Ulysses* via a series of
often fictional anecdotes that recount his actual conversations with Joyce conducted on
their many walks together and via letters and notes, because he felt (and probably rightly so) that describing a series of letters and bits of broken conversations would be less than engaging to his readers. He describes several accounts in which the topic of politics comes up, but Joyce was never forthcoming about his own beliefs. “On one subject,” Budgen writes, “he was more uncommunicative than any man I know: the subject of politics” (191). One anecdote describes a conversation about Irish Home Rule that Joyce ended with an enigmatic smile rather than answering Budgen’s question, “Do you think that we English exist to further the spiritual development of the Irish people?” He took Joyce’s silence to indicate that Joyce was apolitical rather than simply tight-lipped about his opinions. However, in his later “Joyce’s Chapters of Going Forth By Day” (1939-41), written long after the publication of *Ulysses*, Budgen steps back from his claim that Joyce was not concerned with politics and picks up on what Gilbert remarked about politics and Dublin life:

> I must confess that I was once guilty of helping to create the impression that Joyce was nonpolitical. He was certainly non-party, but no man can be nonpolitical who spends the greater part of his life in celebrating his native city… [he] was certainly sceptical of all political parties and all political creeds, but he believed in the city and rejoiced in its life. He refused only to take part in the struggle as to who should govern it. *(Making of, 339)*

This new impression of Joyce as a man deeply concerned with the politics of his homeland, but unwilling to take part in the struggle, was an isolated view of the author that was overshadowed by the publication of a ground-breaking biography that sparked contradictory interpretations of Joyce’s politics for decades.
In 1959 Richard Ellmann released his monumental, and what Emer Nolan aptly describes as “magisterial,” biography of Joyce (2). Ellmann produced an intricately detailed portrait of Joyce through the various stages of his entire life including details about the life of his parents before he was born. This incredible feat in biographical writing was quickly recognized for its depth and completeness and was awarded the National Book Award the same year. It has since earned a reputation as one of the most highly acclaimed works of non-fiction of the twentieth century, and despite a handful of errors, it has yet to be matched by any Joyce scholar since.\textsuperscript{13} Early critics of the biography felt that Ellmann had been too hard on Joyce at times and that he occasionally assumed a tone of denigration. In his 1982 revised edition, however, Ellmann addresses these concerns at the close of the short preface: “In the second edition, as in the first, I have followed Joyce’s own prescription of total candor, with the knowledge that his life, like Rousseau’s, can bear others’ scrutiny as it bore his own. In working over these pages, I have felt all my affection for him renewed” (vii). Ellmann’s claim of “total candor” combined with his renewed affection for the author freed him from much criticism, but some scholars still claim that he remains unnecessarily harsh at times.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite its shortcomings, both documented and perceived, Ellmann’s biography remains the most complete picture available of Joyce as both an artist and as a person, but in terms of Joyce’s politics (about which Ellmann has much to say) he seems to engender

\textsuperscript{13} The Board members of the Modern Library rank Ellmann’s biography at number 73 of the top 100 non-fiction books of the twentieth century (100 Best Nonfiction).

\textsuperscript{14} Jorn Barger, creator of the Robot Wisdom blog, was the primary critic of Ellmann’s biography as being unnecessarily critical of Joyce. He provides a list of citations in the biography in which he believes Ellmann is being unfair. Barger’s original blog is no longer available online, but this list of seventeen instances is reproduced by the editors of the web site, Music in the Works of James Joyce (http://www.james-joyce-music.com/robotwisdom/jb_re_denigrate.html).
some confusion and makes some contradictory claims. Throughout the early sections of the biography, Ellmann paints a picture of a very politically minded young Joyce and repeatedly makes reference to his admiration of socialist ideas and his support (with reservations) for Arthur Griffith, founder of Sinn Féin. By the time he gets to the early 1920s, however, Ellmann’s portrayal of Joyce’s politics changes to near indifference regarding Irish independence:

As the prospect of Irish independence improved, however, Joyce was like his father and other old Parnellites, in that the reality of freedom did not requite the desire for it. He was briefly exhilarated at the foundation of the Irish Free State, and took satisfaction in the fact that, at the very time that he was giving his country a new conscience by completing *Ulysses*, his old associate Arthur Griffith—a lifetime advocate of independence—was taking office as its first president.15 (533)

This description of Joyce being only “briefly exhilarated” and as someone who did not necessarily desire Irish independence seems at odds with his earlier characterization. This perception may be due to Budgen’s earlier account of Joyce seeming to dismiss the idea of a free Ireland in a brief conversation held in 1919 “when the deeds of militant Sinn Fein were becoming world news” and England was doing all it could to maintain its political grip (154). “Tell me why you think I ought to wish to change the conditions that gave Ireland and me a shape and a destiny?” (155). This is one of the many occasions in which Budgen had to guess at Joyce’s ambiguous meaning, and may have misinterpreted

---

15 This passage contains one of the errors in Ellmann’s biography that appears not only in the 1959 edition, but also in the 1982 revised edition. In January 1921 Arthur Griffith was sworn in as President, not of the Irish Free State, but of the Dáil Éireann, the governing body of the revolutionary Irish Republic from 1919 through 1921; he was the third president of this governing body, which was dissolved upon the ratification of the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Under the provisions of the Anglo-Irish Treaty, which was not signed until December 6, 1921, the Irish Free State did not have a President, but was officially governed as a dominion of the British Empire by the King of England and represented by an Irish Governor General, an office held by Tim Healy until 1928. The office of President did not exist in Ireland until 1937 as part of the new constitution and was first held by Douglas Hyde for one seven-year term.
Joyce’s intent. Dominic Manganiello comments in *Joyce’s Politics* (1980): that “the [political] statements [Joyce] made were often ironical, and cannot always be taken at face value; that is, they were not exhortations but criticisms of helplessness, or of situations that offered no cause for hope” (3). This seems to allow room for Joyce to support the rebellion as easily as Budgen claims that he may not have. Despite Joyce’s propensity to obscure his intentions in such a way, the consensus among early scholars was to take his words at face value and to give his pacifist and modernist sensibilities more credit than his nationalist leanings. Wyndham Lewis’ earlier assertion that there need be no separation between nationalism and modernism seems to have fallen on deaf ears among many of Joyce’s critics.

In the 1980s a shift began to take place in the study of Joyce and of *Ulysses* in particular. The rise of theoretical investigations into Joyce’s work sparked by Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer’s *Post-Structuralist Joyce* (1984) produced more than two decades of major breakthroughs in the way readers encounter *Ulysses*. Michael and Paula Gillespie (2000) look back on this theoretical phase of investigation as it reached its climax: “The radical shift in forms of analysis and the incredible expansion of subjects for consideration sparked an exponential growth of interpretive responses to *Ulysses*” (9). They explain, however, that these new methods of inquiry grew out of the foundational work of the previous generation of scholars, stating that “without these foundational readings little of the current work on *Ulysses* could have developed” (9). Andrew Gibson and Len Platt (2006) also reflect on this phase and the new investigative doors it opened. “The theoretical turn in Joyce studies,” they say, “called universals into question. It
asked awkward questions about their ideological bases. It opened up the possibility of reading Joyce in terms of particularisms” (1). They assert that this theoretical phase had run its course by the early 2000s, but, as Michael and Paula Gillespie did to the previous generation, they also give tremendous credit to this period for widening the scope of investigative methods regarding Joyce’s art that were previously considered incompatible, including the cultural, historical, and political aspects of *Ulysses* as well as genetic approaches to the text.\(^{16}\)

In Margot Norris’ feminist investigation, *Joyce’s Web* (1992), she reveals that there are, indeed, direct connections between Joyce’s art and politics, and that previous assumptions about modernism’s incompatibility with politics were not sound. Soon after Norris’ groundbreaking work, Enda Duffy released his post-colonial study, *The Subaltern Ulysses* (1994), which argues that Joyce was using *Ulysses* partly as a subversive means of directly attacking the foundations of British colonialism. Duffy’s work seems to solidify Lewis’ notion that a modernist novel can also deliver a direct political message. Launching the first such post-colonial discussion of Joyce’s novel, Duffy explores the political elements in the Telemachiad and in the “Cyclops” episode revealing that *Ulysses* is a text intricately tied to Ireland’s history as a British colony and claims that it is “*the* text of Ireland’s independence” (3). While Duffy does present a new perspective on Joyce’s work, his scope is limited to sections of the novel in which politics are already overtly part of the dialogue or narration. Norris and Duffy ushered in a flood of theoretical readings of Joyce’s work, which in turn opened the doors to later

\(^{16}\) See Introduction for a brief history of the progression of genetic criticism.
investigations based more in the historical aspects of Joyce’s politics and his representations of Ireland’s struggle for independence.

Two more investigations soon followed that helped to further this shifting paradigm and to show that Joyce was as politically engaged as he was artistically. *Joyce, Race, and Empire* (1995) by Vincent Cheng shows a clear move away from theoretical discourse and towards the historical, but he clearly establishes his investigation in post-colonial theory. He argues that Joyce’s work is the product of “a highly self-conscious Irish writer who was hardly apolitical but who was, rather, deeply steeped … in the very hues and textures of the complex political fabrics of a radicalized and colonized Irish state” (289). Written too soon on its heels to engage directly with Duffy’s study, Cheng unknowingly expands Duffy’s political scope beyond the Telemachiad and “Cyclops” to include the “Aeolus,” “Circe,” “Eumaeus,” and “Ithaca” episodes as well. Like, Duffy, however, Cheng sticks to the dialogue and narration that is already overtly politically charged.

That same year, and as part of the same shift toward the historical, Emer Nolan’s *James Joyce and Nationalism* broke new ground in the assessment of Joyce as a politically focused modernist. Nolan takes great pains to dismantle the perceptions of the previous generations that Joyce was a pacifist and apolitical, and demonstrates that nationalist politics are intricately woven into the text of *Ulysses* and that to ignore this has been a great error on the part of previous critics. She credits Wyndham Lewis’ earlier, and largely ignored, assessment with the accuracy that it deserves regarding Joyce’s political expression. Recalling his *Time and Western Man*, Nolan explains:
‘Joyce and Yeats are the prose and poetry respectively of the Ireland that culminated in the Rebellion’ of 1916. For Lewis, Joyce’s writing offers not a rebuke to the nationalist revolution, and to the ideologies which inspired its protagonists, but the ‘prose’ of that rebellion. (13; W. Lewis 93)

Thus Nolan’s main purpose is to set the record straight regarding Joyce in terms of nationalist politics and the perceived incompatibility of modernism and nationalism.

In her preface and introduction to the study, Nolan carefully examines the history of criticism of Joyce’s politics and determines that:

these [earlier] interpretations symptomatize a crucial failure on his critics’ part to attend to the full complexity of nationalism in the political culture of modernity. The cliché of Joyce’s ‘ambivalence’ towards Ireland suggests mere confusion or ambiguity: we have overlooked the determinate nature of this response, which in fact corresponds to a dialectic fundamental to both modernism and nationalism. (14)

Nolan explains that “nationalisms vary, and are internally divided and disputatious” and that Joyce’s criticism of certain nationalist ideas held by specific groups did not indicate political ambivalence on his part, but rather a deeply complex political outlook that did not coincide with any particular political group (14). She is careful to state that her intention is not to reframe the novel in such a way “that a certain reading of Joyce might facilitate the revelation of his true Irishness, or that his works might be handed back to Irish people cleansed of their difficulty and their political complexity” (15). Her study focuses on both textual and contextual elements of the novel and reveals that the question of Joyce and nationalism is far more complex that it has been perceived:

[T]he material the text supplies for a diagnosis of the economic and political malaise of the group of lower middle-class men who constitute its primary focus, its descriptions of their proneness to alcoholism, violence and debt … and of the bleak lives of their dependants, especially the Dedalus family … powerfully suggests Joyce’s hostility to British colonial
rule in Ireland. But for many commentators, this does not amount to nationalism: … it in fact adds up to something a great deal more radical and valuable, exposing the contradictions and weaknesses inherent in the nationalist project from the start. (56-57)

This complexity in terms of the actual lived experience of the characters, and not just what they think or say, opens the entire novel up to historical scrutiny from several perspectives of nationalist ideology.

Andrew Gibson (2002) delves further into Irish nationalist ideology in *Ulysses* and views it as a response to a concurrent rise in *English* nationalism. He establishes that at the time Joyce was writing *Ulysses*, England was losing its grip on various parts of its world-wide empire, and thus encouraged a unity of English interests both at home and abroad. Gibson explores the novel as a complex discourse with English nationalist ideas from an Irish perspective, where this celebration of all things English “was likely to seem both alien and profoundly suspect” (*Joyce’s Revenge*, 11). His investigation of *Ulysses* as a form of linguistic revenge against English oppressors pushes beyond overt political discussions into contextual situations in the novel and even the very language that Joyce employs. Gibson then teamed up with Len Platt (2006) to assert that the previous views of Joyce as a modernist artist completely removed from local politics, via theoretical then historical investigations, have now shifted to see Joyce “as a harbinger, even a prophet, of a new, modern nation” and that this new generation of scholars “did not see Joyce’s self-exile as implying either a renunciation or a devaluation of Irish culture. They saw his work as everywhere involved in the treatment of Irish historical, political, and cultural themes” (*Joyce, Ireland, Britain*, 13).
It is from this new twenty-first century perspective that Greg Winston begins his study of Joyce’s relationship with institutionalized violence in his 2012 *Joyce and Militarism*. Winston notes that each of Joyce’s major works was published in a year defined by violent military action in Ireland or elsewhere in Europe:

*Dubliners* appeared in 1914, at the outbreak of the First World War. Critics often cite the Easter Rising and the publication of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, both of which occurred in 1916, as parallel political and literary assertions of the coming of age of the Irish nation. The publication of *Ulysses* in February 1922, was less than two months after the Anglo-Irish Treaty and a few months prior to the Civil War. Lastly, when *Finnegans Wake* appeared in 1939, Joyce complained to Samuel Beckett about how it was being upstaged by the westward advances of the German army, which had already displaced Joyce and his family from Paris. (4)

Winston argues that the material of Joyce’s work reflects these events in the rejection of violence and military practices. Winston launches a historical analysis of Joyce’s major works to reveal that:

Joyce’s literary response to the military presence is often subtle, entrenched, and difficult to detect at first glance. It is specifically inscribed as image, metaphor, allusion, theme, and motif; it assumes the shape of character and conflict, structure and setting, perspective and style. In all its subtlety, the material element in Joyce is frequent and ubiquitous… revealing the significant tug of physical-force ideology on the broader social fabric as well as the individual life. (12)

Winston demonstrates the pervasive and near constant presence of both British and Irish military influences in Joyce’s work and how this culture of institutionalized violence becomes a detrimental aspect of the social context of Joyce’s characters.
III. A Man and a Nation Conflicted

It is well documented that Joyce was tight-lipped about politics during the time he was writing *Ulysses*. As noted above, Budgen and Ellmann both take pains to demonstrate that Joyce was “uncommunicative” and that his political interests appeared to trail off after his move to Zurich in 1915. While these claims may be true, they do not necessarily indicate that Joyce’s strong political leanings disappeared, but rather that something else was happening at the time. Herbert Gorman (1948) points out that Joyce had to take an oath of political neutrality before being allowed to leave Austrian-controlled Trieste and to bring his family into Switzerland as the war was expanding across Europe (229-30). Not wanting to risk having his wife and young children forced out of a neutral safe-haven during a war, Joyce reasonably decided to keep his strong political views to himself. He did so until the war was over and he returned to Trieste in October 1919. By this point he had completed the early versions of the first twelve episodes of *Ulysses*, and was sending them to *The Little Review* (the first ten episodes also went to Pound’s *The Egoist*) as he completed them.

The people who met Joyce during his time in Switzerland would certainly have formed the opinion that he was unconcerned with politics due to his strict adherence to the oath of neutrality.\(^\text{17}\) Thus the reports of his early critics were earnest in their claims of disinterest in politics, but unaware of Joyce’s strong socialist leanings and dislike of England’s colonial influence over the Irish. Joyce’s relationship with Irish politics was

\(^{17}\) Joyce received letters from the British Consulate in Zurich in both 1916 and 1917 asking him to report for military service. Joyce declined to respond in accordance with his oath. In his efforts to secure permission to start the acting company, The English Players, he sought permission from the Consul who rebuked him for his failure to report for duty, but granted his permission nonetheless (Ellmann 436).
complicated, but never flagging. Groden notes that Joyce kept himself apprised of the events that led directly to the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921, including the 1916 Easter Rising and the subsequent execution of several of its leaders, Sinn Féin’s victory in the 1918 elections, the formation of the Dáil Éireann, and the events of the Anglo-Irish War beginning in 1919 (Ulysses in Focus, 132). Joyce’s unique situation allowed him to continue to follow the events in Ireland, but forced him to remain silent about them lest he “compound a felony” and risk his family’s security (Ellmann 455). It is understandable then that his critics could have formed the opinion that he was apolitical or at the very least ambiguous about Irish politics.

This ambiguity extends also to the content of his actual political pronouncements. Nolan asserts that, “it represents just the kind of symptomatic ambiguity in his political thought which has been so misleadingly simplified to an idea of impeccable fair-mindedness” (129). Nolan points out Joyce’s inconsistencies in essays like “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages” in which he presents examples of Ireland’s self-betrayal, specifically that “the Anglo-Norman invasion … was instigated by an Irish king, and that the Act of Union was legislated by an Irish Parliament” (129). Joyce quickly counters these historical events with claims that “[w]hen a victorious country tyrannizes over another, it cannot logically be considered wrong for that other to rebel” (CW 163). Despite the fact that Joyce abhorred violence in any form, he makes room in his philosophy for the perpetrators of certain acts of retaliatory violence to be considered free of guilt. This allows him and his characters to express disdain for the Phoenix Park
Murders, for example, but to still have sympathy for the Invincibles who committed them.

In essence, Joyce was a socialist nationalist who disagreed with preemptory acts of violence, and who also felt that the Revivalists’ longing for a romanticized past was insufficient for a complex modern national identity. His ridicule of the Revivalist movement is made clear in his treatment of the popular images of the harp and of the Sean Bhean Bhocht, which will be investigated in more detail below. In the more general political sense, however, Joyce made his support for Irish independence very clear despite the fact that he did not see eye to eye with any particular nationalist group, and despite the fact that he could not openly discuss the matter while living in Switzerland and writing the bulk of *Ulysses*.18 The fact that he could not publicly advocate for Irish independence from England and that he did not identify with any nationalist organizations does not erase his stated desire to see Ireland become a self-determined nation.

I will launch my genetic investigation into the nationalist ideology presented by Joyce throughout *Ulysses* from the historical and political stages set by Nolan and Winston. My research will focus on the systematic textual expansion of these ideas as Joyce neared the publication of *Ulysses*, including the nationalist elements that Joyce either added to the previously written episodes or those included in the composition of the later episodes during the final months before the novel’s publication. Joyce added

---

18 In his introduction to Joyce’s *Occasional, Critical, and Political Writings* (2000), Kevin Barry transcribes an uncollected letter that Joyce wrote to an Italian publisher proposing that he print a collection of Joyce’s Trieste essays on Irish politics, all of which support Irish independence. The publisher declined, but Joyce continued to edit his essays, having several set in typescript for an English language publication that never came to fruition. (*OCPW*, x-xii)
these elements throughout the novel to the dialogue and narration, but a large number of them were added to the characterization of Leopold Bloom. Since Joyce began writing *Ulysses* in earnest in 1914, the final six to twelve months represent a very small period of those seven years, but one in which Joyce made dramatic changes to the novel’s structure, style, and content. My investigation will differ greatly from previous examinations of the politics of *Ulysses* in that I will carefully examine the chronological process by which Joyce composed and changed the political landscape of the novel and its characters over time. I do not wish to suggest that Joyce was exclusively or even primarily focused on creating a more nationalist novel at the time, but that filling the novel with hints and gestures toward nationalist ideas was one goal, among many others, that Joyce accomplished during this intensely productive and intensely creative part of the novel’s composition.

Since very little survives of Joyce’s early work on *Ulysses*, this investigation will begin with the novel as it was serialized in the American literary magazine, *The Little Review*, beginning in 1918 and the documents used to prepare those episodes; earlier documents (notebooks, drafts, etc.) will be used as a starting point where available. Only the first thirteen complete episodes and the first installment of the fourteenth, “Oxen of the Sun,” appeared in *The Little Review* before the publication was shut down by US authorities in 1920 and the publishers were fined and nearly jailed for printing obscenity. The four later episodes were written either partially or entirely as Joyce was revising the

---

19 Most of the additions to the text examined in this chapter were made on the typescripts and proofs between late June of 1921 and early January of 1922. Several examples, however, were added to the early drafts and holographic manuscripts of the later episodes as early as January 1921.
earlier episodes for publication as a complete novel. The revision and draft documents
reveal the process by which Joyce framed the dramatic political changes in the novel as a
whole and in the further development of his characters, none more so than his everyman,
Leopold Bloom.

My primary reason for returning to Bloom’s development throughout the revision
process is that his transformation was more dramatic than that of any other character.
Stephen Dedalus is frequently vocal about his political views regarding British
colonialism and Ireland’s subservient position within the British Empire, but these ideas
were part of Joyce’s early conception of the “Telemachiad” episodes and he made
relatively few alterations to them during revisions. Bloom on the other hand was
changed dramatically regarding his political views during just the last few months before
the novel was complete. There may be many reasons for this as will be detailed below,
but simply put, Joyce, as he mentioned to Budgen, grew tired of Stephen and placed his
primary focus on Bloom who was a more malleable character (Budgen 105). Historical
and personal events also played into Joyce’s decisions, but it was clear that it would be
Bloom who was going to receive the lion’s share of Joyce’s attention as the novel neared
completion, and it would primarily be Bloom whom Joyce would choose to reflect his
own political views regarding Irish independence.

---

20 Budgen describes exchanges with Joyce after having read or heard sections of the *Ulysses* manuscripts.
“Joyce's first question when I had read a completed episode or when he had read out a passage of an
uncompleted one was always: 'How does Bloom strike you?'” A short time later Joyce told Budgen that
“Stephen no longer interests me to the same extent. He has a shape that can't be changed.”
IV. The Nationalist Revisions

As illustrated by the example that opens this chapter, during the final revisions for the novel, Joyce added so many nationalist references that he transformed Leopold Bloom from a politically disinterested character into one with heavy nationalist leanings and a history of participation in political events. He did much the same for the novel as a whole in that he added many references to nationalist ideas and figures to the narration and to the dialogue of many characters. During the months between June 1921 and January 1922, Joyce was simultaneously revising the episodes he had previously written and composing the final episodes for the novel. There are many instances in which his revisions affected changes in the later episodes, and vice versa. Thanks to the fact that most of the typescripts and several of the notebooks have been accurately dated, it is now possible to see which additions influenced the others. There are also many more instances in which Joyce simply added new, uncollected material to Bloom’s thoughts and words that helped to alter his characterization. Due to the limits of space, this chapter can only highlight a very small sample of these additions; the entire list can be seen in Appendix A. In order to illustrate the depths to which Joyce took his alteration of the novel’s political leanings, I will begin with the nationalist anachronisms to illustrate that Joyce was undoubtedly expressing a political opinion regarding the events that led to Ireland’s independence. I will then investigate the additions of references to the Homer-worthy catalogue of nationalist groups, figures, and organizations that Joyce scattered throughout the novel. The final section will examine Irish patriotic symbolism focusing primarily on Joyce’s inclusion of the potato as a polysemous symbol for Ireland. When
considered as a whole, this chapter aims to paint a picture of James Joyce as an Irish exile who was so deeply concerned with Irish politics and independence that he took extreme measures during his final months of revision (when he was finally free to write and speak as he pleased) to express those views through his characters and through the very language of *Ulysses* in order to make the novel, as Lewis asserted, the very prose of Irish independence.

A. “Going to be trouble there one day”: The Nationalist Anachronisms

Famously a strict adherent to details and facts, Joyce often wrote to his family and friends in Dublin to have them provide details needed for the novel. Examples include the time it took to walk between certain points in the city, and whether or not it would be possible to climb over the iron fence and drop safely down to the lower level of the house located at 7 Eccles Street (Ellmann 519). When it came to expressing his nationalist beliefs, however, Joyce proved himself to be not as strict an adherent to historical accuracy. He included several anachronistic allusions to events that would not take place for many years after the events of the novel, including references to World War I, the 1916 Easter Rising, and the Irish War of Independence among others.

During the Autumn of 1921, Ireland was inching closer to becoming the Irish Free State, and Joyce was in Paris working furiously to complete his revisions. During this time, Irish independence had become a certainty, and Joyce was free to insert hints at Ireland’s future in his novel set more than seventeen years in the past. Groden’s observation, mentioned above, that Joyce kept himself apprised of political events in
Ireland but was forced to remain silent suggests that Joyce may have been waiting until such a time that he no longer had to remain silent to use this information. Once the First World War was over and he moved his family out of neutral Switzerland, Joyce was free to express himself as he pleased, and during these late revisions, he made several references to those events of which he kept such close tabs. Moving chronologically from the 1904 events of the novel to the relative present of Joyce’s revision period, he added specific references to events that had not yet happened. This chapter will investigate three of these anachronisms. Two of them are passing mentions of place names, and the other is a direct prediction of future events. By 1921 and the dawning of an independent Irish nation, these places and events had gained a public significance that could not be overlooked by those early readers who were aware of these events that led to Ireland’s freedom.

The first anachronistic reference, and the closest to the time of the novel, is to the events leading up to the first World War, which opened the doors to the Easter Rising of 1916. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914 set off a chain reaction of political alliances around the world eventually drawing over sixty-five million military personnel into action, and resulting in the deaths of twenty million soldiers and civilians (Clark xxiii). The number of Irish deaths ranges between the official British Army calculation of 27,405 to 49,400 according to the official number calculated by Defense Forces Ireland.21 Regardless of the actual number of casualties, this was a

---

21 The British Army calculation of 27,405 includes only those Irish soldiers who served in the British military (Fitzpatrick 392). The Defense Forces Ireland calculation of 49,400 includes all Irish soldiers regardless of what army they fought for, as many served in the United States army as well as other European allied countries (Defense Forces Ireland).
devastating loss for Ireland and for all people and nations involved, but Ireland’s political climate made it especially significant for the nationalist cause.

While drafting the “Cyclops” episode, Joyce included a direct prediction of World War I. Michael Groden (2010) identifies this prediction in Joyce’s early manuscripts for the episode during a conversation between Cusack (later renamed “The Citizen”), O’Madden Burke (later replaced with the new character, “Pisser” Burke), and Ned Lambert (131). Despite the fact that he revised the scene twice, Joyce eventually deleted it entirely. The earliest drafts of this scene are from around June 1919—the time Joyce was actively composing the episode and testing out conversational elements between the radical nationalists in the pub. In one of these elements, Joyce includes the following exchange:22

—Strangle the last king with the guts windpipe of the last priest. We want neither French nor Germans. {We want ourselves. Sinn Fein. Sinn fein amhain.}
—I tell you what it is says —, there’s a war coming for the English and the Germans will give them a hell of a gate going. {What they got from the Boers is only what you might call an hors d’oeuvre}
—But aren’t you saying? says —
—I know what I’m after saying, says —. But this time, whether they win or lose, they’ll have to fight their match not naked Zulus to mow them down with machine guns or Ashantimen with tomahawks {puttyknives} in their hands. Not likely! They’ll be up against an army that’ll kill a man for every man they kill. Wait till you see. (Buffalo MS V.A.8, p. 19v; JJA 13.120; Transcribed in Herring Notes p. 169)

22 In a revision later that month, Joyce added to this exchange and identified the speakers as Cusack, Burke, and Lambert, respectively (Buffalo MS V.A.6, p. 3; JJA 13.134c; Transcribed by Herring in Joyce’s Notes, 180-81).
Joyce left the names out of this early draft, but in a later revision identified the speaker who predicts the war as O’Madden Burke. This clear prediction of brutality between two of the war’s primary antagonists recalls some of the Irish resentment regarding the English actions in the Boer War and the emotional vitriol with which these Irish nationalists view the English monarchy. Curiously, Joyce does not allow Burke to predict a loss for the English at the hands of their military equals, as many Irish nationalists would have wanted. Instead, Joyce gives him the prescience to see the devastating loss of human life on both sides, and leaves the predicted outcome of the war undecided.

In a rare instance of deletion, Joyce scrapped this entire conversation by the time it was ready for public consumption in *The Little Review* between November 1919 and March 1920. Perhaps he did not want this level prescience and example of higher thought going to such a group of thugs and ruffians as the violent and radical Fenians gathered in the pub. Not one to let a good element go to waste, however, Joyce reused the prediction of World War I in another part of the novel. In late September 1921, as he was revising the “Aeolus” episode for the sixth time in less than three months, Joyce endowed Myles Crawford, editor of *The Evening Telegraph*, with the foresight to predict the cause of the Great War. *The Evening Telegraph* is the paper for which Bloom sells advertising, and it also shared office space with *The Freeman’s Journal*, a less radical nationalist publication than *The United Irishman* read by The Citizen and his friends in the pub. Crawford in this scene has just been handed a copy of Mr. Deasy’s letter

---

23 By the time the first section of “Cyclops” appeared in *The Little Review* in November of 1919, Joyce had swapped the original character of O’Madden Burke (a character from “A Mother” and a friend of Stephen Dedalus) for the new character, Andrew “Pisser” Burke, who either lived at or frequented the City Arms Hotel at the same time as the Blooms lived there (Gifford 137, 333).
concerning foot and mouth disease by Stephen. As he glances over the letter and reads
the occasional word or phrase aloud, he reminds those listening that an Irishman named
O’Donnell saved the life of the Habsburg Emperor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in
1853 (Gifford 138). Before the addition of the anachronistic reference to the war, the
scene read as follows:

—Ay, a grass one; Myles Crawford said, his eye running down the typescript.
Emperor’s horses. Habsburg. An Irishman saved his life on the ramparts of
Vienna. Don't you forget! Maximilian Karl O'Donnell, graf von Tirconnell in
Ireland. Wild Geese, O yes, every time. Don't you forget that! (LR V.6 38)

Here Crawford simply refers to the fact that Ireland’s “Wild Geese” or expatriates have
played proud, significant roles in historical events. Joyce’s revision to this scene makes
reference to more recent historical events:

—Ay, a grass one; Myles Crawford said, his eye running down the typescript.
Emperor’s horses. Habsburg. An Irishman saved his life on the ramparts of
Vienna. Don’t you forget! Maximilian Karl O'Donnell, graf von Tirconnell in
Ireland. **Sent his heir over to make the king an Austrian fieldmarshall now.**
**Going to be trouble there one day.** Wild Geese, O yes, every time. Don't you
forget that! (U 7.539–44, emphasis mine)

In this new addition, Crawford is referring to the failed attempt by Edward VII in 1903 to
charm the Austrian Alliance’s allegiance away from Germany by making the emperor an
honorary field marshall of the British army. In response, on June 9, 1904 (exactly one
week before the setting of the novel) the emperor sent his heir, the Archduke Franz
Ferdinand, on a state visit to England. During this visit, the archduke unceremoniously
handed Edward VII the baton of an Austrian field marshall (Gifford 138). This political
rebuff sent the clear message that the Austrians were not interested in switching their
alliances. Crawford, a newspaper editor who would certainly have recognized the
potential ramifications of such tensions, accurately predicts the trouble that would start
the first World War. It was the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand that set off the chain
of events, eventually bringing most of the world into the conflict. Joyce, here, is making a
reference to events that his readers would clearly recognize as an accurate prediction of
the “trouble” that started the war. It is far more subtle than the deleted scene from
“Cyclops,” but a clear reference to the first World War just the same.

The next anachronism according to historical chronology (as opposed to the
chronology of Joyce’s revisions) makes reference to the 1916 Easter Rising. By the time
Joyce was revising *Ulysses* in 1921, the General Post Office (GPO) was known
internationally as the stronghold of the Irish rebels during the Easter Rising. On that
Easter Monday the nationalist group, the Irish Volunteers, led by Patrick Pearse and
James Connolly, and joined by the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) and the Irish
Citizen Army (ICA), took control of the GPO and used it as their headquarters and as the
location of Pearse’s proclamation of Ireland as an independent nation (Campbell-Smith
259-60). The selection of the GPO as opposed to Dublin Castle—the actual seat of
British Rule in Dublin—was more symbolic than strategic, according to Duncan
Campbell-Smith. The grandeur of its immense size and giant pillars in the center of
Dublin’s busiest thoroughfare made it a much more populist statement than if they had
occupied the castle, which was isolated and largely hidden behind large stone walls.
Fearghal McGarry asserts that the selection of the GPO, along with the other positions
around the city, emphasized the symbolic nature of the event, that it was more of a
citizens’ revolt than an attempted *coup d’état* (122-23). Its location would also have guaranteed a larger crowd for Pearse when he delivered his proclamation and thus garnered more public support than militarily strategic positioning. The nationalist rebels held their positions in the GPO and other rebel-held areas throughout the city for six days as British warships demolished much of the city between the river and the occupied GPO.

Immediately after the rebels were forced to surrender, the rebellion was seen by many Dubliners as “little more than a futile gesture” to which most of the population refused to seriously commit. It was not until the executions of the rebel leaders that public opinion slowly began to turn. McGarry notes that “[f]or various reasons, including their timing, rationale, and emotional impact, the executions played a pivotal role in the transformation of public opinion from hostility toward the rebels to an emotional identification with their cause” (269). Most significantly and most upsetting to Irish sensibilities, the execution of James Connolly was seen as a great indignity and insult to a dying man. Connolly was seriously injured during the rebellion and had to be brought to the jail by ambulance, carried to the firing squad on a stretcher, and then

---

24 The other locations occupied by the rebels included the Four Courts, the South Dublin Union, the area around Boland’s Bakery near the Grand Canal, Jacob’s Factory south of Dublin Castle, and the College of Surgeons near St. Stephen’s Green (McGarry 122-23).

25 The GPO and the Four Courts were the only rebel locations to surrender that day despite Pearse’s official surrender order. The other rebel strongholds remained reluctant to give up and held out for one more day (McGarry 247-249).

26 Of the ninety rebels initially sentenced to death, only fifteen had their sentences upheld and carried out (McGarry xxii).

27 The web site, RareIrishStuff.com, which primarily sells Irish collectibles and pub decor, also maintains Facebook and Twitter pages. They frequently post historical images of Irish people and places and invite their followers to leave comments. A post from May 12, 2014 shows a photo of the Stone Breaker’s Yard at Kilmainham Gaol with a cross marking the spot where Connolly was executed. The comments left by followers reflect the outrage and sense of patriotism still present in the Irish people that the executions inspired nearly 100 years ago (Rare Irish Stuff).
propped up in a chair. A witness statement to the execution claims that “he was probably drugged and almost dead” and that the firing squad’s barrage blew out the back of the chair (McGarry 276). Adding insult to injury, the rebels were buried unceremoniously in a mass grave. As word spread about these indignities, public opinion shifted to the cause of independence, and the newly formed Sinn Féin party swept the January 1918 elections, paving the way for the formation of the Dáil Éireann, the War of Independence, and eventual freedom from British control.

Joyce’s early readers would have been keenly aware of these events and of the symbolic cultural significance that the GPO had gained in the wake of the Rising. As he was making these final revisions, Ireland had just ended the War of Independence. Ireland had reached a truce with England and was negotiating the terms of the Anglo-Irish Treaty that would be signed only one month before the publication of Ulysses. Joyce knew that even the slightest mention of the General Post Office would carry with it all of the weight of the Easter Rising and its ramifications, both good and bad.

In his revisions to the “Aeolus” episode, Joyce not only added the ubiquitous headlines, but he also added several paragraphs to the beginning of the episode firmly establishing its setting as the center of Sackville (now O’Connell) Street concluding with the following description:

\[\text{Under the porch of the general post office shoeblocks called and polished.}\]
\[\text{Parked in North Prince's street His Majesty’s vermilion mailcars,}\]

---

28 Bureau of Military History Witness Statement (BMHWS) 979 (Robert Barton), qtd. in McGarry 276.

29 Gabler’s symbols denoting the order of insertion into the text have been left intact in order to facilitate the discussion that follows.
bearing on their sides the royal initials, E. R., received loudly flung sacks of letters, postcards, lettercards, parcels, insured and paid, for local, provincial, British and overseas delivery.\textsuperscript{21} (UCSE 238, emphasis mine)

Here, Joyce not only brings the General Post Office into the novel by name, he follows it with blatant and painful reminders of Ireland’s occupation by the British monarchy. His first addition to this section was simply the location of the GPO where the shoeblocks call for potential clients. In the next set of placards for this episode, however, Joyce went back to this section and added much more detail. He broke the section off under a separate headline recalling the power of British rule. Referring to the King of England in reference to the GPO as “The Wearer of the Crown,” Joyce recalls the position of the building as a symbol of occupation in the same way the rebels did when they chose it as the site of their rebellion instead of Dublin Castle. Thousands of people passed by its imposing façade every day, and it remained a symbol of British power until after the Easter Rising. Joyce doubled down on the references to the crown by adding an entirely new sentence containing several details about the workings of the postal service, and how these were reminders, in and of themselves, of the occupation. He calls attention to the action on the royally named “North Prince’s Street,” which runs perpendicular to Sackville Street next to the post office and is clearly named after a British royal family member. The mailcars carrying the sacks of letters are not only identified as “His Majesty’s” property, but they are also “vermillion” or bright red—the color of British military uniforms. After the establishment of the Irish Free State, the color of all post office property, including the mailcars, was changed to green, the color representing Irish freedom and the color worn symbolically by the 1916 rebels. As if beating the readers
over the head with royal symbols, Joyce adds one more detail in this sentence about the mailcars—they bear “the royal initials, E. R.” for Edward Rex, the official ceremonial initials of Edward VII. By mentioning the GPO Joyce recalls the horrific violence that set the stage for the freedom Ireland was only starting to experience in 1922. By adding the details about the British royalty one after another, Joyce is reopening a wound that for the Irish was just beginning to heal. These additions to “Aeolus” are clear allusions to the brutality of the English during the rebellion and the war that followed, and are painful reminders of the oppression from which they had just escaped.

Joyce added one more anachronism referring to a tragic event that eventually led to Irish independence—the Sack of Balbriggan. As the War of Independence heated up throughout Ireland in 1919, Winston Churchill, then British Secretary of State for War, devised a plan to employ British military veterans from the first World War and to help the British police force maintain control in Ireland. The Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC) was the primary police force in Ireland, and they were being overwhelmed by the guerrilla tactics of the IRA. Churchill organized an auxiliary force for the IRC that came to be known as the “Black and Tans” due to the colors of their khaki trousers and dark tunics. This auxiliary force soon became infamous for their brutal treatment of Irish civilians in their attempts to root out IRA subversives, and for their unofficial “reprisals” against civilians for IRA attacks whether confirmed or not. One such brutal reprisal took place in the town of Balbriggan, a small industrial town north of Dublin.

Yeats directly addresses these brutalities against civilians in the poems “Reprisals” (1920, though not published until 1948) and “Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen” (1921).
Balbriggan was famous for being the home of Smith’s Stocking Mill that produced hosiery and long-john-style undergarments. Their products were world famous and were often copied by lesser-quality manufacturers looking to capitalize on their reputation (Parliament 1731-32). The Balbriggan tragedy started with the killing of an off-duty British police officer on September 20, 1920. Accounts vary as to exactly what led to the death of the policeman, but common elements indicate that there was some sort of loud exchange between the officer and the patrons of a local public house, and that he refused to leave the pub when asked by the local Republican volunteer officers. It was confirmed that he never identified himself as a policeman. At some point he drew his weapon and was fired upon and killed. Local British officials initially agreed that the off-duty policeman was the aggressor in the incident and no charges were filed. Black and Tan forces at the nearby Gormanston barracks where the deceased officer was in training, however, planned a reprisal attack against the town as revenge for the killing. Later that same night, the Black and Tan forces invaded the town, murdering two suspected Sinn Féin members and setting fire to Smith’s Stocking Mill as well as to four public houses and forty-nine houses of private citizens (McKenna 102). For the next week frightened citizens were forced to sleep out in the fields surrounding the town as Black and Tan forces continued to patrol the area and set fire to other houses. An American newsletter published on October 2, 1920 twelve days after the initial violence, noted that “houses were soaked in petrol and left to burn through the night,” and that the citizens were warned that if they tried to bury their dead at a public funeral the Black and Tans “would
return to complete the destruction of the town, and increase the list of the dead” (National Bureau of Information 2).

The brutality and violence of the unjustified attacks by the Black and Tans made international headlines at a time, according to Michael Hopkinson, “when imperialism was at its least popular and the rights of small nations uppermost in international councils” (80). The official response by the British government was to condemn the attacks, but little was done to stop or even discourage the violence, and it continued throughout Ireland until the truce of July 1921. In the wake of this incident, Hopkinson notes, “Balbriggan … will always be synonymous with reprisal” (81). Joyce took advantage of this unfortunate synonym in the “Cyclops” episode, which he began revising around the first anniversary of the Sack of Balbriggan. The truce had only recently been signed and there was much distrust and fear among the Irish toward the British. For Joyce, Balbriggan was likely still a fresh memory and a fresh source of outrage.

*The Little Review* published the “Cyclops” episode in four installments between November 1919 and March 1920. In the episode, a “parodist” intrudes into the narration several times to describe what is going on in Burke’s pub in various, over-the-top styles. The third such intrusion describes the clothes worn by the Citizen, and mocks the overly romantic language of Irish legends and the Revivalists. The section in question originally read:

He wore a long unsleeved garment of recently flayed oxhide reaching to the knees in a loose kilt and this was bound about his middle by a girdle of plaited straw and rushes. Beneath this he wore trews of deerskin, roughly stitched
with gut. His nether extremities were encased in high buskins dyed in lichen purple, the feet being shod with brogues of salted cowhide laced with the windpipe of the same beast. From his girdle hung a row of seastones which jangled at every movement of his portentous frame and on these were graven with rude yet striking art the tribal images of many heroes of antiquity. (*Ulysses: Episode XII* 42)

This passage is a description of a typical ancient hero from Irish myth wearing animal skins dyed with local plants. Joyce took advantage of the former reputation of the famous stocking mill, and the notoriety of the name of the town, and included it in the parody:

> He wore a long unsleeved garment of recently flayed oxhide reaching to the knees in a loose kilt and this was bound about his middle by a girdle of plaited straw and rushes. Beneath this he wore trews of deerskin, roughly stitched with gut. His nether extremities were encased in high Balbriggan buskins dyed in lichen purple, the feet being shod with brogues of salted cowhide laced with the windpipe of the same beast. From his girdle hung a row of seastones which jangled at every movement of his portentous frame and on these were graven with rude yet striking art the tribal images of many heroes of antiquity. (*UCSE* 640)

This addition of the name Balbriggan to the passage does not actually make sense in any context. There was, of course, no such stocking mill in ancient Ireland, the mill that did produce stockings did not produce buskins or boots, and the mention of the town is completely out of place within the parody. There is no clear justification for the insertion of the name other than as a reminder to readers that the town, the destroyed mill, and their products are all part of a proud Irish tradition, just as the stories of the Irish heroes were. To further this connection, Joyce added a few more small details regarding the carved images on the seastones in the following round of revisions to this passage.
He wore a long unsleeved garment of recently flayed oxhide reaching to the knees in a loose kilt and this was bound about his middle by a girdle of plaited straw and rushes. Beneath this he wore trews of deerskin, roughly stitched with gut. His nether extremities were encased in high Balbriggan buskins dyed in lichen purple, the feet being shod with brogues of salted cowhide laced with the windpipe of the same beast. From his girdle hung a row of seastones which jangled at every movement of his portentous frame and on these were graven with rude yet striking art the tribal images of many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity. (UCSE 640)

Joyce makes certain that the likenesses carved on the stones are not only Irish, but also include heroines as well as the heroes. Including this detail so closely after the mention of Balbriggan, it is clear that Joyce is making a reference to the events of the Irish War of Independence that was still more than a decade away for the characters in the novel, and which relied on the heroic acts of many Irish men and women.

These anachronisms Joyce included in Ulysses function as reminders to his readers that an independent Ireland was taking shape within the larger upheaval of European politics as he was completing the novel and as the early readers were experiencing the entire novel for the first time. Joyce had no other reason to include these hints of future events to the action of the novel than to express his own nationalist/political views of the events in question. Joyce knew that the very mention of the GPO and Balbriggan are enough to recall the entire revolutionary timeline that began when the rebels staged the Easter Rising taking advantage of England’s military commitments in Europe during the First World War, and he placed them in Ulysses as an expression of his nationalist pride.

31 Although the parodist asserts here that the heroes and heroines are Irish, the catalog of names that follows includes the names of figures who are clearly not Irish, including Dante Alighieri, Napoleon Bonaparte, Cleopatra, and Gautama Buddha. Joyce’s inclusion of Balbriggan and the mention of Irish heroes and heroines in this section withstands this parodic intrusion of non-Irish figures and remains a clear anachronistic reference to the Sack of Balbriggan.
B. “Up the Boers!”: Nationalist and Patriotic Groups and Figures

In order to understand the changes that Joyce made to Bloom’s nationalist leanings in 1921, it is important to understand Bloom as he appeared to audiences in 1918. The character that readers encountered in The Little Review was relatively unconcerned with politics. When Bloom did try to recall political events, he was frequently wrong, exemplified by his inability to remember the name of James Carey, one of the political assassins called The Invincibles. Bloom first recalls the name Peter Carey, but then corrects himself with the name Peter Claver, which he then immediately dismisses in favor of the name Denis Carey (5.379-81). In the revised version of the novel, Bloom still frequently gets things wrong, but he thinks about local and national politics much more frequently than he did in the earlier version of the text, and even reveals his own participation in political events.

When Joyce began the revisions for Ulysses in 1921, he was still in the process of drafting the bulk of the final three episodes. This meant that as he was writing new material, it often had a ripple effect on the earlier material. For example, in the genesis of the “Hades” episode (episode 6), Bloom thinks of the popular song, “I Vowed that I Would Never Leave Her” by Arthur Lloyd in relation to his friend, Corny Kelleher, who always sings it while drunk; the song was added very late in the revision process. Prior to that addition, Joyce had added the song to drafts of the “Circe” episode (episode 15). These two references to the song did not quite make sense on their own, so, over the next month, Joyce added two more references to the song, one in episode 5, “The Lotus Eaters,” and a second reference in “Circe.” Due to the addition of one simple song
reference, Joyce had to spend over a month adjusting the rest of the novel in order that this one tiny detail make logical sense. Joyce did much the same thing with Bloom and a reference to the Second Boer War (1899-1902).

The Boer War ended in May 1902, just two years before the events of *Ulysses* (June 16, 1904). The invasion and brutal treatment of the “Boer” colonists (Dutch for “farmers”) over the course of the two-year war sparked outrage among many Irish who sympathized with the Boers. The Irish saw the Boers as a group being oppressed by the British Empire in a very similar manner as themselves. During the course of the war, pro-Boer demonstrations were common in Dublin despite the fact that many Irishmen had been conscripted into service by the British military to fight in the war.

In “Lestrygonians” as it appeared in the *Little Review* of July 1918, Bloom recalls just such a pro-Boer demonstration staged by a group of Trinity College medical students in protest of Joseph Chamberlain receiving an honorary degree from the prestigious college in the heart of Dublin. This protest was an actual historical event led by Maud Gonne and several other Irish Nationalists, and it was met with brutal force by the English police. In the earliest draft of the scene, Bloom remembers it as an observer who got swept up in the action. In the 1918 Rosenbach manuscript (the earliest draft available) he recalls his friend Jack Power and how he was beaten by the police that day:

---

32 Joseph Chamberlain (1836-1914) was a British politician and statesman who single-handedly defeated the possibility for Irish Home Rule in 1886. He left Gladstone’s Liberal party in protest and organized his own Liberal Unionist Party in order to ensure that Ireland could not gain complete self-determination. He attempted to work with Parnell in order to expand the powers of local Irish jurisdictions, but Parnell turned him down seeking broader freedom. Chamberlain was also one of the chief architects of the Boer War and ardent supporter of British imperialism. These facts made him extremely unpopular among the Irish, and his being granted an honorary degree from Trinity College, in the heart of Dublin, was seen as an insult to many Irish citizens (Gifford 168; Marsh).
He did come a wallop, by George. Must have cracked his skull on the cobblestones. I oughtn't to have got myself swept along with those medicals. Right here it was.
—Up the Boers!
—Three cheers for De Wet!
—We’ll hang Joe Chamberlain on a sourapple tree.
   Silly game! mob of young cubs yelling their guts out.
   (UR “Lestrygonians” 11)

In this scene, Bloom remembers getting swept up with the medical students, and Bloom identifies the “young cubs” as the shouting voices. Joyce added a few phrases to the scene when it appeared in *The Little Review* in January 1919:

He did come a wallop, by George. Must have cracked his skull on the cobblestones. I oughtn't to have got myself swept along with those medicals. All skedaddled. **Why he fixed on me.** Right here it began.
— Up the Boers!
— Three cheers for De Wet!
— We'll hang Joe Chamberlain on a sourapple tree.
   Silly billies: mob of young cubs yelling their guts out.
   (“Ulysses: Episode VIII” 37, emphasis mine)

Bloom now acknowledges that he was the focus of the policeman’s attention in the fracas, but the shouting is still attributed to the students. This particular scene remains much as it appears in *The Little Review*, but in a later scene Joyce reveals that Bloom was more involved with the demonstration than he wants to admit. The “Circe” episode, which is filled with hallucinations of both grandeur and paranoia, was first drafted between the Spring and December 1920. In this episode, Bloom follows Stephen Dedalus into Nighttown, or the area of Dublin where men would go to find prostitutes. Bloom is petrified that he will see someone he knows there or, worse yet, be approached by the police. He immediately begins hallucinating these very encounters all jumbled together in a nightmare of accusations and a flood of memories for which he feels some
sort of guilt. When Bloom is confronted by the police, he pretends to be sympathetic to the British cause (he learned his lesson with the medical students, it seems). As he is extolling his fabricated British bona fides, an unidentified voice shouts out, “Turncoat! Up the Boers! Who booed Joe Chamberlain?” (Buffalo TS V.B.13.e [31]). Bloom responds with a completely fabricated story that he both fought in and was wounded in the Boer War. This hallucinated accusation that interrupts his manufactured British sympathies likely comes from Bloom’s memory of the event described above, which reveals that it was actually Bloom who shouted “Up the Boers!” during the demonstration. It also indicates that Bloom is afraid that his actual participation in the event will be discovered by people who could harm him. Joyce has now transformed Bloom from an innocent bystander who got swept up in a crowd to the type of person who would join in the protest and shout pro-Boer slogans at the police. This reference to Chamberlain does not appear in the Buffalo V.A.19 draft of the “Circe” episode from the Spring/Summer 1920, but it first appears in the draft from January - February 1921. Later that summer, Joyce then had to go back to “Lestrygonians” and make this connection more clear to the readers.

Bloom’s anti-British leanings did not end that day during the Boer War protest. Joyce peppers his thoughts throughout the day with references (both subtle and blatant) to many anti-British figures as well as Irish nationalist figures and organizations, all of which

---

33 I qualify the source of Bloom’s guilt here with the word “likely” due to the nature of Bloom’s hallucinations and his reaction to entering this part of Dublin. Like HCE in *Finnegans Wake*, Bloom is known to proclaim his British allegiance in some cases and his Irish loyalty in others, and is also capable of feeling guilty about things he did not do, which is clear from his fear of being spotted by someone he knows. The specificity of this accusation, however, makes it much more plausible that Bloom associates the presence of British police officers with his participation in the protest, than simply feeling guilty for having witnessed it.
which Bloom thinks of in a positive light. Before the late revisions, Bloom’s thoughts frequently wander into bizarre subjects, but rarely into anything political. After Joyce’s revisions Bloom’s thoughts turn to politics at the slightest hint. The new Bloom’s memory is packed with Irish historical figures and anti-British slogans.

It makes perfect sense that Joyce would allow Bloom’s mind to recall names like Parnell and O’Connell—names that are just as familiar to Dubliners today as they were in 1904—but Joyce chose to make Bloom’s political awareness much more refined than just the casual recall of contemporary political figures. In the “Hades” episode as it first appeared in *The Little Review* in 1918, as the funeral carriage crosses the Royal Canal, Bloom sees a barge driver and thinks about the canal’s route out of the countryside, through the town of Mullingar where his daughter, Milly, is currently studying photography, and into the city. He then notes that they have nearly made it to the cemetery:

> Athlone, Mullingar, Moyvalley, I could make a walking tour to see Milly by the canal come as a surprise, Leixlip, Clonsilla. Dropping down lock by lock to Dublin. With turf from the midland bogs. Salute. He hefted his brown straw hat, saluting Paddy Dignam. They drove on. Near it now. (“Ulysses: Episode VI” 25)

Joyce altered this short scene four times between August and September of 1921, giving Bloom scattered thoughts about a bicycle for sale at an auction, the director of the Grand Canal Company, a popular song, houseboats, and transporting caskets to the cemetery via the canal. His final addition in mid September refers to one of Ireland’s ancient Kings:

> Athlone, Mullingar, Moyvalley, I could make a walking tour to see Milly by the canal. Or cycle down. Hire some old crock, safety. Wren had one the other day at the auction but a lady’s. Developing waterways. James M'Cann's hobby to row
me o’er the ferry. Cheaper transit. By easy stages. Houseboats. Camping out. Also hearse. To heaven by water. Perhaps I will without writing. Come as a surprise, Leixlip, Clonsilla. Dropping down lock by lock to Dublin. With turf from the midland bogs. Salute. He lifted his brown straw hat, saluting Paddy Dignam. They drove on past Brian Boróimhe house. Near it now. (UCSE 202)

The house that the funeral carriage passes is actually a pub, but it is the name of the pub that recalls the ancient Irish king. Brian Boróimhe was the High King of all Ireland from 1002–1014. He united most of the kingdoms in Ireland, and, according to popular lore, chased the Viking invaders from the island. Boróimhe became a romanticized nationalist symbol for Irish independence, foreign treachery, resistance to foreign occupation. In this scene, Joyce had no reason to include the name of a random pub that sat alongside the canal, but he made the name of this particular pub stand out to Bloom who was watching in quiet reflection as he rode by.35

Joyce frequently uses this technique of pointing out the things that catch Bloom’s attention without any explanation of or belaboring of the details in order to identify Bloom’s nationalist leanings. Between late August and mid September 1921, Joyce was revising the second set of placards for the “Aeolus” episode. He had already added two new opening paragraphs, dozens of rhetorical devices, most of the ubiquitous headlines that divide the episode into small, news-article-like sections, and he had corrected the

34 Brian Boróimhe defeated the Uí Néill clan and ended their long-standing reign as holders of the title “High King.” This defeat united all of Ireland under one king for the first time earning him a place of honor in Irish history. After defending Ireland and defeating a Viking invasion at Clontarf, Boróimhe was assassinated by the fleeing Viking leader, which resulted in Boróimhe becoming a national hero and martyr figure who would later assume messianic qualities in the tales that grew in his wake (see entry, “Brian Bóruma” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography).

35 It is actually the narrator who mentions the name of the pub, but it is clearly part of Bloom’s observations while looking out the carriage window. Joyce frequently uses this conflation of character and narrator in what Hugh Kenner (1978) calls the “Uncle Charles Principle” after a scene in Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Kenner points out other examples from Joyce’s writing and condenses the principle to the phrase, “the narrative idiom need not be the narrator’s” (18).
errors that occurred in the version that ran in *The Little Review* of October, 1918. On these second *placards*, Joyce added a small detail about a person leaving the newspaper office to the scene in which Bloom retrieves a copy of an old advertisement. The original version as it appeared in *The Little Review* reads:

— There it is, John Murray said. Alexander Keyes.
— Just cut it out, will you? Mr. Bloom said, and I'll take it round to the *Telegraph* office.
— The door of Ruttledge's office creaked again.

John Murray's long shears sliced out the advertisement from the newspaper in four clean strokes. (“Ulysses: Episode VII” 26)

In this version, it is unclear what or who made the door of the Business Manager’s office creak. Joyce was simply calling attention to the fact that the office was busy with people coming and going, and that the door squeaked each time someone passed through. While editing the second *placards* for the episode in August and September of 1921, Joyce decided to identify the person who made the door squeak, and to embellish his identity with hints as to his importance. The revised version of the scene reads:

— There it is, Red Murray said. Alexander Keyes.
— Just cut it out, will you? Mr Bloom said, and I'll take it round to the *Telegraph* office.

The door of Ruttledge's office creaked again. **Davy Stephens, minute in a large capecoat, a small felt hat crowning his ringlets, passed out with a roll of papers under his cape, a king's courier.**

Red Murray's long shears sliced out the advertisement from the newspaper in four clean strokes. Scissors and paste. (*U* 7.25–32)

---

36 In one such error, the opening scene of the episode in *The Little Review* contained a repetition of the entire first sentence that Joyce decided to keep, but reversed the order of the phrasing as an example of the literary device, *chiasmus*.

37 Joyce also changed the name of John Murray to that of his nickname “Red.” John “Red” Murray was Joyce’s uncle (Gifford 128).
Bloom is able to identify the man, Davy Stephens, by sight, and comments silently about his appearance. His felt hat is “crowning his ringlets,” and he is made “a king’s courier.” These details make it seem as if Bloom is noticing Stephens for his sympathies to the British crown, but the very opposite is true. Davy Stephens was a newsstand owner in what was then Kingstown (now Dun Laoghaire) who controlled the news business among boat passengers going in and out of the port town. During a visit by King Edward VII in 1903, he and Stephens had “an amusing confrontation,” in which he attempted to sell the king a newspaper, which then earned him the ironic nickname, “king’s courier” among his friends and acquaintances (Gifford 129). The fact that Bloom recalls the man’s nickname proves that he knows about the confrontation he had with Edward VII, and that this confrontation is what Bloom most associates with the famous news vendor. There is no sense of derision or negativity in Bloom’s assessment of Stephens; rather he is presented as a small man who took on the King of England—a figure with whom the revised version of Bloom would proudly associate himself.

Joyce added several other reference to figures like Stephens who stood up to the British. In “The Wandering Rocks” episode, for example, Joyce added references to two men named Lobengula and Lynchehaun to a conversation between Ben Dollard, Simon Dedalus, and Father Bob Cowley. The version from The Little Review in July 1919 appeared to readers:

Ben Dollard with a heavy list towards the shopfronts led them forward, his joyful fingers in the air.
—Come along, with me to the subsheriff’s office, he said. I saw John Henry Menton in the Bodega. We’re on the right lay, Bob, believe you me.
(“Ulysses: Episode X [cont.] 39)
Joyce revised the first set of \textit{placards} for this episode in late August of 1921. It was at this time that he inserted the names of the two men:

Ben Dollard with a heavy list towards the shopfronts led them forward, his joyful fingers in the air.

—Come along with me to the subsheriff’s office, he said. \textbf{I want to show you the new beauty Rock has for a bailiff. He's a cross between Lobengula and Lynchehaun. He's well worth seeing, mind you. Come along.} I saw John Henry Menton casually in the Bodega just now and it will cost me a fall if I don’t … Wait awhile … We're on the right lay, Bob, believe you me. (\textit{U} 10.934–938)

It is clear that Dollard considers the new bailiff to be a formidable person in some respects—so much so that he wants to show the man off to his companions. The terms of comparison, however, reveal themselves to be quite incompatible with a servant of the crown as were all members of the sheriff’s and subsheriff’s offices in 1904 Dublin.

The first name used for comparison, Lobengula, was a king of the Ndembele people of southern Africa. He allowed the British to come onto his land and mine for gold, but the British, led by Cecil Rhodes, soon took advantage of this agreement and began to demand more territory and more mineral rights. Rhodes knew that he could not legally take the Ndembele land unless his people were attacked. Rhodes therefore began to provoke the peaceful king until he had no choice but to fight back. Lobengula launched a series of attacks on the British forces and twice escaped capture. Even though the British were greatly outnumbered, the Ndembele spears were no match for the firearms of the British military, and they were quickly sent into hiding. Lobengula managed to evade the British, but very soon after died of smallpox (Cloete 225–243). Lobengula gained fame among other African communities as well as with other groups
who were cheated or repressed by the British. He stood up to the British and evaded capture until his death.

Lynchehaun was a less savory, but equally popular Irishman who similarly avoided capture by British forces. His real name was James Walsh, and he was tried and convicted of the attempted murder of a young woman on Achill Island. To avoid the life sentence he was given, Lynchehaun escaped to America where he sought, and was granted, political asylum. He later returned to Ireland disguised as a member of the clergy, and again escaped capture. A legend of tough resourcefulness and anti-British sentiment grew around his escapades, and he eventually became the model for the main character, Christy Mahon, in John Millington Synge’s *Playboy of the Western World* (Gifford 279). Both of these men gained fame and sympathy among the Irish for their defiance of British authority, whether corrupt or just. It is odd, then, that Ben Dollard would compare this newly assigned bailiff, an official British authority figure, to these two rebels. It is plausible that because the two names became mythologized as impervious to the power of the throne, that Dollard associates any man of formidable size with the two rebels, politics notwithstanding. Joyce, however, would have known the political implications of these two names very well, and his use of their names was designed to tap into their mythological status as enemies of the crown.

Among the most outspoken and prominent opponents of British rule during the revolutionary period were the Irish militant groups like the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the Irish Citizen Army, and the Irish Volunteers. During the revision period for *Ulysses*, Joyce added more than a dozen references to these groups and their more famous (or
infamous) members. These closely related nationalist groups followed the principles established by John O’Mahoney who formed the Irish republican group, The Fenian Brotherhood, in the United States in 1848. He espoused the belief that Ireland could only be free as a result of an armed revolution, and along with James Stephens, he launched a multi-national organization that plotted against British interests in Ireland. The Fenian group located in Ireland became known as The Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) and was led by Stephens, who had spent seven years in Paris and London studying revolutionary and subversive political tactics. The Irish Volunteers were a splinter group of the IRB. The Irish Citizen Army, led by James Larkin rose out of the 1913 Lockout, a labor dispute over the recognition of trade unions. All three groups consolidated their efforts in the 1916 Easter Rising.

This web of inter-related nationalist organizations gained much public support, even among pacifists like Joyce and Seán O’Casey (discussed in detail in Chapter Two). As noted above, Joyce abhorred violence in any form, but understood that, when pushed to extremes by an oppressive foreign government, the people would react violently. He believed that, while the individual acts of violence were terrible and that he would never participate in them himself, they could not be considered to be wrong in the eyes of Irish patriots, but that it was the natural reaction to oppression (CW 163).

C. The Symbol of a Nation: The Harp and Sean Bhean Bhocht vs. the Potato

The use of symbolic figures and objects is common among Irish writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Sean Bhean Bhocht or “poor old woman”
was used as a symbol for Ireland since the 1798 rebellion and was immortalized by W.B. Yeats and Lady Augusta Gregory in their play, *Cathleen ni Houlihan* (1902). The harp has a much longer history, dating back to Brian Bóroimhe’s reign as High King of Ireland from 1002–1014. It was used in the official seal of the Irish Free State in 1922, and is still used as an official national symbol on Irish currency and passports. While Yeats and the Revivalist movement made much use of these symbols, Joyce was nearly entirely dismissive of them.

As the characters Corley and Lenehan from the story “Two Gallants” make their way to Merrion Square on the south side of Dublin, they walk past the pro-unionist Kildare Street Club, in front of which a harpist is playing for passers-by.

Not far from the porch of the club a harpist stood in the roadway playing to a little ring of listeners. He plucked at the wires heedlessly, glancing quickly from time to time at the face of each new-comer and from time to time, wearily also, at the sky. His harp too, heedless that her coverings had fallen about her knees, seemed weary alike of the eyes of strangers and of her master's hands. One hand played the bass the melody of *Silent, O Moyle* while the other hand careered in the treble after each group of notes. The notes of the air throbbed deep and full. (*Dubliners* 46)

Gifford’s analysis of this image calls attention to the degraded image of the harp and also Joyce’s personification of it, which ties the image directly to the Sean Bhean Bhocht image as well (*JA* 58). The song the harpist is playing is Thomas Moore’s “The Song of Fionnuala,” commonly known by its opening phrase, “Silent, O Moyle.” The lyrics speak of Lir’s daughter, Fionnuala who, along with her siblings, was turned into a swan by an evil spell and forced to wait 900 years before being able to return to her human form and die peacefully. She begs for release, “When will heav’n, its sweet bell ringing, / Call my
spirit from this stormy world?” Joyce draws a parallel between the suffering of the harp at the hands of the harpist, forced to play for her oppressors and the myth of Lir’s daughter who begged for release from the spell that forced her to endure centuries of torture. Joyce presents the national symbol of his country as a humiliated and exposed victim of oppression who no longer has the strength or desire to live, let alone to protect her own sense of dignity, and who sits “weary” and “still in her darkness,” begging for an end to her misery through the lyrics of the song as she is manipulated by her master.

Joyce also makes two direct references in *Ulysses* to the Thomas Moore song, “The Harp That Once Through Tara’s Halls,” in which he presents the harp in a denigratory sense. The first reference appears in the “Lestrygonians” episode when Bloom sees Bob Doran on his yearly drunken bender stagger into a restaurant where Pat Kinsella’s Harp Theatre used to be and ponders Kinsella’s fate. “Where is he now? Beggar somewhere. The harp that once did starve us all” (*U* 8.606-7). Zack Bowen observes that by using this allusion, Bloom is reflecting on the “false pride of former days” and that it is “a song of the vanished past” (137). The second reference to the song appears in the “Sirens” episode as Bloom is having lunch with Richie Goulding, Stephen Dedalus’ uncle. Bloom listens to Bob Cowley playing the piano and his mind races through a series of memories including Molly’s snoring, musical performances they attended, and the fact that Molly will be meeting with Blazes Boylan very soon. “Only the harp. Lovely. Gold glowering light. Girl touched it. Poop of a lovely. Gravy's rather good fit for a. Golden ship. Erin. The harp that once or twice. Cool hands. Ben Howth, the rhododendrons. We are their harps. I. He. Old. Young” (*U* 11.580-83). Bowen notes
that this reference also reflects on “the pride of former days” and that Bloom associates the harp with a thing easily manipulated (172). Joyce’s treatment of this national image is clearly a dismissal of the pride and beauty that it is was intended to represent.

Joyce is no kinder to the image of the mythical poor old woman in *Ulysses*. In the first episode readers encounter the Sean Bhean Bhocht in the form of the old milk woman:

> He watched her pour into the measure and thence into the jug rich white milk, not hers. Old shrunken paps. She poured again a measureful and a tilly. Old and secret she had entered from a morning world, maybe a messenger … Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in old times. A wandering crone, lowly form of an immortal serving her conqueror and her gay betrayer, their common cuckquean, a messenger from the secret morning. (*U* 1.397–406)

In the Homeric parallel, the old woman represents the goddess, Athena, who disguised herself as an old woman to approach Telemachus and convince him to seek news of his father. She also represents Yeats’s version of Cathleen ni Houlihan, who appeared as an old woman to enlist the help of young Irish men to defend her honor. Both of these mythical figures eventually return to their young, beautiful incarnations, but Joyce does not allow for this romanticized transformation. The feeble, old milk woman remains in the state of “their common cuckqueen”. She has not only grown old and figuratively incapable of nurturing her own people, but she is now forced to serve her oppressor. Adding insult to injury, Joyce reveals that she does not even recognize her native Irish language when Haines (an Englishman) attempts to speak it with her. In his revisions for *Ulysses*, Joyce continues to dismantle the romanticized image of the harp as well, and he
goes a step further by replacing these images with a humble potato as the new national symbol.

Joyce’s first revision of the harp motif comes in the “Aeolus” episode. This episode saw drastic revision during the summer of 1921 in terms of both form and content compared to its early version in *The Little Review* in October 1918. Many details about the city were added including the ubiquitous headlines. Joyce identified in the Linati schema that the “sense” or meaning of this episode is “The Mockery of Victory” (Gifford 128). This sense of mockery comes through most strongly in the headlines inserted throughout the episode, and which rarely indicate anything of any importance about the content of the text that follows. Joyce is taking a blatant jab at the Irish media for using such patriotic headlines to attract the readers’ attention but without always providing the promised content.

In August 1921 when Joyce was adding these new headlines, he inserted the phrase “HARP EOLIAN” before a segment of text in which no harps (eolian or otherwise) are mentioned (Harvard MS, *JJA 18 9*). Instead the text that follows simply shows Bloom waiting for an opportunity to approach his newspaper editor to ask a question about an advertisement. He watches the editor floss his teeth, makes his move into the office, and is quickly halted again as the editor makes a phone call. Joyce’s use of the Aeolian harp allows him to combine the ancient Greek wind instrument, the central Homeric figure of the episode (Aeolus), and the Irish national symbol in two simple words. He also uses Coleridge’s spelling of the instrument’s name, which adds a romantic (with both big and little R) element. Dubliners of the time would have found nationalist-
themed headlines like this a common occurrence in papers like the *Freeman’s Journal* that supported Ireland’s independence movement, but they would expect to find some reference to the symbol or to their nation in the text that follows. Joyce does not deliver on this promise, and instead allows the national symbol to stand alone, signifying nothing. About a month later in September, during the next stage of revision for this episode, Joyce changed the headline to read, “O, HARP EOLIAN” using the Romantic poet’s vocative inflection to heighten the sense of mockery and poetic hyperbole (Harvard MS, *JJA 18 20*). This strengthens the romantic connotations, which leaves the reader all the more disappointed to find that the symbol does not stand for anything in the text.

After dispensing with the harp and the Sean Bhean Bhocht, the symbol that Joyce finally decides on, and the one in which he builds up to for much of the novel is the potato. Joyce, however, does not only use a healthy, nourishing image of the potato, but also one that is old, shrunken, and black. This decision to use the potato as a symbol for the nation and plot element in the novel did not become part of the text until the final months of revision and composition in 1921. After this point, Joyce added twenty-four additional references to potatoes to the novel. Before the revision period, the word “potato” only appeared three times—once as part of Bloom’s lunch in the “Sirens” episode, once as a complete mystery in “Lestrygonians,” and once in “Cyclops” in a digression by the parodist narrator. Most of the new additions refer to the small, dried-up potato that Bloom carries in his pocket throughout the day, and about which the readers are not fully informed until Bloom’s day is nearly over.
The potato had been used as a symbol of Ireland and the Irish for centuries before Joyce selected it as his chosen motif in *Ulysses*. It was a common myth that Sir Walter Raleigh (1552-1618) brought the potato to Ireland, and this is a myth that Bloom believes and also repeats, but the actual history of the introduction of the potato to Ireland is far less clear (Gifford 470). According to Redcliffe Salaman, however, as early as the seventeenth century, the potato had already become “inseparably united in the public mind, with one country, Ireland” (188-89). Often the image was directed at the Irish in a derogatory sense, as it was when Branwell Brontë was burned in effigy at Haworth where the protestors waved potatoes in the air to express their displeasure at his family’s Irish origins (Eagleton 2). Both before and after the famine, the potato was seen (primarily by the British) as a symbol of Ireland’s poverty and as a “barbarous form of nourishment” as opposed to wheat or other grains (Eagleton 16, Gallagher and Greenblatt 111). From the Irish perspective, the potato was seen as a symbol of nourishment and fertility and for many was a symbol of hope in otherwise brutal struggle for subsistence (Salaman 593). According to Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, this association with both misery and abundance stems from the fact that at this point in history, “the staple food became almost interchangeable with people themselves, and many insisted that the potato people were radically different from grain people” (111).

Joyce embraces the potato as a national symbol, and recognizes its associations with poverty and subsistence, but also

---

38 The potato was often referred to as a “Murphy” in English-speaking countries since as early as 1811 (OED), which reinforces its association with the Irish. Joyce uses the term for potato multiple times in *Finnegans Wake*, and twice merged with the identities of Irishmen (80.22; 161.29). In a 1929 children’s book, the title character is a potato named Merry Murphy, and is identified as “an Irish potato” (Campbell 2).
of hope and maternal nurturing. He then endows Bloom’s humble, shriveled tuber with magical powers that allows its holders to overcome their oppressors.

The first of the three pre-revision occurrences of the potato in *The Little Review* episodes of *Ulysses* comes in the “Sirens” episode from August 1919. As Bloom sits in the Ormond Hotel, the narrator describes him with his lunch plate: “In liver gravy Bloom mashed mashed potatoes” (“Ulysses: Episode XI” 55). This instance of the word carries no political weight on its own, and simply describes Bloom mashing his already mashed potatoes into the inner organ gravy he relishes. The potato in “Cyclops” appears along with other food items enumerated by the parodist narrator in his first parody mocking the idealized version of history favored by Yeats and the Revivalists. While this second reference to the potato (despite the historical anachronism) does carry some political weight in that it is part of the bounty offered by the land of the High Kings, Joyce’s inclusion of it in this first parody makes it clear that this romanticized symbol of Ireland’s distant past has little bearing on Joyce’s view of Ireland in the early twentieth century.39 By the time Joyce finished his 1921 revisions, however, the word “potato” (or, in one instance, the synonym “spud”) appears twenty-seven times and in multiple contexts. Many of these additions portray the potato as a powerful symbol, and all of them work together to portray the potato as a multi-faceted symbol of Ireland and its people.

The potato references Joyce adds to *Ulysses* fall into three broad categories—food, Irish historical/cultural references, and Bloom’s potato. All three carry political significance, especially when considered as a group; their collective influence on the

---

39 The historical inaccuracy in the parody lies in the fact that the potato was not introduced to Ireland until well after the time of the High Kings.
novel as a whole introduces to readers the idea of the potato as simultaneously ordinary and symbolic of both hope and tragedy for the nation. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of the potato that Bloom carries in his pocket. *Little Review* readers first encountered this potato in a mysterious scene from the “Lestrygonians” episode. As Bloom tries desperately to avoid an encounter with Blazes Boylan, he fumbles in his pockets pretending to look for something as he shuffles madly toward the National Museum to escape the gaze of the man who will be seducing his wife in less than two hours:

> Look for something I.
> His hasty hand went quick into a pocket, took out, read unfolded Agendath Netaim. Where did I?
> Busy looking for.
> He thrust back quickly Agendath.
> Afternoon she said.
> Where?
> Hurry. Walk quietly. Moment more. My heart.
> His hand looking for the where did I put found in his hip pocket soap lotion have to call tepid paper stuck. Ah soap there I yes.
> Gate.
> Safe! ("Ulysses: Episode VIII [cont.]") 62

Joyce gives no indication as to why Bloom would have encountered a potato as he shuffled through his pockets, and his readers remained in the dark for three more years.

Four more episodes and part of a fifth appeared in *The Little Review* over the next several months before the obscenity hearings put an end to the novel’s serialization, and Joyce did not make any further references to Bloom’s potato until he began revising the novel in 1921.
Food References

Seven of the newly added references to the potato fall into the category of food. While these ultimately have some thematic and political correspondence with the second category of historical and cultural references, these seven iterations depict the potato being used for its primary purpose in every-day settings; they make no specific references to historical events or political ideas. Encountering them individually does not present a nationalist or political message, but when viewed together, they represent the extent to which the potato was part of the every day lives of Irish citizens and reinforce the common association between it and the Irish people.

After Joyce describes Bloom mashing his already mashed potatoes in the August 1919 *Little Review*, the next occurrence of the potato as a food item does not appear until two years later in the latter section of the “Circe” episode. After Stephen entertains Bella and the prostitutes with a story about the sexual proclivities of the French, Bloom approaches him, and Stephen hallucinates the image of his own father, Simon. The imaginary Simon initiates a fox hunt, which then merges into a horse race in which Garrett Deasy is riding the favored horse, “Cock of the North” (*U* 15.3874-3983). At the end of the race, Deasy and his horse are showered in Irish stew. “A yoke of buckets leopards all over him and his rearing nag a torrent of mutton broth with dancing coins of carrots, barley, onions, turnips, potatoes” (*U* 15.3990-92). In John Gordon’s analysis of this short passage, he identifies Stephen’s sources for the various images bombarding Deasy. The yoke represents Deasy’s relationship with his his wife; “leopards” used as a
verb here refers to Leopardstown, the site of Dublin’s horse track; the “coins of carrots” reflect Stephen’s last sight of Deasy in the “Nestor” episode walking through the flickering “checkerwork of leaves” that made him imagine dancing coins; the rest of the list of food ingredients and the fact that they are flying through the air reflect the story Stephen heard from Myles Crawford of Deasy’s wife throwing soup in a waiter’s face (Gordon 164). The unidentified soup becomes the traditional ingredients of Irish stew in Stephen’s imagination, and instead of a waiter, it is Deasy who is being showered in the traditional Irish meal. This is Stephen’s imaginary form of Irish retribution against Deasy’s Unionist, pro-British, sympathies, and for his overbearing, paternal attitude toward Stephen earlier in the day.

The next four insertions of the potato into the text come in the “Penelope” episode, where Joyce presents it as an integral part of Irish domestic life. Joyce added the first two of these references during the Spring and Summer of 1921, as Molly thinks about Bloom’s inappropriate behavior with their former maid, “that slut Mary,” she remembers accusing Mary—probably unfairly—of not only of stealing the oysters that Bloom also recalls during one of his hallucinations in “Circe,” but also of stealing potatoes (U 18.56-64, 15.880). Molly claims the price of the oysters to be “2/6 per dozen” [two shillings and six pence], but Gifford reveals this price to be greatly exaggerated to “three or four times the standard prices in 1900” (610). Molly not only artificially inflates the value of the oysters, she also includes the potatoes in the same thought. Molly is as upset by the thought that the maid would steal potatoes as she is
about her stealing the far more expensive oysters. For Molly, then, the potatoes, while far less expensive, are equally valuable to the family due to their role as a staple food item.

Later in the episode Molly complains about how their daughter Milly was causing problems in the house before Bloom sent her to Mullingar for photography lessons. Molly’s chief complaints are that Milly is always barging in on her in the bathroom, that Milly is too rough and is always breaking things, and that she would not “teem the potatoes” (U 18.1009-1017). Again Molly’s associations create an equation between Milly’s other bad behaviors and the fact that she refuses to pour the boiling water away from the potatoes. Molly immediately steps back a bit from the harshness of this accusation by saying, “of course shes right not to ruin her hands,” but her immediate reaction to Milly’s behavior is of frustration equal to the other two things on the list (U 18.1017). Molly’s frustration implies that potatoes were such a frequent part of the Bloom family meals that Milly’s refusal to teem them was a source of frequent contention between the mother and daughter.

Joyce added another point of contention between Molly and Milly regarding potatoes in the late summer of 1921. In an earlier draft of the same “sentence,” Joyce has Molly complain that Milly answered “like a fishwoman when I asked her to go for a head of cabbage” (UR P718-719). At some point between July and September 1921, as he was preparing the holographic manuscript for sale to John Quinn, Joyce decided to change the cabbage to potatoes. The revised version has Milly answer “like a fishwoman when I
asked her to go for a half stone of potatoes” \((U\ 18.1067-68)\).\(^{40}\) This alteration makes no substantive change in the action of the novel, which makes the decision to change it all the more interesting. Joyce had no other reason the change the cabbage to potatoes than to reinforce the importance of the potato to the Irish household.

Joyce gave Molly one more reason to think of potatoes in late October 1921. Toward the end of Molly’s first “sentence,” she imagines how she would confront Josie Powell if she ever caught her with Bloom, but then remembers that Bloom “wasn’t to be got for the asking” by recalling how difficult it was to get him to express his feeling for her \((U\ 18.197-98)\). Joyce added a memory to her monologue in the first set of placards:

\[\begin{aligned} &\text{he was on the pop of asking me too the night in the kitchen I was rolling the potato cakes theres something I want to say to you only for I put him off letting on I was in a temper with my hands and arms full of pasty flour}\end{aligned}\]

\((UCSE\ 1644-1646)\)

The commonality of the potatoes and of rolling out potato cakes make this scene less than perfect for a proposal for Molly. Food, however, is a foundational part of both Blooms’ proposal memories, but instead of the pedestrian potato, it was the less common seedcake—a treat reserved for special occasions—that Molly eventually found suitable for a proposal. In the earliest manuscripts available for “Lestrygonians,” Joyce has Bloom recall the picnic on Howth where he proposed: “Softly she gave me in my mouth the seedcake warm and chewed. Mawkish pulp her mouth had mumbled sweet and sour with

---

\(^{40}\) A stone is a unit of weight measure equal to fourteen pounds avoirdupois, which makes Molly’s request of Milly to buy a “half stone of potatoes” (seven pounds) slightly heavier than a single head of cabbage (2-5 pounds), but not enough to justify Milly’s adamant refusal.
spittle. Joy: I ate it: joy” (UR Lestrygonians 21; P167-168). Joyce also gives Molly this same memory, but only after he added her rejection of Bloom over the potato cakes. In the second set of placards for “Penelope,” in November 1921, Joyce has Molly think, “the day I got him to propose to me yes first I gave him the bit of seedcake out of my mouth and it was leapyear like now yes sixteen years ago my God after that long kiss I near lost my breath yes” (JJA 21 368). This second placard addition to her monologue reinforces Molly’s earlier rejection of the potato cakes due to their domestic plainness.

The final addition Joyce made to the text regarding potatoes as a food item came in early December 1921, just two months before publication. In the “Eumaeus” episode the subdued narrator details Bloom’s assessment of Murphy’s story thus far. In reference to the mention of a stabbing in a Trieste brothel, Bloom explains to Stephen that the stabbing would be consistent with what he knows of Italians, but also that the local Italian immigrants were decent people. The earliest version of this scene reads: “that stab in the back touch was quite typical of those italianos though candidly he was free to admit those icecream and fish friers and so forth, over in little Italy there, near the Coombe, were sober thrifty hardworking fellows” (JJA 15 337). At some point between the typescript and the first set of placards in early December of 1921, Joyce had expanded the “and so forth” contingency of the local Italians to to specifically include a reference to the potato:

that stab in the back touch was quite in keeping with those italianos though candidly he was none the less free to admit those ice creamers and friers in the fish way, not to mention the chip potato variety and so forth, over in little Italy there, near the Coombe, were sober thrifty hardworking fellows. (UCSE 1390; JJA 20 291)
This addition of the potato to the Italian immigrants in Dublin accomplishes two things for Joyce. First it reinforces Bloom’s association of common foods with potatoes. The second thing this addition accomplishes is to make the potato an important part of the lives, not only of the native Irish, but also of those who had moved here from other countries. While it is not certain that the Italian immigrants are actually consuming the “chip potato” products they sell, they certainly recognize the importance of it to the locals, and are providing it to them as an easy, takeaway meal.

These seven additions to the text of *Ulysses* work together to establish the potato as a central part of the Irish diet and daily life. Whether as part of a meal like Deasy’s Irish stew, or Bloom’s insufficiently mashed potatoes, as a quick snack like the chips offered for sale in Little Italy, or as an important part of the every-day domestic life in the Bloom household, which Molly mentions four times, Joyce clearly made a concerted effort to represent the potato as a common, yet crucial, part of the Irish diet.

**Historical and Cultural References**

Historical and cultural references to the potato occur only in three episodes, as do the above references to the potato as a food source. The food references, however, appear in the later episodes only; in the case of the historical references, Joyce made more of an effort to go back to the earlier, previously published episodes and to include such references there as well as in the later episodes he was actively composing at the time. Two and a half years after the earliest such example from “Cyclops” mentioned above in
which the parodist mocks the revivalists, Joyce began including more historical and cultural references to the potato in the “Circe” episode.

Between January and April 1921, as Joyce was drafting the “Circe” episode, he included two cultural references to the potato. During the hallucinatory scene in which two married women, Mrs. Yelverton Barry and Mrs. Bellingham,41 accuse Bloom of sending them inappropriate letters, Mrs. Bellingham notes that Bloom included something else in the envelope: “Subsequently he enclosed a bloom of edelweiss culled on the heights, as he said, in my honour. I had it examined by a botanical expert and elicited the information that it was a blossom of the homegrown potato plant” (V.B.13.e, JJA 15.43). As with Molly’s above assessment of the potato cakes as too common a setting for a marriage proposal, Bloom hallucinates a scenario in which a potato blossom is unsuitable as a token of affection. After the publication of the Berthold Auerbach novel *Edelweiss* (1861), the flower became popularly representative of a lover’s devotion. In the novel the flower is described as growing only in the high mountains “on the line of perpetual snow,” and that “only the boldest alpine goatherds and hunters venture to pick the hardy little plant from its native soil” (Auerbach 77). Bloom is making a clear reference either to the Auerbach novel or a similar account when he imagines sending Mrs. Bellingham such a flower in a letter. The realization, however, that the flower is not in fact the rare alpine edelweiss, but instead the common potato flower is an insult to the receiver of the letter. Despite the similar aesthetic qualities of the potato flower, it is not

---

41 Both of the women have either British or Anglo-Irish sounding names, which brings national and class prejudices into the scene, and which may explain Mrs. Bellingham’s disdain for the potato flower. It is also another example of the British identifying the potato with the Irish.
rare, nor hard to come by, and Mrs. Bellingham claims it to be so common as to be
“homegrown.” Gifford points out that the potato flower “stands for benevolence in the
language of flowers,” but that interpretation stands at odds with the context of the scene
(466). Mrs. Bellingham sees no benevolence in the deception, and therefore, neither does
Bloom, since this scene is his hallucination. The potato flower here is nothing more than
a common Irish blossom, but with deep cultural connections as will be explored further
below.

During the same time period in early 1921, Joyce also included a bit of the history
of the potato in Bloom’s catalog of trivia. After making a lewd comment to the prostitute
Zoe, Bloom tells her that Sir Walter Raleigh brought both the potato and tobacco to
Europe from the New World (U 15.1356-57). While this is historically inaccurate, this
was a common claim and is clearly the version of history that Bloom believes. Whether
or not Bloom had heard any other version of the introduction of the potato is uncertain,
but the fact that he decides to tell the story attributing the act to the well-known writer is
perfectly in keeping with his personality. Bloom knows that Zoe will have heard of
Raleigh and would be impressed at his knowledge.

Later in the summer of 1921, Joyce was revising the placards for the
“Lestrygonians” episode. He added many food references to those that were already in
the text, and gave the potato three more appearances, all of them of historical or cultural
importance. The first two came in late August while Joyce was revising the first set of

---

42 Weldon Thornton explains that this misconception likely came from the publication of The Royal Reader; no. III in which Raleigh is credited with the introduction of both plants to Europe. Thornton also points out that, as of 1904, Thom’s Dublin Directory gives credit to a man named John Hawkins for the introduction of the potato (373).
placards. At the beginning of the episode as Bloom makes his way toward the O’Connell Street Bridge, he looks up the street adjacent to the north side of the Liffey and sees Dilly Dedalus standing outside the auction house a few doors down. In the holographic draft Joyce wrote for Quinn in 1918, Bloom makes the following comment about the young Dedalus girl: “Good Lord, that poor child’s dress is in flitters. Underfed she looks, too. It’s after they feel it. Undermines the constitution” (UR Lestrygonians 2). More than three years later, Joyce revised the passage to read: “Good Lord, that poor child’s dress is in flitters. Underfed she looks, too. Potatoes and marge, marge and potatoes. It’s after they feel it. Proof of the pudding. Undermines the constitution” (UCSE 318; JJA 18 89, emphasis mine). Gifford identifies the source of this added phrase: “Potatoes and marge, marge and potatoes—Margarine and potatoes, the staple diet of the poverty-stricken city dweller in the British Isles and the chant protesting that diet” (158). Here Joyce not only adds the first instance in the novel of the potato as a meal with direct associations with the poor, but he also refers to the fact that there were protests staged by the poor who used their staple diet as their rallying cry. In this instance the potato is not only a food, but also an emblem of political resistance.

After his lunch, Bloom leaves Davy Byrne’s “moral pub” on Duke street and makes his way toward the National Museum where he will hide in order to avoid an encounter with Boylan. Bloom walks by a Protestant bookstore and sees the pamphlet entitled Why I left the Church of Rome displayed in the window. In the 1918 holographic manuscript Joyce wrote the scene as follows:
He turned at Gray’s confectioners window of tarts and passed the reverend Thomas Connellan’s bookstore. Why I left the church of Rome. Birds’ nest women finance him. They say they used to give hungry children soup to change to Protestants. Why they left the church of Rome. (UR “Lestrygonians” 26)

Bloom’s thoughts drift from the bookstore, to the pamphlet, to the “birds’ nest women” who used to coerce poor Irish Catholic children by offering them soup in exchange for religious conversion. In his first revisions of this passage for publication in late August 1921, Joyce added more detail about the soup and a deeply personal connection to this coercive process for Bloom.

Joyce had previously made slight changes to this passage for The Little Review including the more specific “pauper children” instead of “poor,” which connotes images of much more severe destitution as opposed to simply lacking wealth. He also changed the final play on the title of the pamphlet from “Why they left the church of Rome,” referring to the children, to “Why we left the church of Rome,” referring to his own family. This change was apparently a bit too subtle for Joyce’s taste, so he made the reference much more specific in the first placards by explaining that it was just such an organization that convinced his father to leave Judaism—a decision he would later regret. The most significant change to this passage, however, is in the addition of the phrase, “in the time of the potato blight.” Joyce is being very specific about exactly when the birds’ nest women were bribing the poor into conversion with food, and he reveals that it was during
the time when the Irish were at their weakest and most desperate because of the famine. The children were given the option to either convert or to die of starvation. The British government is not mentioned directly in this passage, but the Protestant elements of the passage are directly connected to the English for whom the king is also the head of the church. Joyce’s connection of this practice with his own family’s conversion provides a missing piece of the puzzle in the story of his father, but also shows that his mother survived the famine as well due to this conversion. Bloom’s mother’s connection with the potato blight and the famine will gain greater importance for readers later in the novel, and this is the first hint of that connection that Joyce provides for his readers.

The final cultural/historical reference to the potato that Joyce adds to this episode came almost a month later while revising the second set of placards. Just after the scene in which Bloom recalls getting involved in the Boer War protest with the Trinity students, he suggests that there are informants for the British government everywhere in Dublin, including people one would least suspect.

Never know who you’re talking to. Corny Kelleher he has Harvey Duff in his eye. Like that Peter or Denis or James Carey that blew the gaff on the invincibles. Member of the corporation too. Egging raw youths on to get in the know all the time drawing secret service pay from the castle. (UR “Lestrygonians” 11)

Bloom here suspects Kelleher of being an informant, and is probably correct in his assessment. Bloom makes a few mistakes about James Carey (including his name), who did inform on the Invincibles and who was a member of the Dublin Corporation but was not an employee of the castle. Despite his errors, Bloom’s point that anyone in Dublin

---

43 Later in “The Wandering Rocks” episode, Kelleher is seen speaking with a police constable. The constable clearly knows Kelleher and the implication that this is a common encounter in which Kelleher provides the officer with some sort of information is made very strongly by Joyce (U 10.207-26).
could be an informant for the British government was well founded. For *The Little Review* in 1918, Joyce added roughly twelve lines of text to this scene describing the ways that plain-clothes officers would take advantage of servant girls to get information about the families they work for. He went back to this scene again in September 1921 to add a short phrase.

> Never know who you’re talking to. Corny Kelleher he has Harvey Duff in his eye. Like that Peter or Denis or James Carey that blew the gaff on the invincibles. Member of the corporation too. Egging raw youths on to get in the know all the time drawing secret service pay from the castle. \[\textbf{Drop him like a hot potato.}^{21}\] (\textit{UCSE 342; JJA 18 116})

This short phrase adds the element of betrayal to the British as well as to the Irish informants. Bloom is suggesting here that once the informants had served their purpose or had been caught, their British employers would abandon them. This implies that the British were not only using the Irish to spy on their own countrymen, it shows that they were not loyal to their informants. The saying to drop something “like a hot potato” had been around at least since the early nineteenth century, and was a common phrase meaning to get rid of something quickly.\[44\] The fact that the phrase is being used in this scene to describe the act of abandoning an Irish person carries with it all of the negative associations of the potato with the Irish people that the English harbored, as discussed above. In this case, the “hot potato” is not the figurative object that must be gotten rid of quickly, but rather it is very specifically the abandonment of an Irishman.

Joyce was making the final revisions to the novel in December 1921 and January 1922. By this point the page proofs for most of the novel were set and revisions were

---

\[44\] The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists the first recorded instance of this phrase as Aug 7, 1821 ("Hot Potato").
completed, but Joyce was still making changes to the final episodes. It was at this time that he went back to the “Circe” episode and added two more historical/cultural references to the potato. The first instance came as Joyce was working on the first complete set of page proofs for the episode in early December. Joyce was revising the “messianic” scene (U 15.1398-1956), which he had completed the previous summer as an addendum to “Circe.” After Bloom hallucinates his impassioned socialist speech decrying the machines of progress for abandoning the working class and refers to the industrial progress brought to Ireland as “a horde of capitalistic lusts upon our prostituted labour” (U 15.1394).

The stage directions then describe a spontaneous parade forming in the streets of the city in honor of Bloom. The parade consists of prominent political and religious figures from all over Ireland. Once these figures have passed in the parade, Joyce inserted a long list of “guilds and trades and trainbands” representing the labor forces being displaced in Ireland. The list includes various trades and industries in Ireland such as coopers, chimney sweeps, undertakers, plumbing contractors, and the very specific newspaper canvassers. Also among this list are the “egg and potato factors” (U 15.1435). A “factor” in this sense refers to people who buy and sell for the farmers in exchange for a commission of the sales, which underscores the importance of the potato (and the egg).

---

45 Ellen Carol Jones describes the political and historical background of the “messianic” scene in her chapter “Ghosts Through Absence” (2014) as follows:

Composed during the summer of 1921 as addendum to “Circe” and completed at least by August 11, a month after the truce ending the fighting of the War of Independence, this scene of Bloom’s political ascendance and ultimate immolation obliquely addresses the assassinations and military reprisals: boycotts and intiminations; sacking of towns, cities and townships; burning of part of the city of Cork; martial law, imprisonments and hunger strikes of a war that Joyce claimed had turned his country into a “slaughterhouse.” (140)
as a vital part of Dublin commerce ("factor"). The “egg and potato factors” are the only groups in the parade list who deal directly with raw materials, whereas the rest of the list consists of groups who refine either raw materials or participate in some sort of skilled labor. In Bloom’s imagination, the agents of these two food products rise above all others to be considered worthy of participation in the parade. Joyce recognizes the central role of the potato in the local commerce and made sure to include them in this list of “prostituted labour” that he felt was essential, yet endangered by industrial progress.

Joyce’s final addition of the potato as a historical/cultural symbol was also the very last addition of the word “potato” to the novel. Joyce was revising a mixed batch of page proofs and placards for “Circe” between late December 1921 and early January 1922—less than one month from the publication date. During the scene in which Stephen is eventually punched in the face by the British soldier, Private Carr, he hallucinates the image of “Old Gummy Granny.” This manifestation of the Sean Bhocht recalls Stephen’s encounter with the old milk woman earlier in the day (see discussion of the Sean Bhocht above) in which Joyce dismisses the romanticized nationalist image of the poor old woman. Stephen’s immediate reaction to being approached and hassled by the British soldiers is to imagine the failed symbol of his country about whom he thought in the “Telemachus” episode, that she represented a “lowly form of an immortal serving her conquerer” (U 1.404). Stephen here is placing part of the blame for the British military presence on Ireland itself, which reflects Joyce’s own opinions expressed in 1907 in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages.” Stephen shouts out to the image of the old woman that he recognizes her, and he calls her “the sow that
eats her farrow,” a line he used in *Portrait* to rebuke Davin’s claim that “a man’s country comes first” (171). The stage directions describe the old woman as wearing a “sugarloaf hat” and “seated on a toadstool” (*U* 15.4578-79). The toadstool image is the same one Stephen imagined as he pictured the milk woman as a witch seated at her work milking cows in “Telemachus,” but when combined with the “sugarloaf hat,” Stephen is bringing in yet another clichéd image of Ireland, the leprechaun. Gifford explains that leprechauns are frequently pictured on toadstools and wearing sugarloaf hats (524). Joyce went back to this scene that was already rich with his criticism of nationalist imagery and included one final image. The final version of the stage direction reads: “*Old Gummy Granny in sugarloaf hat appears seated on a toadstool, the deathflower of the potato blight on her breast*** (UCSE 1302; JJA 20 221). The image of the potato flower suffering from blight as a “deathflower” is a direct reference to Joyce’s own 1907 assertion that “in the years in which the potato crop failed, the negligence of the English government left the flower of the people to die of hunger” (*OCPW* 118). Stephen is very critical of Ireland’s role in its own oppression, but the image of the potato flower and the reminder of the famine shifts the preponderance of the blame to the British.

The Potato in Bloom’s Pocket

For most readers of *Ulysses* the image of the potato immediately calls to mind the small, shrivelled potato that Bloom carries with him in his pocket throughout the day. He makes sure that he has it before leaving the house, he runs across it in his pocket occasionally, and it eventually becomes a crucial part of the novel in the “Circe” episode
where Joyce imbues it with the powers of Homer’s moly flower, which allow Bloom to escape the nightmarish influences of Nighttown. As discussed above, however, early readers of the serialized *Ulysses* did not get to see this version of Bloom’s potato or the important role that it would take on in the following years. Their only exposure to this potato was the brief and confusing mention of it when Bloom fumbles through his pockets while trying to avoid Boylan. Before *The Little Review* was barred from printing any more of Joyce’s work in 1921, Joyce had written one more reference to this potato into the “Oxen of the Sun” episode, but this section of the episode was not published before the authorities stepped in. This second reference provides a partial explanation as to why someone would carry a potato around in his pocket. As the entire group of drunk friends leaves the hospital and makes their way toward Burke’s pub, the young Dr. Dixon, who treated Bloom for a bee sting “two weeks and three days previously (23 May 1904)”, begins to talk about Bloom to his friends (*U* 17.1449). “Got bet be a boomblebee whenever he wus settin sleepin in hes bit garten. Digs up near the Mater” (*U* 14.1472-74). The young men then turn the conversation to their admiration of Bloom’s wife, but then Dixon brings the conversation back to Bloom, and he mentions Bloom’s potato. “Spud again the rheumatiz? All poppycock, you'll scuse me saying. For the hoi polloi. I vear thee beest a gert vool” (*U* 14.1480-82). In the deteriorating language of the episode, Dixon is telling his friends that Bloom carries a potato in his pocket to ward off rheumatism, and that he thinks this is ridiculous and only the uneducated would consider this to be a viable option. Dixon then says he fears that Bloom is a great fool (“geert vool”).
Joyce got the idea of using a potato as a preventative for rheumatism from his wife’s family in west Ireland. During their first year living in Zürich, both Joyce and Nora began to suffer from ill health. Brenda Maddox describes their afflictions and puts them into contemporary terms:

Joyce suffered from rheumatism, tonsillitis, and possibly colitis, and Nora from ‘nerves’ and occasionally ‘a nervous breakdown’ (as did Joyce from time to time). It is difficult to put these complaints into modern perspective, but they seem to have been talking about feelings of depression, expressed in anxiety, insomnia and fits of weeping. They both, with their contemporaries, firmly believed in “change of air” as a cure. (141)

While the exact symptoms of the “rheumatism” that Joyce experienced remain unclear, they took the condition very seriously as did Nora’s family in Ireland. Nora’s uncle, Michael Healy, “strongly advised Joyce to carry a potato in his pocket to ward off rheumatism,” and Joyce followed his advice (Maddox 146).

At this stage of the genesis of *Ulysses*, then (1918-1920), the potato in Bloom’s pocket was simply a folk remedy for rheumatism, but it did not stay that way for long. In early 1921, as Joyce was composing “Circe,” he brought Bloom’s potato back into the story and added more personal significance to it. It is unclear as to whether or not Joyce had planned to use the potato as the Homeric moly flower, but at this stage of composition, he employed it for this purpose and also gave it deep personal connections to Bloom.

Joyce began by establishing the importance of the potato to Bloom as something other than a folk preventative. In the draft dating from January to February 1921, Joyce

---
46 The term “rheumatism” can refer to either the symptoms of rheumatic fever, from which Joyce suffered in 1907, or to joint pain resulting from various causes (“rheumatism”).
added two references to the potato in Bloom’s pocket. The first is a reminder to readers that Bloom has the potato in the first place, and the second reveals the personal significance it has for him. As Bloom follows Stephen into Nighttown, two children, identified as Jacky and Tommy Caffrey from the “Nausicaa” episode, run “full tilt” into Bloom as he is standing in the street. Afraid that he might be the victim of a well-known pickpocket technique, Bloom quickly checks his pockets: “Shocked, on weak hams, he halts. Tommy and Jacky vanish there, there. Bloom pats with parcelled hands watchfob, pocketbookpocket, pursepoke, sweets of sin, potatosoap” (U 15.241-43). The compound words combining items in his pockets serve to reveal Bloom’s urgency in making sure he was not robbed, but they also provide a truncated reenactment of the “Lestrygonians” scene in which The Little Review readers first encountered the mysterious potato. As Bloom was frantically avoiding Boylan he fumbled through his pockets encountering the purse, the potato, and the soap in the same order. Joyce is making certain that his readers understand that this is the very same potato that Bloom has had in his pocket all day.

Bloom then hallucinates the image of his father who rebukes him for having followed the “drunk goys” into this bad part of town and for spending his money foolishly. Bloom’s mother then appears and reenacts a scene in which a much younger Bloom came home bleeding and covered in mud. The stage directions describe her searching through her own pocket: “She hauls up a reef of skirt and ransacks the pouch of her striped blay petticoat. A phial, an Agnus Dei, a shrivelled potato and a celluloid doll fall out” (U 15.287-89). It is not immediately clear that this potato and the one in Bloom’s pocket are one in the same, but Joyce will make that connection later. At this
point, Joyce is letting the readers know where Bloom got the idea for the rheumatism remedy and that the potato has close associations with Bloom’s memory of his mother.

It is also at this point that the symbolism of the potato becomes even more complicated. Bloom’s potato is no longer a nondescript tuber, but one that is shriveled. The condition of the potato recalls both the Great Famine and the function of the potato as a symbol of hope for Ireland. Julieann Ulin observes that “the tuber had long been viewed as Ireland’s salvation—a food source that helped the peasantry survive for centuries” and that the potato Bloom’s mother produces recalls both the great Irish tragedy and the great Irish hope (57). It is no longer only a panacea for rheumatism, but also, as Ulin points out, a “panacea for Mother Ireland.”

This makes the potato in Bloom’s pocket significant in four ways: first as a connection to his mother, second as a preventative measure against rheumatism, third as a reminder of the tragedy of the famine, and fourth as a hopeful symbol of Ireland’s future.

While preparing the holographic manuscript for sale to John Quinn, Joyce took advantage of this multi-faceted image of the potato he had created and further imbued it with mystical powers. Completed in January 1921, this manuscript is the first draft in which Bloom’s potato takes on the role of Homer’s moly and in which the nationalist implications of the potato gain a heightened significance. As Bloom wanders into Nighttown looking for Stephen, the prostitute Zoe calls out to him. She sees that he is looking for someone, and since he and Stephen are both dressed in mourning, she assumes they are together. After a little flirting on Zoe’s part, she finds the potato:

\[47\text{ see also: Roos, Bonnie. “The Joyce of Eating: Feast, Famine and the Humble Potato in Ulysses.”}\]
ZOE
You both in black. Has little mousey any tickles tonight?
(\textit{His skin, alert, feels her fingertips approach. A hand glides over his left thigh.})

ZOE
How's the nuts?

BLOOM
Off side. Curiously they are on the right. Heavier, I suppose. One in a million my tailor, Mesias, says.

ZOE
(\textit{In sudden alarm.}) You've a hard chancre.

BLOOM
Not likely.

ZOE
I feel it.
(\textit{Her hand slides into his left trouser pocket and brings out a hard black shrivelled potato. She regards it and Bloom with dumb moist lips.})

BLOOM
A talisman. Heirloom.

ZOE
For Zoe? For keeps? For being so nice, eh?
(\textit{She puts the potato greedily into a pocket then links his arm, cuddling him with supply. He smiles uneasily. Slowly, note by note, oriental music is played. He gazes in the tawny crystal of her eyes, ringed with kohol. His smile softens.})
(\textit{UR “Circe” 29-30})

Zoe as prostitute and temporary Circe in this scene literally disarms Bloom. She takes his emblem of comfort and protection (his moly), and immediately “his smile softens”—he has fallen helpless under her spell. A few lines further down, Joyce reveals that Zoe is not Irish, but English (\textit{U 15.1346-47}). In presenting an English prostitute stealing the very symbol (albeit a complex symbol) of Ireland, Joyce presents a very clear analogy to British colonialism and the implication of England’s culpability for the deaths caused by
the famine. Joyce has an English prostitute steal the figurative hope, food, and cultural memory of the Irish people.

During his revisions to “Circe” in the summer of 1921, Joyce re-emphasizes the cultural significance of the potato in Bloom’s pocket, revealing that it means far more to Bloom than just a protector against rheumatism and a symbol of his mother. In one of the following hallucinatory segments added in its entirety in the summer revisions, Bloom is symbolically set on fire while wearing Catholic vestments, which seemingly protect him from the flames: “(in a seamless garment marked I. H. S. [Bloom] stands upright amid phoenix flames) Weep for me not, O daughters of Erin. (he exhibits to Dublin reporters traces of burning) (U 15.1935-37). Without his potato, Bloom conjures other Irish symbols to protect him—the Catholic church and the women of a nationalist political organization. The Daughters of Erin are so impressed with Bloom’s supernatural survival of the flames that they fall to their knees and pray in his honor:

THE DAUGHTERS OF ERIN
Kidney of Bloom, pray for us
Flower of the Bath, pray for us
Mentor of Menton, pray for us
Canvasser for the Freeman, pray for us
Charitable Mason, pray for us
Wandering Soap, pray for us
Sweets of Sin, pray for us
Music without Words, pray for us
Reprover of the Citizen, pray for us
Friend of all Frillies, pray for us
Midwife Most Merciful, pray for us
Potato Preservative against Plague and Pestilence, pray for us.

(U 15.1940-52, emphasis mine)
Each line of the prayer represents a symbol of Bloom for each episode of the novel thus far in which he is present, beginning with “Calypso.” The symbol for “Circe” that Joyce/The Daughters of Erin choose is Bloom’s potato. But the potato has gained symbolic importance in that it is now a “Preservative against Plague and Pestilence,” which connects it directly to the Famine and the blight that caused it. Because this is Bloom’s own hallucination, it now becomes clear that the potato is not only a folk remedy for rheumatism, and a relic of his mother, but also a symbol of the suffering of the Irish people during the Famine and a talisman preventing future occurrences of such events.

Bloom soon realizes his mistake in parting with his potato when Bella, “the massive whoremistress,” arrives, and Bloom immediately falls under her spell. Unable to look her directly in the eye, Bloom converses with Bella’s fan as he finds that he is helpless to fend her off and is drawn further and further into a scene of deep humiliation. As Bella lures Bloom deeper under her thrall, he says, “I should never have parted with my talisman” (U 15.2794). Without the protection of his potato that was stolen by the English Zoe, Bloom is at the mercy of forces far greater than he is—a clear metaphor for Ireland at the mercy of the British Empire.

It was not until Joyce completed the draft of the second half of the “Circe” episode in April 1921 that Bloom was finally able to get his potato back. He approaches Zoe and asks for it back, providing some explanation of its importance as well as the revelation that this is the very same potato his mother carried: “(gently) Give me that potato back, will you? … (with feeling) It is nothing, but still a relic of poor mama … There is a memory attached to it. I should like to have it” (U 15.3509-3520). Once
Bloom is able to confront his English oppressor and recover the potato, which is finally able to fulfill its Homeric role in helping our hero free his men (Stephen and Lynch) from the brothel. From the moment that Bloom gets his potato back, he is composed and in control. Completing the political metaphor, Ireland has recovered its cultural heritage, its hope, and its nourishment, and is finally a self-determining nation able to help its own people.

Joyce employs the potato over the course of the revisions and late composition of *Ulysses* in order to exploit every possible connection it has to the Irish people. After dismissing the earlier national symbols of the harp and the poor old woman, Joyce slowly replaces it with the potato. He takes great pains to include all aspects of the potato from the mundane qualities of it as an everyday food source, to the deep cultural connections it has with the Irish people, to the nearly magical qualities it has when used as a symbol of the suffering and the endurance of an oppressed people who were, at the very time Joyce was implementing these changes, finally freeing themselves from their oppressors.

V. Conclusion

Joyce’s late revisions and insertions of anachronistic allusions to the Irish fight for independence, of nationalist groups and political figures, and of Irish national symbols are not the only examples of nationalist or anti-British/anti-colonial references that Joyce included in his late revisions. He also included many references to nationalist groups and organizations of which both he and Bloom were very critical like the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA), which received five additional references, and to obscure historical figures with names like Smashall Sweeney and Tay Pay. He added dozens more
references to ways in which Irish citizens were indoctrinated into pro-British sympathies from the National School system to the pervasiveness of British products and popular culture. He included over a dozen references to the imposing power of the British monarchy, and nearly double that number of jokes at the monarchy’s expense. This reading of Joyce and of *Ulysses*, however, as Emer Nolan states above, does not “facilitate the revelation of his true Irishness” nor does it hand Joyce’s works back to Ireland “cleansed of their difficulty and their political complexity” (15). If anything, this examination of Joyce’s late revisions reveals the very opposite—that his sense of patriotism and nationalist leanings were far more intricately interwoven than most early critics and readers were aware and that recent criticism has only begun to unravel.

Looking into the process by which Joyce revised his work in order to include more of these references points to the fact that he had deeply-held and sophisticated political views that he took great pains to include in the novel at the same time that Ireland was on the verge of claiming its political freedom from England after nearly eight centuries of oppression. There is still a tremendous amount of research to be done not only into Joyce’s political and nationalist revisions in *Ulysses*, as is evident from the two-hundred and sixty-one examples in Appendix A that were not used in this chapter, but also into his revisions as they apply to other avenues of investigation. Genetic Criticism has just begun to crack the surface of Joyce’s works and the process by which he created them, and these genetic inquiries open innumerable new doors for further theoretical, historical, cultural, or other methods inquiry. Despite the fact that scholars and critics have been studying
Joyce and his works since he began publishing, more so than any other author in modern history, we as scholars, critics, and even casual readers still have much, much to learn.
You were interested in the Irish civil war and at every moment of those plays wrote out of your own amusement with life or your sense of its tragedy; you were excited and we all caught your excitement; you were exasperated almost beyond endurance by what you had seen or heard.

—W. B. Yeats in a letter to O’Casey

Chapter Two

“‘Scuse me mister. I thought you was an Irishman”

I. Background

The opening performances of Sean O’Casey’s *The Plough and the Stars* (1926) were met with disapproval by Dublin audiences. The play uses the 1916 Easter Rising as a backdrop for criticizing the blind patriotism that O’Casey believed had supplanted the socialist concerns of the national labor movement. His first four plays at the Abbey were critical of the struggle for Irish independence, the Irish Civil War, and the problems he perceived in the Irish Free State, and were met with mixed success, but the Easter Rising was considered by many to be sacrosanct and outside the bounds of criticism. This violation of the sanctity of the Rising and of its heroes resulted in the first three

---

48 The play premiered on February 8, 1926, just over two months away from the tenth anniversary of the Easter Rising. The community’s heightened sense of awareness of the events may have contributed to the disapproval.
performances being met with occasional hisses and heckling from the audience. On the fourth night of the play’s run, the audience erupted into a riot and attempted to storm the stage. Robert Lowery summarizes the events:

Twenty women rushed from the pit to the stalls. Two of them succeeded in reaching the stage, where a general melee took place. The invading women were thrown bodily back into the orchestra. A young man then tried to reach the stage, but was cut off by the lowering of the curtain. This he grabbed, swinging out on it in a frantic endeavour to pull it down. Women rushed to aid him in this project, but he was suddenly thrown into the stalls by a sharp blow from one of the actors. The pandemonium created a panic among a section of the audience, who dashed for the exits and added to the confusion. (*Whirlwind* 30)

Just as he had done nineteen years earlier during the riots that accompanied an early performance of John Millington Synge’s *The Playboy of the Western World*, William Butler Yeats then took to the stage in an attempt to calm the audience and to defend the playwright. 49 He shouted into the screaming crowd:

I thought you had got tired of this, which commenced fifteen years ago. 50 But you have disgraced yourselves again. Is this going to be a recurring celebration of Irish genius? Synge first and then O’Casey. The news of the happening of the last few minutes here will flash from country to country. Dublin has again rocked the cradle of a reputation. From such a scene as this theatre went forth the fame of Synge. Equally the fame of O’Casey is born here tonight. This is his apotheosis. 51 (Hunt, The Abbey 128)

O’Casey, a witness to the events that night, compared Yeats’s performance to one of Ireland’s greatest mythic heroes, and wrote that he was like “Cuchullain in his hero-rage;

49 Yeats had anticipated the unrest that night and had prepared his words ahead of time. Because he was not sure if he would be heard above the crowd, he provided the speech to members of the press before arriving at the theater (Hunt, The Abbey 128).

50 Yeats mistakenly dated the Synge riots as fifteen years previous to the events of that night when it was actually nineteen years previous (1907).

51 O’Casey later said of the events, “I was wondering all the way home, ‘what in the name of God was the meaning of apotheosis?’ And ‘what had happened to O’Casey that he’d had such an honor conferred on him?’ It was only when I got home and quietly, and secretly, you know, looked up the dictionary, I discovered that O’Casey was translated up into the gods!” (*Sean O’Casey vs. Ireland*, part 2)
his long hair waving, he stormed in utter disregard of all around him confronting all those who cursed and cried out” (Hunt, *The Abbey* 128). The police were called in to disperse the rioters, and the play commenced to cheers from the remaining crowd. The rest of the play’s run played to full houses and was free of disruptions.

Although O’Casey had already written four other successful plays for the Abbey Theatre, Yeats’s proclamation that the fame of O’Casey had been born that night was correct.\(^2\) The play subsequently opened in London to rave reviews, and was later adapted into a film by John Ford, starring Barbara Stanwyck, in 1937. It is the most frequently performed of O’Casey’s plays, and it continues to draw praise from audiences and critics who know little about the politics of revolutionary Ireland. Anthony Domestico notes that “[i]t is a testament to his powers of characterization and verbal ingenuity that such a frankly political play has far outlasted its political context.” The political context of the play, however—the 1916 Easter Rising—was not the original backdrop for what would later become O’Casey’s masterpiece. The play began as a one-act drama set during the far more sedate first national elections of the Irish Free State entitled *The Cooing of Doves* (sometimes misnamed as *The Cooing of the Doves*). O’Casey submitted *Doves* to the Abbey Theatre in August 1923, and, after careful review by the theater’s board members, it was rejected. Despite what the Abbey records claim, the play was not returned to O’Casey, and he never saw it again. It remained missing for eighty-two years.

---

\(^2\) O’Casey’s first four plays performed at the Abbey were: *The Shadow of a Gunman* (1923); the one-act play, *Kathleen Listens In* (1923); *Juno and the Paycock* (1924); and another one-act play, *Nannie’s Night Out* (1924). *Shadow* and *Juno* would later be grouped together with *The Plough and the Stars* as O’Casey’s “Dublin Trilogy.”
During the intervening years, there was much speculation as to the exact contents of the missing play and as to how much of it was used by O’Casey in *The Plough and the Stars*. Only after the missing play resurfaced in 2005 could misconceptions and conjectures about it be replaced with textual evidence. Examining both texts along with other available documents also provides unique insight into O’Casey’s writing process and the artistic development of his messages and characters. This chapter will clear up some of the misconceptions about *The Cooing of Doves* and will demonstrate that, contrary to earlier belief, the one-act play was not merely the source for Act II of *Plough*. Instead it contained material O’Casey revised and developed into all four acts of the play most critics consider to be his masterwork.

II. The Invention of “Seán O’Casey”

Nearly all investigations into Seán O’Casey’s work begin with a recounting of his childhood and early life in Dublin. As his background is crucial to understanding his political and artistic development, this chapter will follow suit and highlight the events and aspects of his early life that are relevant to the discussion of his plays. O’Casey lived in a poor neighborhood in the north side of Dublin during the most violent time in Ireland’s history. This became the setting for many of his plays, and his artistic achievements and as well as his politics all stem directly from growing up at that particular time and place. The difficulty of his upbringing, however, began even before he was born.
Michael and Susan Casey had five children who survived past infancy. Their youngest child, and third to be named John (he would later change it to the Gaelicized “Seán”), was born on March 30, 1880. The Protestant family lived in a tenement house on the north side of Dublin, for which Michael acted as landlord and which nearly ruined him financially. Dublin tenements were the former large houses of the Georgian upper classes. These houses eventually fell into disrepair (many became structurally unsound) and were occupied by poor families who rented individual rooms in which they would house an entire family. The conditions of these houses were reported to be filthy, disease-ridden, and among the worst slums in Europe. The family soon moved into a small, nearby row house that the family could better afford, but they were still in the heart of the poorest part of the city.

John was frequently in poor health, but began to attend school in 1885. His education was cut short when he was diagnosed with an ulcerated cornea. The treatment for this condition required that both of his eyes be bandaged for extended periods of time and that he avoid daylight. His eyesight was permanently affected, and his attendance at

---

53 The exact number of children the Caseys had is unclear. Baptism records only account for seven, but O’Casey mentions another baby named Susan who died as an infant, and who may have died before being baptized. He also mentions five others who remained nameless, and about which he commented that “maybe [his mother] had forgotten the others” (Autobiographies 2, 515). Biographer, Christopher Murray doubts the veracity of the claim that a mother could forget five of her deceased children, and, therefore, establishes the number of Casey children at eight with only five surviving (Writer at Work 19).

54 O’Casey describes the tenements in the stage directions of The Plough and the Stars. Of the plays he had written to this point, these descriptions are the most descriptive of the poor living conditions. In Act I the interior of the house is described as “struggling for its life against the assaults of time, and the more savage assaults of the tenants” (135). The exterior is described at the start of Act III: “the brick front is scarred with age and neglect. The wide and heavy hall door … has a look of having been burned by a fire in the distant past…. The diamond-paned fanlight is destitute of a single pane, the framework alone remaining” (180). The attic rooms are described at the start of Act IV: “There is an unmistakable air of poverty bordering on destitution. The paper on the walls is torn and soiled” (200).

55 The death rate in Dublin at that time was 44 in each 1,000 people, which was worse than the notorious slums of Calcutta (Kiberd 219).
school became sporadic and eventually ceased (Stewart 3-4). When he was six, his father, Michael, suffered a series of health problems that remain unclear, but that resulted in his death that same year.\footnote{Murray notes that Michael may have suffered a fall from a ladder, but also that his cause of death was listed as bronchitis and swelling of the lower body and trunk, which are inconsistent with a spinal injury. He also notes that the middle-aged O’Casey believed that his father’s death was related somehow to a fall, but that he recalled his father wasting away at home as “an invalid, not a cripple” (\textit{Writer at Work} 27).} This left Susan to care for the family on her own, and the family sank deeper into poverty. Despite their hardships, the Casey children continued their educations, and the older boys would read passages of literature to young John, which he would then memorize. When he was in his early teens, and when his eye condition had improved enough for him to see better, John taught himself how to read and began to study the works of Shakespeare, Dickens, and other well-known works of literature. His passion for reading was so great that he, at times, resorted to stealing books he wanted to read, but could not afford (Stewart 4; Murray \textit{Writer at Work} 51).

In his early twenties, John became interested in causes of the Irish nationalist and labor movements. He joined the Gaelic League, which supported the preservation and promotion of the Irish language and culture, and the Gaelic Athletic Association, which organized Gaelic sports, but which also maintained a strong political presence. It was in solidarity with these causes that John Casey changed his name to its fully Gaelicized version, Seán O’Cathasaigh.\footnote{From this point in the chapter until he changes his name again to Seán O’Casey, I will follow the model established by Christopher Murray and refer to him as Seán (see Murray \textit{Writer at Work} 66).} The Irish cause also led him to join the more politically-charged and militant organization, the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB). Murray describes this time in Seán’s life as a period in which “he was a fanatic for all things Irish” (\textit{Writer at Work} 66). He began to write comic stories and poems (of which only a
few snippets survive) for the IRB’s monthly reading of their hand-written magazine, *Croidhe na h-Éigse.*

He remained committed to the IRB, even their commitment to taking militant measures to achieve their goal of Irish independence, which stands in stark contrast to the author who would later denounce this type of violence in his plays.

Seán continued his political activism by following the lead of the union organizer, Jim Larkin and supporting his labor strike, which led to the infamous 1913 Lockout with violent clashes between labor protestors and the police, and eventually to Larkin’s arrest. Seán then played a pivotal role in the reformation of the defunct Irish Citizen Army (ICA) under Larkin’s leadership. At this point, Seán was a supporter of several of these militaristic nationalist groups, but the goal of his rebellion became sharply focused on workers’ rights, not the English.

He found himself consistently at odds with these groups of which he was once an integral part, because he now felt they were supporting “a bourgeois agenda” as opposed to supporting the workers and the poor (Murray *Writer at Work* 89). The ties between the ICA and the Volunteers were getting closer even though they did not see eye-to-eye on all issues. Seán saw this, not as a strengthening of the groups by forming an alliance, but as a weakening of the directives of the ICA.

During an August 1914 meeting of the ICA Council in which Countess Constance Markievicz was present as joint-Treasurer, Seán, as acting Secretary, made the following formal demand that the Countess choose which group she wanted to be allied with:

---

58 *Croidhe na h-Éigse* is Irish for “The Heart of Her Poetry.”

59 Although he allied himself with many of these nationalist groups, Seán never considered joining Arthur Griffith’s Sinn Féin movement, which opposed Larkin’s 1913 labor strike and supported the Irish Parliamentary Party (see Murray, *Writer at Work* 89).
Seeing that Madame Markievicz was, through Cumann na mBan, attached to the Volunteers, and on intimate terms with many of the Volunteer leaders, and as the Volunteers' Association was, in its methods and aims, inimical to the first interests of Labour, it could not be expected that Madame could retain the confidence of the Council; and that she be now asked to sever her connection with either the Volunteers or the Irish Citizen Army. (O’Cathasaigh, *Story 45*)

Seán had misjudged the amount of support he would receive for such a motion, and Jim Larkin asked that he withdraw the comments made about Markievicz. Seán, true to his Labour ideology, refused and tendered his resignation. By the end of the summer of 1914, he had broken his ties with all of these groups. In spite of the fact that he had left the ICA under such terms, he continued to be supportive of Larkin, and several years later wrote his *The Story of the Irish Citizen Army* in which he extolls the virtues of Larkin and the early Labour movement.⁶¹

Seán soon found himself destitute with no source of income and no ability to provide himself with food. He confided to a friend that he was living off two cups of tea per day, and he soon began to suffer severe malnutrition symptoms (Murray *Writer at Work* 92). He recuperated in his mother’s home until he was strong enough to begin writing again, and he began to sell articles to James Connolly’s newspaper, *The Irish Worker*. Despite the fact that Connolly (the newly appointed leader of the ICA) was printing his articles, Seán continued to be openly critical of the organization under Connoly’s leadership, even going so far as to speak out against the organization to crowds outside the ICA headquarters in Liberty Hall. He also began working as a laborer

---

⁶⁰ Cumann na mBan was the women’s auxiliary branch of the Irish Volunteers.

⁶¹ *The Story of the Irish Citizen Army* (1919) was published under the name P. O Cathasaigh due to the author’s failure to proofread the title page, and in it Seán refers to himself in the third person, which became his typical autobiographical style in later publications (Murray, *Writer at Work* 122).
and helped build a stage for theater productions of the Irish Workers’ Dramatic Company and later for the Liberty Players. Seán never wrote about which plays he saw during that time with the exception of Connolly’s own play, *Under Which Flag?*, which he criticized harshly in his autobiography. He said the play “blundered a sentimental way over a stage in the Hall in a green limelight” (*Drums* 315). The “green limelight “was Seán’s way of indicating that Connolly had left all socialist (red) ideology behind in favor of blind, violent Irish nationalism. With the Labour movement now all but dissolved, and Connolly in charge of the ICA, Seán’s outlets for political involvement were now dried up and he became simply a witness to the events of Easter Week 1916. Although he played no role in the Rising, he, along with many other men, was arrested and held in a church until the fighting was over. Many of the events he witnessed during the Rising, including his arrest, later made their way into the text of *The Plough and the Stars*.

Seán then began to write poetry to earn enough money on which to survive, and soon after bought tickets to two plays at the Abbey Theatre: *Blight*, co-authored by Oliver St. John Gogarty and Joseph O’Connor, and Lady Augusta Gregory’s *The Rising of the Moon*. He was deeply impressed by the acting, but felt that he could write a better play (Murray, *Writer at Work* 113). He then decided to dedicate all of his time to getting a play of his own accepted by the Abbey.

In 1918, Seán began a serious romantic relationship with Márie Keating, a local school teacher. Her Catholic family did not approve of their daughter seeing a poor, unemployed Protestant, so the couple had to keep their relationship a secret. The influenza epidemic that spread across the world that year claimed the life of Seán’s dear
sister, Bella, and nearly the life of Márie. His elderly mother, with whom he lived and for whom he cared, also grew ill. Márie recovered, but his mother did not. The relationship soon ended, however, due to their religious differences, and Seán was left devastated, but continued to write, determined to get a play of his performed at the Abbey. He completed two scripts, *The Harvest Festival* and *The Frost in the Flower*, both of which he submitted to the Abbey in 1920, and both of which were rejected.

Seán tried again, and in 1921, at the turning point of the War of Independence, he submitted another play about the tensions between the Labour movement and Sinn Féin entitled *The Crimson in the Tricolour*. Lady Gregory, a member of the Abbey board, commented that it was “extremely interesting,” but that it “ought to be kept back till the fight with England is over, & the new Government has had time to show what it can do” (*Letters I*, 95). W. B. Yeats, also a member of the board, and the final authority on what was accepted or rejected for production, was far more critical of the play. Seán quickly decided to use Lady Gregory’s support to his advantage and sought her advice for his future plays.

While working on his next play, Seán shared a room with his friend Micheál Ó Maoláin in a tenement on Mountjoy Square, all the while the War of Independence was raging around them. Their room was raided eighteen times by British forces and the Black & Tans. Despite the interruptions and constant fear of arrest or being killed, Seán prepared another play, *The Seamless Coat of Cathleen*, which was subsequently rejected by the Abbey. His next play was to be entitled *On the Run*, and he worked on it as the War of Independence came to a close and the Civil War began to rage across the country.
In this play, he included a fictionalized version of the military raids of his shared
tenement room, and he submitted it to the Abbey in November 1922. After a long,
three-month delay, he received the good news that his fifth attempt at writing a play was
successful. It was set to be staged in April for three performances, and Lennox Robinson,
the Abbey’s third board member, suggested that he change the name to *The Shadow of a
Gunman*—a request to which Seán happily acquiesced. He also billed himself for the
very first time on the playbill as “Seán O’Casey,” and his career as a playwright was
finally born at the age of forty-two.

O’Casey was well aware that this one success after seven years of difficulty did
not guarantee him further successes, but that he had to get back to work right away. He
writes about his thoughts while watching the crowd fill the theater on the third and final
night of the play’s short run in the fourth volume of his autobiography, *Inishfallen, Fare
Thee Well*.63

Well, he had done what he had set himself to do seven or more years ago: he had
mounted a play of his on the Abbey stage. Odd, he felt no great elation; no more
than he would have felt in the middle, or at the end, of a speech in Irish delivered
before a crowd of Gaels. He felt, though, as he stood quiet in the vestibule, that
he had crossed the border of a little, but a great, new kingdom of life, and so
another illusion was born in his poor susceptible soul. He didn’t know enough
then that it was no great thing to be an Abbey playwright; and, afterwards, when
he knew a lot more, he was glad he had suffered himself to feel no jubilation to
mar his future by thinking too much of a tiny success: life remained a mystery to
him. He thought, not of what he had done, but of what he had to do in the form
and substance of his second play; realising, though unaware of it at the time, that
to be a great playwright was a very different thing from merely being one who
had had one, two, or even three plays produced at the Abbey Theatre. (103)

---

62 O’Casey also recounts these events in his chapter, “The Raid” in *Inishfallen Fare Thee Well* (1949).
63 O’Casey writes about himself under the pseudonym, Johnny (sometimes Sean) Cassidy, throughout the
autobiographies, and always in the third person. The spelling of his surname was changed to “Cassidy” in
the 1965 film, *Young Cassidy*, based on his 1956 autobiography, *Mirror in My House*. 
He quickly began to pen his follow-up in the form of two one-act plays, which he submitted within a week of each other. *The Cooing of Doves* was submitted first on August 23, 1923 and *Kathleen Listens In* on August 30. *Kathleen* was accepted as his second play, but *The Cooing of Doves* was rejected and the typescript subsequently misplaced. O’Casey believed that *Doves*, another play about the tensions between the socialist Labour movement and the Nationalists, was a far better play than *Kathleen*, and he was shocked at its rejection. “This was the first jolt he got,” he writes of his thoughts at the time, “but he was to get many more before he was much older, and from the same source, too” (103). Thus began his difficult relationship with the Abbey, as well as the mystery surrounding the whereabouts of *The Cooing of Doves*.

III. The Mystery and Reappearance of *The Cooing of Doves*

While it would later become O’Casey’s “apotheosis,” *The Cooing of Doves* was, from the time of its composition, surrounded by confusion and mystery. Its story actually begins with the Abbey’s rejection of the earlier *The Crimson in the Tricolour* in 1921. As mentioned above, *Crimson* was a play about the tensions between Labour and the nationalist movement. The manuscript was initially lost, found again, and subsequently lost again for good (Cowasjee 25, n. 80). The Abbey actor, Michael Dolan, had read the original manuscript and was interested in the play, but found aspects of it problematic.

---

64 Cowasjee explains that Lennox Robinson was the last person to have possession of the manuscript, but that he could not locate it. O’Casey requested the manuscript of Robinson repeatedly for thirty-five years before giving up.
Joseph Holloway, a regular patron of The Abbey, recorded his conversation with Dolan and O’Casey regarding the play:\footnote{Holloway kept a diary for decades, which Murray compares to Samuel Pepys in scope. It consists of 221 volumes, and is now held in the National Library of Ireland (see Murray, Writer at Work 144).}

As originally written, Dolan found it impossible. The first scene was outside a convent with people spouting socialism for no earthly reason. Dolan suggested if [O’Casey] wanted his characters to spout such stuff, the bar of a pub would be the most likely setting. O’Casey has acted on his suggestions and made one of his scenes to take place in a pub. (219)

It is unclear whether Holloway was referring to a revision of Crimson or the manuscript of Doves in his assertions that O’Casey “acted on [Dolan’s] suggestion,” but the idea of setting a scene in a pub had clearly taken hold for O’Casey at this point in time. Saros Cowasjee also notes that O’Casey used characteristics of one character from Crimson to create The Covey in Plough (25). Despite any confusion as to whether O’Casey had revised the lost Crimson, he clearly took Dolan’s advice and set Doves in the specifically named Leitrim Bar and used aspects of it for what would later become The Plough and the Stars.\footnote{Leitrim is a small village that gives the name to County Leitrim. The mechanization of the textile industry hit the town very hard and forced many laborers out of work. The town was subsequently devastated by the Great Famine and the resulting emigration. For O’Casey, Leitrim could have been a symbol of the poverty and devastation resulting from the mistreatment of the labor force. It is also possible that O’Casey named it after Lord Leitrim, who, as John Paul Riquelme notes, “was a landlord with large holdings, hated for his treatment of tenants” and who was murdered by his tenants in 1878 (Joyce Portrait 28, n.1). O’Casey may have been using this latter fact to figuratively establish the bar as a place of violent rebellion against British rule.}

The extent to which O’Casey used Doves to create Act II of Plough is the primary confusion surrounding the once-lost play. Various sources, including O’Casey himself, claim lesser and greater influence. In Blasts and Benedictions O’Casey says of Plough and the controversy it caused, “[a]ll the time, there was hovering in my mind that The
Cooing of Doves, the play rejected by the Abbey Theatre, now formed the much-praised second act of the play … It went in with but a few minor changes” (98). Cowasjee, drawing from his personal correspondence with O’Casey, was the first critic to suggest that Doves was inserted into Plough relatively unchanged, that it simply “became” the second act, and this misconception became the accepted conclusion. Robert Lowery’s simple note on the play, for example, says that Doves is “[a]n early short play which became Act II of The Plough and the Stars,” using Cowasjee’s same wording (467). Kosok Heinz says that the rejected Doves “was then integrated by O’Casey, with some minor alterations, into his new play” (75). Other critics followed suit and suggested that the original play remained relatively unchanged as it was used in Plough, but also recognized that some changes would have to be made in order to adapt it to the new material. Holloway recalls conversations with O’Casey about both rejected plays, Crimson and Doves: “[h]e said he destroyed them but he didn’t. He hopes to use some of the dialogue later on” (qtd in Cowasjee 26). It remains unclear as to why O’Casey would have told Holloway that he had destroyed the earlier plays that were simply unaccounted for at the time, but the idea that he planned to use some of the material at a later date is the closest any critic came to the truth. Hugh Hunt also takes Holloway’s approach, claiming that Doves was “later to be used as the basis for the second act of The Plough and the Stars,” although he boldly claims that the play was not misplaced, but “destroyed in the Abbey fire in 1951” (Sean O’Casey 45). Murray takes a stronger position than even

---

67 This section of Blasts and Benedictions entitled, “The Plough and the Stars in Retrospect” first appeared in the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1960. The play was being revived in New York at that time (95n).

68 see Cowasjee 26, 26n.
O’Casey himself regarding the lack of revision to the source and claims that “it was inserted undetected into the script of the Plough” (*Writer at Work* 142). In hindsight, it turns out that all of the critics were wrong. *The Cooing of Doves* was not integrated into the text of *Plough* as merely the second act; instead, its historical setting was changed by seven years and its characters were revised and expanded into all four acts of *The Plough and the Stars*.

The mystery of the lost play’s whereabouts was finally solved in 2005, eighty-two years after it was first submitted to the Abbey Theatre in the summer of 1923. Mealy’s Fine Art and Antiques in Kilkenny, Ireland held an auction in December 2005 in which the once-lost typescript for *The Cooing of Doves* appeared as lot number 660. Murray describes the reappearance of the play “as a small shock to scholars and Irish theater aficionados” (*Doves* 327). The auction catalog answered many of the immediate questions that scholars had, not the least of which was the play’s whereabouts for the previous eighty-two years. Mealy’s provided provenance for the document listing the original owner as Eric Gorman. Gorman was the actor who played Peter Flynn in the original Abbey production of *Plough*, and who later served as the theater’s secretary until 1964. Exactly when and how Gorman came into possession of the play is still uncertain, but it was clearly before the Abbey fire in 1951. Gorman sold the play to a collector in the town of Killiney where it remained until the collector’s family placed it up for auction in 2005. A private collector named Leonard Milberg bought the play and, through his cooperation with Princeton University, Christopher Murray, and the O’Casey estate,

---

69 Murray later corrected this assertion in his introduction to *The Cooing of Doves* when it was finally published in the *Princeton University Library Chronicle* (Autumn 2006-Winter 2007).

The typescript was completely intact and contained many corrections and alterations made in O’Casey’s hand. As with any early draft, however, the play had many typographical, spacing, and textual errors, all of which Murray has painstakingly corrected in the published version of the play. He adapted the text to conform to current theater conventions by setting all stage directions in italics and spelling out the characters’ full names each time they speak, whereas O’Casey used abbreviations. Murray also provided annotations to the text, which help provide historical background for the action of the play, explanations to references made by the characters, and the locations of any significant alterations by both O’Casey and by Murray himself. The following investigation of the texts of *Doves* and its evolution and expansion into *Plough* will take these annotations into consideration and will at times provide alternative interpretations and corrections where necessary.

IV. The Doves’ New Voice

Misconceptions

The primary misconception regarding *Doves*, as noted above, is that it was simply “inserted” into the text of *Plough*—that it just “became” Act II. This misconception is largely due to O’Casey himself, who wrote that he incorporated the play into *Plough*, but “made a few minor changes” (*Blasts and Benedictions* 98). Now that the text of *Doves* is
available, it is clear that O’Casey made drastic, not minor, changes to the text, not only in content, but also in context.

The content of *Doves* shares some occasional similarities with Act II of *Plough*, and these similarities are significant enough to warrant further investigation below. The vast majority of the text of *Doves*, however, is completely abandoned and replaced with new writing in *Plough*. Murray claims that O’Casey “obviously had a copy of the script to work from,” but, due to the facts that O’Casey repeatedly asked for the return of the typescript from the Abbey, and that he used so little of the actual content of *Doves* in the new play, it is more likely that he was working from notes or possibly from memory (*Doves* 328). The entire text of *Doves* consists of approximately 5,250 words. Fewer than 400 of those words, or paraphrases of them, appear in *Plough*. This is less than eight percent of the original text, which means that, far from being “inserted” with “a few minor changes,” Act II of *Plough* consists of almost completely new material.

Regarding the context, *Plough* is set among the events leading up to and including the Easter 1916 Rebellion, while *Doves* is set in August 1923, just before the first national elections after a long and brutal war, and after Ireland had finally gained independence from England. This should have been a time of peace and prosperity, but instead Ireland found itself in the midst of a civil war. The Irish had just ended their fight with England and, instead of ushering in a new era of peace, they wasted no time in

---

70 This word count was calculated electronically by word-processing software. Different software applications may use different algorithms and another may arrive at a different result. The point of the calculations, however, regards the general proportion of the text brought from *Doves* into the text of *Plough*, and the differences between one software application and another would be insignificant.

71 O’Casey identifies the time of the play as “The Present.” He submitted the play on August 23, 1923 just days before the first election.
starting to fight amongst themselves. The Man on the Seat in *Doves* makes this very clear early on when he says, “long ago we writ a book called ‘The War o the Gaels With the Galls;’ now we have to write a new one—‘The War of the Gaels with the Gaels!’” (341). *Doves* is about a struggle among fellow citizens to define their new country’s method of self determination, whereas *Plough* is about the complex struggles, both internal and external, regarding Irish independence from England. One play is about the Irish people at odds with each other, and the other is about the poor Irish people coming together for a common cause despite their differences.

Another misconception, and one that will likely remain unresolved until another lost manuscript turns up, is the suggestion that *Doves* was the only source for *Plough*. Gabriel Fallon, who knew O’Casey and acted in his plays at the Abbey, claimed that O’Casey used the rejected play, *The Crimson in the Tricolour*, as an additional source for *Plough*. Both W.A. Armstrong (1961) and Ronald Ayling (1966) reject this claim. They assert that only *Doves* was used without considering that O’Casey may have very well used more than one of his previously rejected plays as source material for a new one.

Both Cowasjee and Murray confirm that *Crimson* was, indeed, a source for *Plough*. Murray notes that O’Casey “mentions re-reading the text in November 1924, at which point he saw ‘no merit in it’. He nevertheless plundered it to create the Covey and Fluther in *The Plough and the Stars*” (134). Cowasjee, as noted above, confirmed that the character of The Covey originated with a character from *Crimson* (25). The text of *Crimson* has yet to emerge after it was last seen by O’Casey in 1924, and according to

---

72 *The War of the Gaels with the Galls*, translated from the Irish *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh* is a twelfth-century account of the Battle of Clontarf in which the Irish fought off the galls (Viking foreigners).
Michelle Paull, may have been consumed in the Abbey fire of 1951, the same fire that
Hunt claims destroyed the script for Doves, but we now know did not (25). Regardless of
the fate of Crimson, enough evidence exists to confirm that it was, indeed, a source for
Plough, but the extent to which it was used will remain a mystery (145).

The Similarities and Correspondences

While it is now clear that less than eight percent of the text of The Cooing of
Doves made it into The Plough and the Stars, that small percentage had a tremendous
influence on the plot and characters. Nearly all of the characters in Doves were used to
create the characters for Plough. In this respect, Doves acted as a prototype for the setting
and characters in the later play; it was, in essence, the seed that grew into Plough. In
contrast to earlier claims that the one-act was incorporated nearly invisibly into the text of
the newer play, it is now clear that Doves was the centerpiece around which O’Casey
created Plough, not an act added to an existing framework.

Long before the lost typescript reappeared, Cowasjee identified Act II of Plough
as “the very soul of the play” (66). It is this scene set at a bar in which O’Casey presents
the various political views of the characters, and in which he openly mocks each of the
various political ideologies present in revolutionary Ireland by having each one
represented by a stereotype. Even the list of characters for Doves reads more like a list of
archetypes than actual people. None of the characters are listed by name (although
several are named in the dialogue), but are instead listed by descriptions:
The Proprietor of the Leitrim Bar [the Bartender].
The Man on the Seat.
The Orange Seller.
The Forester.
The Carpenter.
The Republican Labourer.
The Native Speaker.
The Ballad Singer.
The Socialist Clerk.
The Socialist Labourer. (337)\textsuperscript{73}

Any member of the Abbey audience in 1923 would have recognized these character types and would have been able to ascertain their political positions before the curtain rose.

Nearly all of the characters listed above have counterparts in \textit{Plough} with the exception of The Man on the Seat, essentially a one-man Greek chorus, whose role in the play is to provide cynical and jaded commentary on the political rantings of the other characters, and who Murray associates with many of O’Casey’s personal political opinions (\textit{Doves} 333). In a full-length play, O’Casey would have much more time to allow these opinions to make themselves clear without the necessity of having them spoken aloud by an interlocutor and so removed him from the scene when writing \textit{Plough}. Rosie Redmond, however, who has no counterpart in \textit{Doves}, takes on a small part of the role of The Man on the Seat in that she opens the scene with the bartender, and she supports the nationalist cause in a similar way; this, though, is where their similarities end. The Native Speaker, a Blasket Islander, also has no counterpart in \textit{Plough} at all. His character does little to advance the action of \textit{Doves}, and his relatively few lines could easily be spoken by almost any other character. His only function in the play is to set up a joke for the Man on

\textsuperscript{73} See Appendix B for a chart showing the correspondences between the characters of \textit{Doves} and \textit{Plough}. 
the Seat. The Carpenter mispronounces The Native Speaker’s home as “the Blawsted Islands.” The Native Speaker angrily corrects The Carpenter and insists that “theres no such place in Ireland as the Blasted Islands!” to which The Man on the Seat replies, “the whole country is a blasted island” (344). Given that the character of The Man on the Seat was unnecessary in *Plough* and is no longer there to make the joke, the Native Speaker became unnecessary as well.

The rest of the cast all have direct correspondences to the familiar characters in *Plough*. The Bartender is, of course, present in both scenes, and, although his name changes from the Bartender “Johnny” in *Doves* to the Barman “Tommy” in *Plough*, his character is essentially the same. In both scenes, he is the first to speak. The opening line of *Doves* is the Bartender making pleasant conversation with the Man on the Seat, “The meetin is goin on very quietly after all; I was afraid thered be rows at it. God knows its nearly time we had a little peace” (338). The Barman opens *Plough* in a very similar, casual manner, but speaking, instead, to a local prostitute, Rosie: “Nothin’ much doin’ in your line to-night, Rosie?” (161). The only two direct correspondences in dialogue between the two bartender characters comes when he is trying to cool the tensions among patrons. The first instance occurs when the Carpenter and Forester/Fluther and Peter, respectively, begin to argue about an annual trip to Bodenstown to pay respects to Theobald Wolfe Tone—an eighteenth-century revolutionary and considered by many to be the founder of Irish Republicanism—and the Bartender intervenes.74

*Doves*: “Now then, now then; we want no fightin here” (346).

*Plough*: “Now then, thry to speak asy will yous? We don’t want no shoutin’.

---

74 See note on page 4 for details on Theobald Wolfe Tone.
here” (168).

The second instance occurs a few pages later when tensions rise between The Ballad Singer and The Carpenter/Bessie and Mrs. Gogan, respectively, and the Bartender must, once again, intervene. He admonishes to the combatants:

Doves: “Here, none o this fightin here; if you cant conduct yourselves, go somewhere else” (349).

Plough: “Here, now, since yous can’t have a little friendly argument quietly, you’ll get out o’ this place in quick time. Go on, an’ settle your differences somewhere else” (172).

Other than these two interventions, the two characters share no dialogue, but the Bartender/Barman remains a proud and careful proprietor in both plays.

The Orange Seller is an early version of Bessie Burgess, who is also “a fruit seller” and is called an “Orange bitch” by Mrs. Gogan in Plough (183). Her title itself is an allegory for Unionist politics—the color refers to William III, formerly Prince of Orange, who is honored by the Orange Order, a Protestant, pro-British fraternal organization based in Northern Ireland. By selling the orange-colored fruit, she is literally selling the symbolism of the pro-British northern counties to the people of Dublin. The original typescript shows O’Casey developing this idea on the page. The character’s original name was Mrs. Mackineely, and O’Casey abbreviated it in the script as “Mrs Mac—” for the first few pages of the play. In her character’s first appearance on stage, O’Casey crossed out the name and wrote in “The Orange Seller” by hand. He crossed out all other occurrences of her name on that page and replaced it with the abbreviated “The O Seller” (339n.). In what was probably an earlier change that prompted the alteration of the character’s name, he revised the final line of the stage directions
introducing her character from, “She carries an empty basket on her arm—she is a fruit vendor” to “She carries a basket of oranges on her arm—she is a fruit vendor” (339n). This decision to switch the character from a fruit vendor bearing no fruit to one who carries only oranges makes it clear that O’Casey was highlighting her association with pro-Unionist politics. The two characters, while representing the same political archetype, share no dialogue at all between the two plays.

The Ballad Singer is slightly less recognizable as Mrs. Gogan in *Plough*. Both share many characteristics, but only two lines of dialogue on the same corresponding page. Both women are offered a drink and order “the ball o’ malt” in *Doves* and “a half o’ malt” in *Plough* (348; 167). Both also appreciate the uniform of the Irish National Foresters.

*Doves:*

The Ballad Singer. “Isn’t it a gorgeous rig out, the Foostherers? They’re a far more nice dress than the kilts, I think; I don’t really think the kilts is decent.” (348)

Mrs. Gogan’s comments are broken up a bit by Peter and Fluther, but remain almost identical:

*Plough:*

Mrs. Gogan. “The Foresthers’ is a gorgeous dhress! I don’t think I’ve seen nicer … nicer than th’ kilts, for, God forgive me, I always think the kilts is hardly decent.” (167)

The strongest similarity between the two, however, is the fact that both are easily sent into a rage if confronted. The bartender intervenes in both plays in order to prevent each of them from starting a fight strengthening the correspondence between the two characters.
There are also several instances in *Doves* in which The Ballad Singer has lines that will later be spoken by other characters in *Plough*. For example, The Ballad Singer’s insult to the Carpenter, “Gway, you little yella-faced, consequential, little, pudgee little bum, you!” is hurled almost verbatim by Bessie to Peter (*Doves* 349; *Plough* 171). In another case, The Ballad Singer reacts to the dent in the The Carpenter’s skull with the line, “Be God, thats a dint right enough!” In *Plough*, it is Rosie who feels the dent in Fluther’s head and who says, “My God, there’s holla!” (*Doves* 353; *Plough* 174).

The Forester\(^{75}\) and the Carpenter appear together in *Doves* just as their counterparts Peter Flynn and Fluther Good appear in *Plough*. O’Casey identifies Fluther in the character list as “a carpenter,” and opens the first act with Fluther fixing a door lock, and using a hammer and screwdriver (133; 136). Peter is only identified in the cast list as “(a labourer), Nora’s uncle,” but throughout Act I, he is seen donning items of clothing until he finally appears in a full Foresters’ uniform (133; 150). The pair are frequently in conversation with each other, and in both plays they end up arguing for a full page about The Forester/Peter and his aforementioned annual visit to Bodenstown and the grave of Wolfe Tone (*Doves* 346; *Plough* 167). For the Forester and Peter, this argument is their only correspondence in dialogue between the two plays, but The Carpenter and Fluther share another scene in which they argue with the Socialist Labourer and The Covey, respectively. Among the shared dialogue are his responses to two questions, the first is about Karl Marx and “the mechanism of exchange.”

\(^{75}\) The Irish National Foresters were a mutual benefit or friendly society that gathered to provide community assistance in the absence of state social welfare programs. Their uniform was based on that of Robert Emmet, who led the failed 1803 Rebellion against England (Keenan 360; Murray *Doves* 340).
Doves:
The Carpenter. “How the hell do I know what he says—theres nothin about that in the rules of our Trades Union.” (354)

Plough:
Fluther. “How th’ hell do I know what it is? There’s nothin’ about that in th’ rules of our Thrades Union!” (174)

The second question is about Marx’s concept of “the Relation of Value to the Cost of Production,” which elicits another nearly identical response:

Doves:
The Carpenter. “How the hell do I know? Who was Karl Marx, anyhow? Dye think I’m goin to folly foreigners?” (355)

Plough:
Fluther. “What the hell do I care what he says? I’m Irishman enough not to lose me head be follyin’ foreigners!” (175)

Other lines of shared dialogue involve The Carpenter’s/Fluther’s battle scars from nationalist events held on O’Connell Street and in Pheonix Park, and his allegiance since childhood to the “Shan Van Vok” (352-3; 174).

The Republican Labourer, The Socialist Clerk, and the Socialist Labourer from Doves are all combined into one character in Plough—The Young Covey. The change in the historical setting of the play (discussed in more detail below) allowed O’Casey to combine the characters since Socialism was a far more accepted political ideology during the historical events of Plough than it was during the events of Doves, which was set more than seven years later when the socialist Labour movement had all but vanished. This earlier historical acceptance allows The Covey to interact more openly with the other characters than the earlier three incarnations in Doves. O’Casey also made the character of The Covey vibrant and engaging enough to easily take on the function of all three of his predecessors. In a rare instance of shared dialogue outside the bar scene, The
Socialist Labourer and The Covey each use the phrase, “in seculo seculorum.” The Labourer uses it in response to The Carpenter quoting a line from the Song, “Thou Art Not Conquered Yet.” He shouts in earnest, “No, nor shall it ever be conquered! The spirit of Ireland lives in seculo seculorum!” before storming defiantly out of the bar (342). In *Plough*, The Covey (always looking to cause a stir) uses the religious term sarcastically in reference to the exercises of the Irish Citizen Army volunteers. He remarks, “They have to renew their political baptismal vows to be faithful in seculo seculorum” (142). His desire to start a fight is successful as Fluther takes the bait and they argue about the role of religion.

The location settings of both *Doves* and Act II of *Plough* are nearly identical with the exception of the layout of the pub. *Doves* opens in the specifically named Leitrim Bar. The bar itself takes up about half of the stage and disappears off-stage to the right. There is a large window looking out onto the street, under which there is a seat. The unnamed “public-house” in *Plough* has a similar set up with a large window and a seat, except the bar takes up less space on stage and extends off to the left, and there is also a snug, or small enclosed seating area, near the window. Although the bar in *Plough* is unnamed, it is clear that its location is near the center of O’Connell Street, as Pádraig Pearse (also unnamed) can be heard delivering bits of speeches meant to recall his famous delivery of the Proclamation of the Irish Republic in front of the General Post Office on Easter.

---

76 The characters are referring in each case to the end of the Latin vulgate translation of the Greek phrase meaning “for eons and eons,” and which is commonly recited at the end of the doxology, “Gloria Patria.” Common English translations include, “for ever and ever,” and the more poetic “world without end,” which Joyce used four times in *Ulysses* and six times in *Finnegans Wake* (U 2.204, 3.28, 15.2236, and 15.3935; FW 244.01, 261.13, 272.04, 276.05, 455.17, and 582.20-21)
Monday 1916 as well as his other public speeches and publications leading up to the event. Both settings allow the patrons to see and hear the events going on outside the bar. Both scenes also make reference very early to “The Soldiers’ Song,” which would later become the Irish national anthem.\footnote{"The Soldier’s Song” (“Amhrán na bhFiann”) was written by Peadar Kearney in 1907 and by 1912 was regularly used as a marching tune by the Irish Volunteers. It was extremely popular among nationalists during the 1916 Easter Rising and during the War of Independence. The song’s chorus was officially adopted as the national anthem in 1926 (Keating and O’Laughlin 17).} In \textit{Plough}, Act I has political elements, but it is also a portrait of domestic life among the Dublin tenement dwellers. In Act II, however, O’Casey uses the model he established in \textit{Doves} to focus almost exclusively on nationalist politics, and the play maintains this sharp political focus until the curtain falls at the end of Act IV. In the second line of dialogue in \textit{Doves}, and the first spoken by The Man on the Seat, he says, “It’s not over yet. We have to live, not according to nature, but according to our songs:—‘We’re childhren of a fightin race, that never yet has known disgrace,’ —ah, we must keep up our national traditions” (338).\footnote{O’Casey frequently altered the spellings of words as in “childhren” and “fightin” above in order to preserve the pronunciation of the Dubliners he was portraying on stage.} If, as Murray suggests, The Man on the Seat represents O’Casey’s political views, then it is clear that he wanted to set the tone for \textit{Doves} as a play about nationalist politics by having this delivered as one of the first lines of the play. In the opening pages of the second act of \textit{Plough}, Peter and Fluther enter the bar after hearing a speaker (Pearse) at the public meeting going on immediately outside the pub. Peter orders drinks, then his next line is, ‘I felt a burnin’ lump in me throat when I heard th’ band playin’ ‘The Soldiers’ Song’, rememberin’ last hearin’ it marchin’ in military formation with th’ people starin’ on both sides at us, carryin’ with us th’ pride an’ resolution o’ Dublin to th’ grave of Wolfe Tone” (163). In
Peter’s reference audiences get both the history of the song as a marching tune for militant nationalist groups, as well as its use at public gatherings. By switching these lines from The Man on the Seat to Peter, O’Casey provides a heightened sense of political fervor with the reference. After The Man speaks the lines, he quickly begins to reveal his political apathy until he finally reveals to The Orange Seller, “I don’t take no interest in politics,” to which she replies, “’Scuse me mister… I thought you was an Irishman,” suggesting that all Irishmen have a duty to be concerned with local politics (339). Peter, on the other hand, is presented in Act I as intensely political and by the end of the act is dressed in full Foresters’ regalia. Allowing him to make the reference to the song gives O’Casey another opportunity to further develop Peter as a nationalist caricature whose militaristic views he will later harshly criticize.

These similarities and correspondences demonstrate that the characters in *Doves* were the clear, yet undeveloped prototypes for those in *Plough*. O’Casey took the basic character elements and a few lines of dialogue from *Doves* and gave them much more depth in *Plough*. The earlier characters were listed in the script as prototypes and caricatures, but by the time he was finished writing *Plough*, O’Casey had given them not only names, but also more developed lives and back stories so that audiences could relate to them on a more personal level. The more fully developed characters were no longer just stereotypes the audience could easily identify, they had become people with whom the audience could relate on a much more personal level and with whom some audience members would take extreme exception.
The Differences

The most conspicuous difference between the two plays is the difference in the historical setting. *The Plough and the Stars* is set in the weeks before and during the events of the Easter Rising in 1916. *The Cooing of Doves* is set in August 1923, just before the first official national election. Murray notes that O’Casey submitted the play to the Abbey four days before the election was held, and that “he viewed the election result [in favor of the Pro-Treaty contingency] as a foregone conclusion.” He adds, “it seems that to O’Casey the election was a joke and the issues at stake in the new postrevolutionary Ireland woefully misunderstood” (*Doves* 329). O’Casey was certainly hoping that The Abbey would produce the play quickly enough that he could confront the audience with their own lack of political awareness, but, much to O’Casey’s shock, the play was rejected, and he was forced to take a new approach (*Inishfallen* 164-5).

O’Casey’s new approach was no less politically confrontational than than *Doves*. It was, in fact, far more confrontational, which is part of the reason the audience rioted that first week. The new and greatly expanded play, *The Plough and the Stars*, was set seven years earlier than *Doves*, and earlier than either of the other two full-length plays that would come to be collectively called O’Casey’s “Dublin Trilogy” (the others being *Juno and the Paycock* (1924), set in 1922 and *The Shadow of a Gunman* (1923), set in May 1920). For this new play, O’Casey took audiences back to the 1916 Easter Rising and the events leading up to it.

---

79 O’Casey established the time of the play as “The Present” on the typescript, but Murray identifies the time more precisely based on references made by characters in the play.
As noted above, the Easter Rising was considered by many to be sacrosanct and outside the bounds of criticism. The execution of the rebel leaders had turned them into political martyrs in the eyes of the majority of the Irish people, and to criticize them and their actions was considered by many to be in poor taste at best and unpatriotic at worst. O’Casey, clearly, did not share this opinion. In 1960 he reflected back on the time of the Rising:

I, of course, lived in the midst of all the events described in the play. There I was part of them, yet subconsciously commenting on all that was said, much that was done, to be coloured afterward (though I had no inkling of this at the time) through my imagination, seeing at the same time, the sad humour and vigorous tragedy of this historic time to Ireland.” (Blasts and Benedictions 95)

O’Casey was not drawn into the blind patriotism adopted by many in the wake of the Easter Rising and its aftermath. O’Casey describes the scene on the street at the outset of the Rising in his 1919 The Story of the Irish Citizen Army:

Astonishment was followed by stupefaction as faint echoes of rifle shots penetrated from a distance to where the people were gathered together, and all things were forgotten as the news spread from mouth to mouth that the Volunteers and the Citizen Army were taking Dublin, that a Provisional Government had been established and an Irish Republic proclaimed. (59)

His words, “astonishment” and “stupefaction” clearly indicate that the people of Dublin were not only unprepared for such an event, but also that they were utterly confused by it.

During the actual events, many Irish citizens thought that the Rising was a mistake and that it caused the unnecessary destruction of a large section of the city center as well as numerous deaths and serious injuries to both rebels and civilians. The general population only supported the movement after the executions of sixteen of the rebels—particularly the seriously wounded James Connolly—and their unceremonious burial in a
mass grave.\textsuperscript{80} The executed rebels were quickly viewed as heroes and martyrs, and
despite many earlier objections, the Rising became the turning point in Ireland’s hope for
independence and emblematic of the fighting spirit of the Irish people. O’Casey chose to
challenge this idea and presented the Rising as the senseless human cost of a sparsely
armed and poorly organized group of everyday people fighting against the well trained
and fully armed British military. He made no attempt to hide this opinion, but chose his
public words carefully. He recognized the sacrifices of all who participated, but took a
public jab at James Connolly’s militaristic approach to politics by celebrating the actions
and death of Francis Sheehy-Skeffington. O’Casey called Sheehy-Skeffington “the living
antithesis of the Easter Insurrection: a spirit of peace enveloped in the flame and hatred of
the contending elements” (\textit{Story} 64). Sheehy-Skeffington was a pacifist and disavowed
the actions of the rebels, but supported their cause. He did not take part in the Easter
Rising, and even organized a militia group to protect businesses from being looted. He
was nonetheless arrested and executed by British soldiers during the events of Easter
week. O’Casey commemorates his passing by contrasting him with Connolly: “In
Sheehy-Skeffington, and not in Connolly, fell the first martyr of Irish Socialism, for he
linked Ireland not only with the little nations struggling for self-expression, but with the
world’s Humanity struggling for a higher life” (64).

O’Casey’s private conversations were far less guarded. Desmond Greaves notes
that O’Casey considered the Rising to be “a terrible mistake” and confessed this opinion
to Lady Gregory (10). He also argued with John Ford during the production of the film

\textsuperscript{80} See pages 45-47 of Chapter 1 for more detail on the gradual increase of support for the Easter Rising.
version of the play. According to Murray, “Ford misread O’Casey and glorified the stereotypical fightin’ Irish” and believed that the Easter Rising is what freed Ireland from England (246). Ford consulted O’Casey on the adaptation of the play for film, and O’Casey found many of his suggestions to be misguided and “set about exposing the absurdity of Ford’s suggestions” (246). Despite his attempts to protect his original intent of the play, Ford continued making changes based on his faulty interpretations without consulting O’Casey.

Another clear point of departure of *Plough* from *Doves* comes in the naming of the characters and their relationships to each other. Creating *Plough* from his surviving notes and memories of the rejected play allowed O’Casey to take his archetypes and turn them into much more fully developed people.81 The characters are no longer identified by descriptions, but by their names or nick-names. The Young Covey seems to be the exception here, but the characters in the play (including himself) refer to him as “The Covey” or “Young Covey,” except Nora, who calls him by the more familiar, “Willie.”

The Character list in the new play is as follows:

JACK CLITHEROE (*a bricklayer*), *Commandant in the Irish Citizen Army*

NORA CLITHEROE, *his wife*

*PETER FLYNN (*a labourer*), *Nora’s uncle*

*THE YOUNG COVEY (*a fitter*), *Clitheroe’s cousin*

*BESSIE BURGESS (*a street fruit-vendor*)

*MRS. GOGAN (*a charwoman*)

MOLLER, *her consumptive child*

*FLUTHER GOOD (*a carpenter*)

LIEUT. LANGDON (*a Civil Servant*), *of the Irish Volunteers*

---

81 As noted above, Murray asserts that O’Casey “obviously had a copy of the script to work from, though not necessarily the one published here [Princeton University Library Chronicle]” (Doves 328). The lack of textual correspondence between the plays, however, (less than eight percent) combined with the fact that O’Casey repeatedly asked the Abbey to return the play suggests otherwise. It is far more likely that O’Casey was working from notes and memory when composing *Plough.*
CAPT. BRENnan (a chicken butcher), of the Irish Citizen Army
CORPORAL STODDARD, of the Wiltshires
SERGEANT TINLEY, of the Wiltshires
*ROSIE REDMOND, a daughter of 'the Digs'
*A BAR-TENDER
A WOMAN
THE FIGURE IN THE WINDOW (133, my asterisks).

The addition of the Clitheroes provides O’Casey with a family around which he could bring the rest of the characters together. Each of the first eight characters listed is identified as a resident in the same tenement where the Clitheroes rent a pair of rooms, and the first act is set in these rooms. Of the characters with counterparts in Doves (identified by asterisks above) two are reimagined as relatives of the Clitheroes—Peter and The Covey—while the other tenement residents are familiar enough with each other that no one is ever surprised to see them in any room in the house. Mrs. Gogan, a partial counterpart to The Ballad Singer, is given two children who appear on stage (an infant and Mollser, who dies of tuberculosis between Acts III and IV). Bessie Burgess is also given a child, but her son does not appear on stage as he is in Belgium fighting for the British army in WWI. All of these changes to the familiar characters in Doves combine to make them more like real people and less like character sketches, which, in turn, elicits sympathy for them when the events turn tragic. O’Casey did not connect Rosie and the Bartender, who only appear in Act II, with the Clitheroe family nor to the tenement. The other characters listed only appear briefly, which leaves the bulk of the action and dialogue of the play up to the same characters he first developed in Doves.

82 O’Casey also uses the family name of Bessie Burgess to reveal her political sympathies in the same way as The Orange Seller as a “burgess” is a member of British parliament. Bessie is openly supportive of the British forces and critical of the nationalist movement.
The final obvious difference between the plays is the presence of The Figure in the Window in Act II of *Plough*. The text of *Doves* was punctuated by lines from various patriotic songs and actual singing by the characters on stage culminating in a ridiculous rendition of “The Blacksmith of Ballinalee,” the lyrics of which are comically transformed into “The Baker of Boolinavee” by the crowd outside the pub. The crowd inside accepts the mangled lyrics without question and rush outside to join in the festivities oblivious to their error and to the fact that the song commemorates a Unionist hero. Murray considers this to be “the punchline to the whole play” (*Doves* 356).

In *Plough*, O’Casey replaces the occasional song lyric with bits of revolutionary speeches being delivered by The Figure in the Window on a platform outside the pub. While he remains unnamed in the play, his lines are clearly identifiable as bits of speeches written and delivered by Pádraig Pearse. O’Casey took the liberty of cherry-picking from three of Pearse’s most famous and inflammatory speeches, which fictionalizes the rhetoric, but only to a small extent. While real audiences would not have heard all of these phrases delivered at the same event, most would have been familiar enough with Pearse’s speeches as reprinted in a book and in several local newspapers to recognize them with little difficulty. This alteration in the play shows O’Casey making much better use of the setting he established in *Doves* with the pub windows facing the action on the street and the ability of the patrons to hear the events going on outside. The change of historical events allowed O’Casey to replace the relatively mundane election

---

83 “The Blacksmith of Ballinalee” is a song about Sean McEoin, a supporter of the treaty boundaries who fought against, and was captured by, Republicans in the War of Independence (Murray *Doves* 356).

84 The first edition of Pearse’s collected writings was published just one year after the Easter Rising, and several individual articles and essays were published separately.
meeting with the far more dynamic calls for rebellion and revolution and to contrast
Pearse’s call to action with the inaction of the characters in the bar. O’Casey made
Pearse’s words such a central part of the play that some critics, including Cowasjee and
Kosok, presumed that they must also have been part of the lost Doves (66-69; 75). This
presumption is understandable given O’Casey’s skillful use of the speeches and his
relative silence about the actual content of the lost play and how much (or little) of it was
used in the new play. The presumption speaks far more to O’Casey’s skill and his silence
on the matter than to any error on the part of the critics.

The Figure in the Window is never identified by name in the text of the play. His
voice is heard four times throughout Act II and he is referred to as “The Voice of the
Man” on three occasions and “The Voice of the Speaker” once (162, 164, and 178; and
169, respectively). It is unclear with the existing documents which of the three names
O’Casey chose first, and equally unclear why he did not make them uniform. The fact
that O’Casey chose not to identify Pearse by name, however, accomplishes two things for
him politically. The first is to confront audiences with the harshest of Pearse’s rhetoric.
Many audience members were likely to have been long-time supporters of Pearse’s, and
others would have been among those who began to support the nationalist cause after his
execution in 1916. The Figure in the Window was a way for O’Casey to display his
distaste for Pearse’s bellicosity as well as for the way he saw the average Dubliner
blindly falling into step with Pearse’s call for sacrifice and bloodshed.

85 Both Cowasjee and Kosok begin their discussions of Padraig Pearse’s inclusion in the play with a
reminder that Act II of Plough derived from the lost Doves. In both cases, they also make the erroneous
claim that Doves was integrated into Plough relatively unchanged. Cowasjee states that the entire Act II as
it currently exists, “was formerly a one-act sketch called The Cooing of Doves” (66). Kosok, echoing
O’Casey, remarks that it was integrated into the longer play, “with minor alterations” (75).
The first time audiences hear the figure is early in Act II when Rosie and the Barman are the only characters yet to appear on stage. They both quiet themselves so that they can hear what is being said:

It is a glorious thing to see arms in the hands of Irishmen. We must accustom ourselves to the thought of arms, we must accustom ourselves to the sight of arms, we must accustom ourselves to the use of arms. . . . Bloodshed is a cleansing and sanctifying thing, and the nation that regards it as the final horror has lost its manhood. . . . There are many things more horrible than bloodshed, and slavery is one of them! (162, O’Casey’s ellipses)

The entirety of this passage comes from Pearse’s *The Coming Revolution* (November 1913). The original text reads much as it does here; O’Casey omitted only a single phrase where he inserted the first ellipsis, “We may make mistakes in the beginning and shoot the wrong people, but” (98-99). This sentiment was clearly too outrageous for even O’Casey to use in this context. Such inflammatory and irresponsible rhetoric seems to be easy prey for O’Casey’s criticism, but he likely omitted it to maintain the focus on what Pearse’s supporters would have considered justified bloodshed, as many would likely have taken issue with mistakenly killing the “wrong people.”

O’Casey was then able to show his audience how his characters react to this call for bloodshed. Rosie says, “It’s the sacred truth, mind you, what that man’s afther sayin’” to which the Barman replies, “If I was only a little younger, I’d be plungin’ mad into th’ middle of it!” (162). Both characters support this violence, but neither has any intention of joining the fight themselves. The Barman’s reaction is foreshadowed in *Doves* by both the Carpenter and the Forester (discussed in more detail below), but is significantly less critical.
The next segment of The Figure’s speech audiences hear is a combination of an excerpt from Pearse’s *Peace and the Gael* (1915) and O’Casey’s own invented religio-political rhetoric made to sound like Pearse:

*Comrade soldiers of the Irish Volunteers and of the Citizen Army, we rejoice in this terrible war.* The old heart of the earth needed to be warmed with the red wine of the battlefields. . . . Such august homage was never offered to God as this: the homage of millions of lives given gladly for love of country. *And we must be ready to pour out the same red wine in the same glorious sacrifice, for without shedding of blood there is no redemption!* (164, emphasis mine)

The first and last sentences are entirely O’Casey’s inventions made both to echo Pearse’s content, but also, as observed by Rebecca Steinberger, to highlight and criticize clerical involvement in Irish politics. Using words like “rejoice,” “sacrifice,” and “redemption” recalls Christian theology and Christ’s crucifixion. Steinberger also points out that immediately following this passage, both Fluther and Peter are reenacting the Catholic eucharist. “Peter and Fluther, excited by the Speaker’s words, react as they would if they are partaking in Communion in the Church. Upon drinking the wine [whiskey] they return to the place they were standing in the midst of the Speaker. Thus the bar serves as an altar” (58). O’Casey here is mocking both the Catholic church and its involvement in Irish politics and the characters. The Catholic church publicly opposed the Nationalist movement and the militant groups that rose in favor of it. O’Casey is highlighting the hypocrisy of the pubgoers who continue to practice Catholic rituals by rote even when the church opposes their political positions.

The middle part of this passage and the entirety of the next passage by the Figure also come from Pearse’s *Peace and the Gael.* This speech was actually delivered the
month following the time of Acts I and II of the play (November 1915). The fact that O’Casey selected excerpts from three different speeches, however, suggests that he was more concerned with capturing Pearse’s violent language than with historical accuracy. Pease’s *Peace and the Gael* is a very short speech extolling the virtues of war in the face of tyranny and suggesting that true peace, ordained by God, can only come to the oppressed minority through bloodshed on the battlefield. Pearse made overt references to religion in this speech suggesting that Ireland take up “Christ’s sword” if it wanted to find “Christ’s peace” (218). O’Casey clearly saw the hypocrisy in this statement and this is likely why he inserted the less overt religious imagery in this section of the Figure’s speech.

The final excerpt we hear from the Figure’s speech is from Pearse’s speech at the graveside of O’Donovan Rossa (August 1915). O’Casey selected the powerful closing words of the speech to be sure that the audience, if they had missed the references to the earlier speeches, would certainly recognize this last one:

> Our foes are strong and wise and wary; but, strong and wise and wary as they are, they cannot undo the miracles of God who ripens in the hearts of young men the seeds sown by the young men of a former generation. They think that they have pacified Ireland; think that they have foreseen everything; think they have provided against everything; but the fools, the fools, the fools!—they have

---

86 Murray notes that O’Casey had a copy of Pearse’s *Collected Works: Political Writings and Speeches* (1924) from which he gathered all of the excerpts for the play (164).

87 O’Donovan Rossa was one of the early members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (Fenians), his defiance of the British, his arrest and exile to the United States made him a folk hero to many Irish revolutionaries. After his death in New York, his body was returned to Ireland for burial in Glasnevin Cemetery. His funeral was widely attended and Pearse’s dedication at the event became one of the independence movement’s most famous speeches.
left us our Fenian dead, and while Ireland holds these graves, Ireland unfree shall never be at peace! (178)

The final lines of Act II that follow this speech show the local leaders of the Irish Citizen Army and the Irish Volunteers repeating the call for a blood sacrifice to Ireland as they march off to take part in military training exercises. O’Casey juxtaposes this jingoistic display by showing Rosie flirting with Fluther and singing him a bawdy song. Essentially, O’Casey is demonstrating how life quickly goes back to normal for those who are not enchanted by Pearse’s nationalist rhetoric.

A less obvious, yet significant difference between the plays is in O’Casey’s presentation of performances of Irish masculinity and heroism. In *Doves*, the inaction of the characters, despite their bellicose rhetoric, is at the heart of O’Casey’s critique. When faced with confrontation, the men in the pub do nothing but make excuses for their inaction. In response to The Republican Labourer’s anti-treaty proclamations and attempts to start a fight, the Carpenter and Forester freeze up:

The Republican Labourer: …(*loudly, poking The Carpenter in the chest*)
Up the Republic! Up the Republic!!
The Carpenter: I’ve nothin to say agen the Republic.
The Republican Labourer: You’d betther not! (*He goes out*)
The Carpenter (*after a pause*): Only I was sure that he had a gun on him
I’d a — (*He takes a drink*).
The Forester: Ay, an only for the respect I have for the costume I’m wearin, I’d a— (*Takes a drink*). (343)

This behavior runs counter to the “fighting Irish” stereotype and patriotic posturing that defined much of the behavior of revolutionary Irish men. Cormac O’Brien refers to this hypermasculine behavior as an Irish extension of Peter Middleton’s “fantasy of

---

88 O’Casey also made reference to this speech earlier in *Juno and the Paycock* in Johnny Boyle’s line, “Ireland only half free’ll never be at peace while she has a son left to pull a trigger” (27).
manhood” that “fosters a hierarchal pack mentality whereby men will reflect upon and copy each other’s behaviour, particularly that of their leader,” and that this fantasy “is a reified commodity marketed and sold to men” (38). O’Casey’s characters are conscious of this fantasy, but lack the conviction of the pack as well as a leader. They recognize their failure to act in the situation and immediately come up with excuses for their inaction, which suggests that they feel a sense of shame as a result.

O’Casey further mocks the inaction of the male characters by making them all run for cover when a warning shot is fired to disperse a restless crowd outside the pub:

(A shot is heard; there is a wild rush by those [onstage] to get over the counter. The Bartender preventing them.)

The Bartender: Where the hell are yous goin, where the hell are yous goin— yous arent goin to get in here.

The Forester: We’ll have to go somewhere; dye think we’re goin to stop here an have our limbs pulled out the way a chiselerud pull wings out of a fly?

The Carpenter: What the hell are you here for if youre not here for the protection of the public? (351).

O’Casey’s male characters prove that this fantasy of manhood is a societal pressure that few could actually live up to in the aftermath of the War of Independence and the Irish Civil War.

In *Plough*, O’Casey allows room for only one of the characters to fulfill this fantasy. When the violence at the start of the Easter Rising breaks out in Act III, Clitheroe is off fighting with his regiment of the Irish Citizen Army. Clitheroe is the only primary male character in the play to fall in line with this fantasy of manhood, and by Act IV, he

---

89 A “chiseler” (often “chiseller”) is an Anglo-Irish term for a young boy, usually ill behaved. Therefore “like a chiselerud pull wings out of a fly” in O’Casey’s colloquial spelling means, “like a chiseler would pull wings out of a fly” (chiseller, OED). O’Casey is also alluding here to Gloucester’s line in *King Lear*, “As flies to wanton boys, are we to the gods; / They kill us for their sport,” further emphasizing the imbalance of power between the Irish and British police/military force (Act IV, scene 1).
has paid for it with his life. In a harsh criticism of the behavior of Dubliners during the rising, O’Casey presents much of the cast in Act III participating in the looting of neighborhood shops, but, as observed by Bernard Benstock, it is Fluther (the hopeless drunk) and later Bessie (the Unionist) who emerge as the heroes of the play (69-71). Fluther braves the snipers’ bullets in order to bring Nora back home, and it is Bessie who protects Nora from being shot at the upstairs window, and who ends up taking a bullet herself. In contrast to his mockery of the fantasy of manhood in *Doves*, O’Casey in *Plough* shines a light on the human cost of falling in line with a pack mentality. He adds an aspect of humiliation to this nationalist fantasy of manhood, by making a female Unionist the most sympathetic and heroic character in this play about nationalist politics.

Despite the many differences between the two plays, it is clear that *The Plough and the Stars* grew out of the ideas that O’Casey first penned in *The Cooing of Doves*. The characters who started as archetypes in the one-act play grew into the fully-formed characters audiences know today. Although rejected by the Abbey, it is clear that the ideas O’Casey wanted to express in *Doves* were so important to him that he took the concept back to the drawing board and turned it into his most famous, most frequently staged, and most critically acclaimed play.

IV. Conclusion

Despite the rough start for *The Plough and the Stars* at the Abbey, it quickly became a great success for O’Casey. Within the year it opened to London audiences and O’Casey fell in love with the actress who played Nora, Eileen Carey, and within a year
they were married and had made England their permanent home; O’Casey would never live in Ireland again. The play was later published along with two of his earlier plays, *The Shadow of a Gunman* and *Juno and the Paycock*, and rebranded as his “Dublin Trilogy.” O’Casey’s relationship with the Abbey rapidly deteriorated. His next submission was *The Silver Tassie*, which received harsh criticism from Yeats. This caused a falling-out between the two that lasted for eight years, at which point the Abbey reversed its decision and staged *The Silver Tassie* after all. Several more of O’Casey’s plays were staged in Ireland during his lifetime, but O’Casey remained critical of the Irish government and the interference of the Catholic church with ideas of artistic expression.⁹⁰

O’Casey went on to write and produce a total of twenty-two plays before his death in 1964. He maintained for the rest of his life that *The Plough and the Stars* was his best play, but it was not his favorite—that honor went to *Cock-a-Doodle Dandy* (Murray 301).⁹¹ Being considered his most well crafted play is a testament to his dedication to the ideas that first appeared in *The Crimson in the Tricolour*, were adapted into *The Cooing of Doves*, and were later revised and expanded into *The Plough and the Stars*. The characters and political ideas that began as a crowd “outside a convent with people spouting socialism for no earthly reason” slowly, over the course of five years, were reimagined and reborn as the fully-developed cast of characters and their tragic experiences during the 1916 Easter Rising. O’Casey took his original idea, developed character types, and then created complex people with families, friends, neighbors,

---

⁹⁰ See Stewart 15.

⁹¹ In an article O’Casey published in 1958, he states that *Dandy* was both his favorite and his best, but other sources quote him as saying *Plough* was his best (*Blasts and Benedictions* 143; Halloway 267).
conflicts and alliances. He made them funny, but also tragic and relatable. Even today, nearly ninety years later, audiences still fill theaters to see his masterpiece in live performances around the world. The political details of the history of the Easter Rising may be lost to many theater-goers, but the experiences of the characters living amid the violence of revolution remain as potent as ever.
Yeats, too, was a fine and fearless fighter [...] He is gone now, and Ireland will miss him sorely, for he was Ireland's greatest poet, and a great warrior to boot.

—Sean O’Casey on the death of William Butler Yeats

Chapter Three
“The great gloom that is in my mind”

I. Hammering Thoughts into Unity

Once more the storm is howling, and half hid
Under this cradle-hood and coverlid
My child sleeps on.

The tempestuous opening lines of “A Prayer for My Daughter” (1919) evoke the imagery of external threats to William Butler Yeats’s infant child as he paces the room, and as his mind is filled with “great gloom and sorrow.” The storm seems to threaten the doting father’s hopes for his daughter’s future, which he details throughout the poem. Figurative interpretations of these “haystack- and roof-leveling winds” include David Ross’s assertion that it represents the coming of the apocalypse as foretold in “The Second Coming,” (Ross 204), or Geoffrey Thurley’s interpretation that the storm and sea are “that barbarous mass of mankind likely to be unleashed into power before it has had time to civilize itself,” referring to the uncertainty of European politics after World War I

92 Blasts and Benedictions 178
In his original drafts for the poem, however, Yeats made the meaning of this image very clear and was far less symbolic in his language.

The earliest draft of the opening lines of the poem show Yeats struggling to find the best words to express his new concept. The holographic manuscript page is uncharacteristically dense and packed with small script, rejected lines, crossed-out stanzas, proposed and rejected replacements, and new attempts at the existing stanzas (NLI 13,588 (15), 2'). One of the rejected phrases was notably the image of “the storm [?beating] stone upon stone” (MRDMSS 169). He rejected this metaphorical image in favor of more concrete references to the incipient War of Independence that was causing tensions and unrest across the country. Some of the phrases he settled on at this stage were, “the times are so evel (sic),” and “The world fell stone upon stone / and the masters of the world ran wild.” This was very likely a reference to the destruction caused by the British Army during the Easter Rising, and the subsequent abuses of British (“the masters of the world”) power. This poem would see two more near-complete revisions before Yeats turned his attention back to the first two sections and returned to the figurative language of the storm raging while his infant daughter sleeps in her cradle (181).

This example demonstrates, not only a part of the genesis of Yeats’s poem, but also a master poet’s struggle to find the most effective means of expression, whether

---

93 David Ross refers to the fact that “The Second Coming” immediately precedes this poem in the collection Michael Robartes and the Dancer.

94 See Michael Robartes and the Dancer Manuscript Materials (MRDMSS), page 168.

95 The Irish War of Independence began with Sinn Féin’s official Declaration of Independence on January 21, 1919. The Irish Republican Army (IRA) quickly began to stage attacks and raids on British military and police outposts. By the time Yeats was drafting this poem in March or April of 1919, tensions were rising quickly, and a full-scale British military invasion was imminent. (See Stallworthy, Between the Lines, 25 for more information on the dating of the early draft manuscripts).
literal or figurative, overt or subtle. In this case (but certainly not in all cases), Yeats chose the latter. In many of his politically focused poems, Yeats chose to avoid potential ambiguity by being direct and explicit with his imagery and content, but in this case he chose to obscure the politics in favor of the more concrete images of his sleeping daughter and his hopes for her future. The reference to the nascent war against England, however, was not eliminated, but merely concealed. The entire “prayer” that makes up the poem is situated in opposition to the frightening events happening, quite literally, right outside the door of the Yeats’s family home in West Ireland. These early drafts of the poem clarify the meaning behind imagery he finally selected, but without the rejected lines, the images became open to interpretation by generations of critics and scholars.

The poem first appeared in print in November 1919 simultaneously in Harriet Monroe’s *Poetry* magazine, based in Chicago, and in *The Irish Statesman*. This dual transatlantic publication carried with it several levels of political intent on Yeats’s part. *Poetry*, a magazine dedicated to printing the best English language poetry regardless of style, gave Yeats a vehicle for expressing his fears of British abuses to a largely sympathetic audience of American readers (Monroe 28). The poem appeared as the first poem in the issue and as the lone poem by Yeats. The context of this first printing does some harm to Ross’s above interpretation that the winds were a reference to “The Second Coming,” which, while composed a few months earlier, would not appear in print for

---

96 Securing a U.S. copyright was likely among Yeats’s concerns as well. According to the “manufacturing clause” of the 1909 Copyright Act, works published outside the U.S. must be typeset, printed, bound, and published entirely within the U.S. in order to secure a copyright on the material in question. Failure to meet these requirements and to mail the material for deposit in the Copyright Office within sixty days would result in forfeiture of all legal claims to copyright of the material in question (Spoo 69). American Publisher, Samuel Roth, took full advantage of this legal loophole and famously published unauthorized versions of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* as well as works by both Pound and Eliot.
another year, and when first published, was not followed by “A Prayer for My Daughter.”97 Publication in the short-lived first run of the Dublin journal, The Irish Statesman, carried a different kind of political message to his readers. The journal was published in order to promote the political views of the Irish Dominion League, which supported dominion status for Ireland rather than complete independence.98 Yeats was making an attempt with this poem to reach political moderates who hoped for some sort of compromise that would eliminate the need for further bloodshed. His message of British brutality and the fear it caused him for his family’s safety, however, was veiled to such an extent by this late point in the poem’s development that it could not be clear to any reader what his actual intent might have been. The content of the poem notwithstanding, the mere presence of Yeats’s name in this highly political publication was seen as an endorsement of the publisher’s political ideology.

This chapter will investigate the composition and publication of other poems by Yeats containing political content written between the events of the Easter Rising in April 1916 and the publication of The Tower in 1928. During this period, Yeats abandoned his decades-long romantic pursuit of Maud Gonne and married Bertha Georgie “George” Hyde-Lees, he and George had two children, tensions between Ireland and England boiled over into a brutal war that eventually secured Irish independence, Yeats was appointed as a senator in the newly formed Irish Senate—the Seanad Éireann, the pro-and

97 The first publication of “The Second Coming” was in The Dial, November 1920, where it appeared as the last of ten poems by Yeats, all of which would later appear, slightly reordered, in Michael Robartes and the Dancer.

98 The first issue of The Irish Statesman in June 1919 contained the manifesto of the Irish Dominion League, establishing its purpose and political agenda.
anti-treaty factions of the new Irish government clashed in an equally brutal civil war, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in literature, and he published the first version of his esoteric work, *A Vision*. During this time of upheavals and great change, Yeats wrote many of his most famous and enduring poems. Through these poems and their modes of publication, Yeats delivered some of his strongest political messages as well as some of his most touching personal expressions of love while still keeping some of his initial intent from public view.

The poems included in this investigation appear in two of Yeats’s major collections—*Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921) and *The Tower* (1928). All of the poems, however, had a history of publication before Yeats collected, rearranged, revised, and presented them to the public in their new contexts extending from as early as 1916 to the eve of *The Tower*'s publication in 1928. This chapter will pay particular attention to the creative development of the poems and will follow the composition process in Yeats’s manuscripts as well as the poems’ initial publications, or what Yug Mohit Chaudhry refers to as “a text’s original purpose and function” (2). However, whereas Chaudhry considers each poem’s initial publication to be “the most interesting for what it can reveal about the author, the influences shaping the text, and the historical circumstances to which it may have been responding,” this chapter will also look at the political implications of subsequent publications and, further, of placing the poems together in the two major collections. The second lives of these poems in the collections, and the context in which most of Yeats’s contemporaries encountered them, prove to be equally
interesting, if not more so due to their combined messages and internal conversations with the other poems in each collection and across the Yeats oeuvre.

Before Yeats’s poetry can be examined, it is necessary to place the poet within the political landscape of revolutionary Ireland. Yeats’s politics have been under critical scrutiny for more than fifty years, suffering both attacks and defenses of his positions. One common factor about which most critics ultimately agree, however, is that Yeats went through several different political phases throughout his life. Many critics assign to Yeats three phases that roughly correspond to early, middle, and late stages of his poetic development, but there is little consensus on the precise boundaries for each phase. For the purposes of this investigation, the phases will be divided as follows. The early stage is characterized by Yeats’s recall of Ireland’s mythic past in poems like “Who Goes with Fergus?” and “The Song of Wandering Aengus” as well as his plays, *Cathleen ni Houlihan* and *Diarmuid and Grania*. The middle phase, and the phase primarily under consideration here, reveals a shift from Ireland’s mythic past to its realistic present in poems like “Easter 1916” and “Meditations in Time of Civil War” that show the poet dealing with a period of political and personal upheaval. This period also marks the beginning of his spiritual/philosophical work. The late phase covers the rest of his life in which he continued to develop his spiritual work. Declan Kiberd suggests that in this phase of his life, Yeats was seeking “to define an alternate vision of society” in the post-independence era in his revisions to *A Vision* (316).

For Yeats politics was just one aspect of a multi-faceted artistic vision. In his essay “If I Were Four-and-Twenty” (1919), Yeats describes the evolution of this vision:
One day when I was twenty-three or twenty-four this sentence seemed to form in my head, without my willing it, much as sentences form when we are half asleep: ‘Hammer your thoughts into unity’. For days I could think of nothing else, and for years I tested all I did by that sentence. I had three interests: interest in a form of literature, in a form of philosophy, and a belief in nationality. None of these seemed to have anything to do with the other, but gradually my love of literature and my belief in nationality came together. Then for years I said to myself that these two had nothing to do with my form of philosophy …. Now all three are, I think, one, or rather all three are a discrete expression of a single conviction. I think that each has behind it my whole character. (25)

The early phase in which Yeats hammered literature and nationality into unity is evident in his poetry and plays as well as his heavy involvement with Ireland’s national theater, the Abbey. Nationalism and Irish identity are at the forefront of the plays On Baile’s Strand (1904) and Cathleen ni Houlihan (1902) as well as in poems like “Who Goes with Fergus?” (1892) and “The Song of Wandering Aengus” (1897). Yeats was recycling stories from Irish mythology as a form of commentary on the political climate of the time, reflecting the rise of nationalism and Irish identity among the public.

The next phase began in earnest after the Easter Rising and the devastating events of World War I. Yeats was staying in Gloucestershire at the time of the Rising, but, soon after, moved back to Ireland. He was filled with regret for what he felt was his direct involvement in the rebellion that led to the execution of sixteen Irish leaders and the death of many other fellow countrymen and women. Yeats’s play, Cathleen ni Houlihan reinforced the idea of self-sacrifice for a greater cause using the mythical title figure’s transformation from the sean bhean bhocht into a young, beautiful woman to inspire young Irishmen to sacrifice themselves to the independence movement.99

---

99 While Yeats was technically a co-author of Cathleen ni Houlihan with Lady Gregory, his name was listed as sole author for decades after its 1902 opening.
Rising and its aftermath came as a shocking realization to Yeats that the noble martyr image he promoted in the play and the cult-like following it generated came at the all-too-real cost of the nation’s husbands, fathers, and sons. As a display of his rededication to the Irish cause in the horrible aftermath of the Rising, he moved to West Ireland and purchased a fifteenth-century stone tower from Lady Gregory, had it remodeled to be habitable, and renamed it “Thoor Ballylee.” He soon married Georgie Hyde-Lees, and there the couple began their spiritual/philosophical work based on the results of automatic writing sessions and seances that would eventually become the foundation for both versions of *A Vision* (1925 and 1937) and numerous poems and stories.

As he wrote “If I Were Four-and-Twenty” in 1919, he was deeply involved in the occult activities that were reshaping his personal philosophy as well as keeping a watchful eye on the post-war events in Europe and the political tensions rising across Ireland. All of these affected, and were reflected in, his poetry. His claim that “now … all three [literature, nationality, and philosophy] are a discrete expression of a single conviction” was for him a source of inspiration that had changed the style and content of his poems and had given him a new outlook on the power of his art.

---

100 He felt this regret for the rest of his life, asking openly in his 1939 poem, “The Man and the Echo,” “Did that play of mine send out / Certain men the English shot?” See also Rob Doggett, *Deep-Rooted Things* (6, 8, 14-16) for more on Yeats’s personal and professional reaction to the fallout of *Cathleen ni Houlihan*. 
II. Will the Real Willie Yeats Please Stand Up?

Yeats’s passion for literature and metaphysical philosophy has been critically examined for decades, and critics have found very little about which to disagree. Yeats’s politics, however, have witnessed a firestorm of attacks and defenses dating from the mid-1960s, but concentrated mainly in the eighties and nineties. Since then critical opinions have settled and the harshest criticisms have become the outliers, but there is still little consensus.

This critical scrutiny of Yeats’s politics begins with Conor Cruise O’Brien’s 1965 “Passion and Cunning: An Essay on the Politics of W. B. Yeats.” O’Brien portrays Yeats as a devoted Fascist. He frequently paints with broad strokes, suggesting that Yeats’s sincere but brief involvement with the Irish Blueshirts movement, and his overt desire to regain some form of the aristocracy that was lost in the revolution, cast a pro-Fascist shadow over all of his life and works. O’Brien focuses his criticism on speeches and letters written between 1928 and 1933, but pays little attention to Yeats’s previous periods of interest and involvement in Irish politics, when, by all measures, he was a dedicated nationalist. “Passion and Cunning” delivered a sharp blow to the study of Yeats’s politics, and it took sixteen years for a response that effectively pushed back against O’Brien’s claims. Elizabeth Cullingford’s *Yeats, Ireland, and Fascism* (1981) takes direct aim at O’Brien’s thesis, stating:

This theory implies a degree of disjunction between Yeats’s political philosophy and his creative work which cannot be reasonably postulated, especially in view of Yeats’s own assertion and repeated demonstration of the interrelatedness of his public and poetic interests. (viii)
Cullingford further attacks O’Brien on his assessments of Yeats’s nationalism, class, and his views on the Easter Rising, finally concluding that in O’Brien’s essay, “his [Yeats’s] fantasies have been taken for his convictions,” and that “any assessment of his politics which lingers too long over his outbursts of passion is in danger of mistaking the show for the substance” (234). Cullingford systematically analyzes Yeats’s entire career identifying the variety and complexity of his political opinions and involvement, including expressed disengagement with the Fascists and any form of anti-semitism, censorship, and cruelty (235).

As completely as Cullingford laid O’Brien’s claims to rest, the ambiguity of Yeats’s politics remained fertile ground for criticism. Critics like Seamus Deane and Declan Kiberd, writing during the height of the violent attacks during The Troubles, took aim at Yeats’s apparent anti-Catholic and pro-Ascendancy positions. Kiberd claims that Yeats’s poetry establishes an authoritarian mythology privileging the Anglo-Irish, and in a later publication claims that Yeats was setting up the Catholic Irish for abuse.101 Deane’s assessment of Yeats is that he was a “Literary Unionist,” who blamed the political instability in Ireland on the Catholic middle class and exonerated the Ascendancy.102 It was not until Edward Said’s 1986 lecture, “Yeats and Decolonization,” at the Yeats Summer School in Sligo that critical opinion began to shift in favor of Yeats regarding his politics. Said argues against what he knew to be the prevailing attitude toward Yeats’s politics at the time and claims that the poet is an “indisputably great

national poet who articulates the experiences, the aspirations, and the vision of a people suffering under the dominion of an offshore power” (69). He goes to great lengths to acknowledge the tarnished reputation of Yeats in Ireland, especially as presented by Deane, to show that “one can quite easily situate and criticize those unacceptable attitudes of Yeats without throwing out the baby with the bath water” (83). He paints a picture of Yeats as an artist dedicated to ending the colonial oppression experienced by all of the Irish people. In the wake of Said’s ground-breaking post-colonial presentation of Yeats as a political figure and a poet, both Kiberd and Deane revised their former positions and accepted an interpretation of Yeats as nuanced and imperfect, yet firmly dedicated to the cause of Irish liberation from England. Critical consensus remains at this point today, viewing Yeats’s politics as primarily aimed at the nationalist cause, but with some problematic aspects and unsavory associations.

III. Poetic Politicking

The Irish War of Independence and the Irish Civil War are the two major political events that frame much of Yeats’s poetry during what I am defining as his “middle period”: roughly from the 1916 Easter Rising to the publication of *The Tower* in 1928. The poetry from this period sees a dramatic shift away from the universalizing politics of Irish mythology, and towards a contemporary nationalist position, or as David Lloyd remarks, the poetry of this period is “devoted to the project of founding and forging a nation” (60). Lloyd further describes Yeats’s poetry of this period as “inseparable from

103 A couple poems discussed below were started as early as 1912 and 1914, but the rest were composed entirely within this period.
the politics of cultural nationalism.” Accepting Yeats’s own assertion in “If I Were Four-and-Twenty” that, at this point, his poetry had reached a complete fusion of the poetic, the political, and the philosophical, Lloyd’s observation of inseparability must also be extended to include Yeats’s personal and spiritual life.

The poems Yeats published during this period reinforce this inseparability, especially when viewed in their original contexts, and when his notes and drafts are taken into consideration. Chaudhry asserts that the original context, or the first mode of publication, is fundamental to our understanding of Yeats and his poetry. Chaudhry argues:

> Restoring the ties that existed between a text and its context humanises the text at its most fundamental level by reanimating it with the materiality and vibrancy that it formerly possessed and by viewing it as the product of human agency in its interactions with its immediate world. (1)

Chaudhry employs Walter Benjamin’s concept that a work’s original mode of publication carries with it the “fabric of tradition,” that it is, in itself, historical testimony. He also repeats Pierre Bourdieu’s admonition that removing a piece of literature from its original context erases “the self-evident givens” of the work, and that as a result of such removal, the works “are impoverished and transformed in the direction of intellectualism or an empty humanism.” Chaudhry, however, specifically excludes an author’s own subsequent publications as being part of the fabric of its tradition:

> [w]hat makes the contexts of a text’s first publication more significant than the contexts of its republication—even if these republications have authorial sanction—is the fact that it represents a text’s original purpose and function, as opposed to

---


105 See Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* 31-32.
the subsequent uses to which it is put through republication by the author and his editors. (2)

Chaudhry’s assertion certainly applies to anthologies or “selected works” collections in which the poems are placed among others with little or no connection to the original context, but, in the case of Yeats, I argue that a poem’s second, third, and at times, fourth publications can carry with them the very same original purpose and function and can be read as a reinforcement, or doubling-down, of the poet’s original intent. I demonstrate that Bourdieu’s “self-evident givens” are still relevant to the subsequent publications with no “impoverishment,” but rather are often stronger political messages than the originals.

This chapter will look at several poems and one play fragment from Yeats’s middle period. I will first look into Yeats’s composition process. Many of his poems from this time underwent significant transformation from the earliest drafts to the finished products while others seemed to flow from his pen easily into their final form. In his poems for *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, this ease of composition corresponds directly to his level of personal involvement with the subject matter. In the poems to which he was more personally connected, his political message was typically boldly overt in the earliest drafts, but then became obscured or softened by the time the poem was first seen by the public, whereas the poems with no personal connection remain politically overt. These poems with personal connections show the artist struggling to find the most effective means of expression. The example from “A Prayer for My Daughter” that begins this chapter is one such poem. The evils that the British Empire, or “the leaders of the world,” were threatening are slowly transformed over several drafts into a storm
raging outside the family home. Other poems, such as “Sixteen Dead Men” show Yeats boldly asserting his political and personal opinions about the events with absolutely no attempt to obscure his meaning through figurative language. His earliest drafts of such poems are largely complete, with only minor changes in word choice or punctuation in later drafts. “Easter, 1916” is not only among the earliest poems in the group, but it also provides examples of both the struggle to express his personal connection to the events as well as his unmodified bold political statements about the Rising. After analyzing the genesis of this and several other poems, I will look at the political implications of their early publications considering the mode of publication itself, the publishers, and the other poems (if any) published with them. I will begin with several poems that ultimately appeared in the collection, *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921) and conclude with other poems that were ultimately published in *The Tower* (1928), and will look briefly into their later publications in various, author-sanctioned, collections.

IV. The Poems that became *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*

Yeats published the collection *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1921) just two years after the second, expanded publication of *The Wild Swans at Coole* (1919). Composing and compiling a collection in such a short span of time was highly unusual for Yeats. The rapid creation of new poetry reflects the flurry of creative activity that followed his marriage and the birth of his daughter combined with the couple’s subsequent spiritual activities as well as the compulsion to write about the events of the Easter Rising and the “terrible beauty” that was born of it. In addition to the poems, he
also wrote *The Dreaming of the Bones*, a play that straddles the transition Yeats was making between his mythic themes and the realism of the tensions between England and Ireland. The action of the play occurs shortly after the Easter Rising. The ghosts of the twelfth-century King Dermot and his wife Dervorgilla guide to safety one of the rebels who has fled to the West, and they beg him for forgiveness for bringing the English to Ireland in order to end their curse. The rebel refuses to forgive them. This play demonstrates Yeats’s continued effort to address national politics in his plays as well as his poetry.

The collection, *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, consists of fifteen poems, “A few of which,” Yeats confesses in the Preface, “may be difficult to understand, perhaps more difficult than I know.” He gives the reasons for this difficulty in an explanation that is, in itself, a challenge to understand:

> It is hard for a writer, who has spent much labour upon his style, to remember that thought, which seems to him natural and logical like that style, may be unintelligible to others. The first excitement over, and the thought changed and

106 By this point in his career, Yeats had all but abandoned the mythic element in his poetry, but he was still using Irish mythology and ancient history in his noh plays. His political message in the plays, however, was still as overt and unambiguous as were many of his poems. In a letter to Lady Gregory written on June 11, 1917, he refers to the as yet unnamed play: “I have almost finished my Dervorgilla play, I think the best play I have written for years. It has grown greatly since you saw it and is I’m afraid only too powerful politically” (Letters 626).

107 Dermot MacMurrough (Diarmuid Mac Murchadha) was denied his position as King of Leinster because he had stolen the wife of the King of Breifne, Dervorgilla (Derbforgaill). Dermot sought the assistance of Henry II of England, to whom he swore an oath of allegiance. This allegiance created the opportunity for Henry to launch a full-scale invasion and claim Ireland as an English Lordship, which stood for nearly four hundred years.

108 Yeats tried, unsuccessfully, to get *The Dreaming of the Bones* published in the popular weekly paper *Everyman* as an overt political message. He proposed including a note comparing the English treatment of the Irish to the German treatment of Belgium in hopes that the comparison would sway popular English opinion to the side of the Irish (*Letters* 653-4).

109 See also Julieann Veronica Ulin’s *Medieval Invasions in Modern Irish Literature* 71-73 and 81-96 for a detailed account of Yeats’s linking the medieval characters with twentieth-century revolutionary Ireland in an effort to promote nationalist narratives.
settled into conviction, his interest is simple, that is to say in normal emotion, is always I think increased; he is no longer looking for a candlestick and matches but at the objects in the room.

Yeats is essentially saying that he (and all writers in general) may obscure the original inspiration or “thought” for a poem due to the necessary focus on poetic style. This is a great oversimplification of the writing process and the artistic choices made by the poet, but it works as a confession to the reader that some elements of the collection may only be clearly understood by the poet himself. Yeats includes over ten pages of notes for two of the more challenging poems in the collection, “An Image from a Past Life” and “The Second Coming,” but neither note provides a clear explanation for casual readers. Instead, the notes give Yeats an outlet for his growing philosophical concepts that would later appear in the first version of A Vision in 1925.

The fifteen poems were first brought together for publication by the Cuala Press, owned and operated by Yeats’s sister, Elizabeth, nicknamed “Lolly” (Cuala Press will be discussed in greater detail below). Cuala’s signature red colophon on the collection’s final page dates the completion of the press work as “All Souls Day” 1920, (November 2), but the actual disbursement of the original 400 copies was delayed until February 1921 in deference to the publishers of The Dial and The Nation (London) in which several of the poems also appeared in late 1920. The poems contained within the collection, however, began their lives much earlier.

In April 1916, Yeats was in England taking part in a literary charity event in Gloustershire. As the news of the Easter Rising trickled in by way of much rumor and a few letters, Yeats was horrified to discover that the city of Dublin was seized by a group
of republican rebels, and more horrified to learn that he personally knew several of the
rebel leaders. Yeats had known Constance Markievicz since they were children. Padraig
Pearse, who caused earlier tensions with Yeats and the Abbey Theatre, had since
reconciled and was on good terms with both the poet and the company. Yeats knew
Thomas MacDonagh and Joseph Plunkett well, and also Maud Gonne’s estranged
husband, John MacBride, whom he disliked immensely. Several employees of the Abbey
Theatre and family members of the Cuala Press employees were also involved in the
Rising.110

Yeats’s immediate reaction to the events was bewilderment that Sinn Féin would
attempt such a coup. Yeats did not know at the time, despite the fact that they were being
blamed by both public opinion and the British press, that Sinn Féin took no part in the
events.111 He wrote to the Abbey Theatre on May 8, while the rebels were being executed,
concluding the letter with this vague prediction: “As yet one knows nothing of the future
except that it must be very unlike the past” (qtd. in Foster, 46). His assessment was far
more prescient than he could have imagined. He shared the public opinion that the Rising
was ill conceived, and initially thought the rebels were foolish and would be imprisoned
for a short time, but would later be released as had been the case in earlier tensions. He
quickly changed his assessment of the rebellion when, instead, the rebel leaders were
hastily tried and executed over a nine-day period between May 3 and May 12. This was

110 See also Foster, *W.B. Yeats: A Life II: The Arch Poet* 44-50 and G. Lewis, *The Yeats Sisters and the
Cuala Press* 133.

111 To blame Sinn Féin for the Rising was common among British soldiers as well. In his personal
diary kept during the events of Easter week, Sergeant Major Samuel Henry Lomas made multiple
references to “Sein Feinners” [sic], using the term synonymously with “the enemy.” He also drew a map of
the area between the General Post Office and Parnell Street, where he was stationed, and noted that the
buildings opposite the GPO on Henry Street were “Absolutely full of Sinn Feinners” (O’Farrell 162-188).
devastating to Yeats and made him physically ill. “The Dublin tragedy,” he wrote to Lady Gregory on the eighth day of executions, “has been a great sorrow and anxiety … I have little doubt there have been many miscarriages of justice … I had no idea that any public event could so deeply move me—and I am very despondent about the future” (Letters 612-13). In this same letter, Yeats tells Gregory that he had begun to gather ideas for a commemoration to the rebel leaders. “I am trying to write a poem on the men executed —‘terrible beauty has been born again’” (613).

The first surviving holographic draft of the poem is dated, “Sept 25, 1916,” the same date as its first publication (NLI 13,588 [6]). There were likely several earlier drafts of the poem as Yeats had been working on it for nearly five months at this point, but none survive. This draft shows the poem nearly complete and much as it appears in its final form. Yeats struggled with the second line of the fourth stanza. The stanza opens, “Too long a sacrifice” and Yeats wrote then crossed out the next three attempts at the following line, rejecting “Changes to a stone the heart,” “Can make a stone seem like a heart,” and “Can petrify a heart.” He finally settled on the final version of this line, “Can make a stone of the heart.” Other than a few other such minor changes, the poem appears much as it does in its first publication. The poem, initially titled “1916,” was published with the new title, “Easter, 1916” by Clement Shorter, founder of the British newspaper, The Sphere on September 25, 1916. Shorter printed only twenty-five copies of the poem, intended only “for distribution among his friends” as is stated on the title page.112

112 One of the friends to receive a copy of this edition was Oliver St. John Gogarty, who had hosted Yeats in his home on several occasions after the Rising. Yeats inscribed it, “Oliver Gogarty from W B Yeats” and it is now among the collection at the National Library of Ireland.
Yeats would wait more than three years before allowing this poem to be distributed to more than just his close friends. He chose not to have it printed in either of the two versions of *The Wild Swans at Coole*, which were published in November, 1917 by the Cuala Press, and with seventeen additional poems in March, 1919 by Macmillan. When asked by AE for permission to print his poem for a 1917 pamphlet designed to “negotiate the continuing political impasse,” Yeats, always mindful of his public image, declined (Foster 82). He justified his refusal to Gregory in a letter from May 31 of that year: “I do not want to take a political part however slight in haste so he will perhaps have to do without my name.” This reluctance to take a public position on the rebellion and the rising tensions that followed demonstrates Yeats’s keen awareness of the precarious nature of the political climate. Although his politics had been on display via his plays and his leadership role at the Abbey Theatre, he was aware that, as an artist and not a politician, both his professional and personal livelihood could be jeopardized by sticking his neck out at the wrong time. His was not a decision about which political message to deliver, but rather, when it was safe to deliver it.

Yeats finally published the poem widely in late 1920. He simultaneously sent the poem to *The New Statesman, The Dial*, and his sister at the Cuala Press. The poem appeared alone in *The New Statesman*, but with five other, newly-drafted political poems in *The Dial*, and six others in the collection he sent to Cuala Press. Most of the poem

113 While he withheld publication of “Easter, 1916,” Yeats made reference to it in *The Wild Swans at Coole* (1917). The title poem, written in 1917, contains the phrase, “All’s changed,” which is a direct reference to the repeated phrase from “Easter, 1916” that would not be published widely for three more years. He also later used the phrase in “Phases of the Moon” (1919) and in “Coole and Ballylee” (1931).

114 Letter from WBY to Gregory dated 31 May [1917] held in the Berg Collection at the New York Public Library. See also Foster, *The Arch-Poet*, 82.
remained as it was in the Shorter publication of 1916, but Yeats deleted the stanza numbers and made several changes to the section dedicated to his old friend, the Countess, Constance Markievicz (née Gore-Booth). Yeats had known Markievicz since they were children in Sligo, and, of all the leaders in the Rising, she was the closest to him personally. The second stanza in the Shorter publication remained much as it was in the earliest draft:

That woman at whiles would be shrill
In aimless argument,
Had ignorant good will,
All that she got she spent,
Her charity had no bounds;
When young and beautiful
She had ridden well to hounds. (NLI 13,588 (6))

Yeats had reworked the beginning of this stanza on a new page in the same loose-leaf notebook as the original draft, as is evident by the tear across the pages, resulting in the following:

Of late this woman spent
From ignorant good will
Her nights in argument
Therefore her voice grew shrill
What voice more sweet than hers
When young & beautiful
She rode with harriers (NLI 13,588 (12))

Curiously Yeats chose not to incorporate any of these changes with the exception of the idea that her voice was sweet. Instead of “Young and beautiful,” the Shorter publication reads, “Sweet-voiced and beautiful.” Yeats made this change by hand on the typescript that is most likely the one sent to Shorter (Huntington Library MS, 1). When Yeats sent the poem to The Dial in 1920 along with eight other new poems and the older short
stanza entitled “A Meditation in Time of War,” he chose to go back to his revisions and rework this stanza yet again. This, however, was a late decision on his part as the page proofs had already been set. He wrote in the following changes in by hand:

That woman’s days were spent
In ignorant good will,
Her nights in argument
Until her voice grew shrill.
What voice more sweet than hers
When young and beautiful,
She rode to harriers?

This version shows a complexity of character in Markievicz not present in the earlier published edition. Her good-willed nature is now balanced with her argumentative side with the additions of the day and night contrast. Yeats also provides the delicate personal connection to Markievicz with the memory of her sweet voice while riding with hunting dogs when they were both young in Sligo. This is the only part of the poem to receive such repeated revisitation, and the only part with such a deep personal connection.

Yeats gathered “Easter, 1916” along with five other political poems for publication in *The Dial* including, “Sixteen Dead Men,” “The Rose Tree,” “The Second Coming,” “On a Political Prisoner,” and the handwritten stanza mentioned above, “A Meditation in Time of War.” For *The Nation*, he chose not to include either “Easter, 1916” or “Sixteen Dead Men.” For the Cuala Press collection, however, he included all of these political poems as well as “A Prayer for My Daughter” previously published in

---

115 George Yeats claims the date of this poem to be 1914, but Thomas Parkinson proposes that “it may refer to the later period of the Black and Tans,” as Yeats was also drafting other political poems (*MRDMS* xix). The earliest draft of the poem, however, is clearly dated 1914 in Yeats’s hand (194, NLJ 30,358, 58r). Parkinson is correct to connect it to the later period as Yeats clearly intended by including it in the collection, but the composition actually began as a response to the events of WWI.

116 The politics of this decision will be discussed further below in section VII, “The Politics of Publication.”
1919 by *Poetry* magazine and *The Irish Statesman*. All of these new poems except two fall into the category of political messages that seemed to flow easily from Yeats’s pen. The exceptions are “The Second Coming” and “A Prayer for My Daughter,” (both previously published twice separately), which Yeats placed side-by-side in the Cuala Press collection. Both of these poems hold deep connections to Yeats’s personal life, but in very different ways.

The deep personal connection Yeats has with “The Second Coming” comes through his emerging occult/philosophical work with his wife, George. Quickly after being rejected by Iseult Gonne for the second time, Yeats proposed to and married George in October 1917. He immediately regretted this decision, and began to suffer from depression and even physical pain. Just nine days after their hasty marriage, Yeats wrote a letter to Gregory explaining the mysterious birth of what would immediately change his opinion of his marriage and come to occupy much of the poet’s efforts for the rest of his life:

> There has been something very like a miraculous intervention. Two days ago I was in great gloom (of which I hope, and believe, George knew nothing). I was saying to myself ‘I have betrayed three people;’ then I thought ‘I have lived all through this before.’ Then George spoke of having lived through something before (she knew nothing of my thought). Then she said she felt something was to be written though her. She got a piece of paper, and talking to me all the while so that her thoughts would not affect what she wrote, wrote these words (which she did not understand) ‘with the bird’ (Iseult) ‘all is well at heart. Your action was right for both but in London you mistook its meaning.’ … The strange thing was that within half an hour after writing of this message my rheumatic pains and my neuralgia and my fatigue had gone and I was very happy. From being more miserable than I ever remember being since Maud Gonne’s marriage I became extremely happy. That happiness has lasted ever since. (Letters 633)
This happiness and enthusiasm continued to grow and Yeats communicated with the spirit world with George acting as medium and amanuensis. It was from these automatic writing and question-and-answer sessions that Yeats began to form his new philosophy that would later become two very different versions of *A Vision* (1925 and 1937). It is from these sessions that Yeats formed his concept of history as being cyclical and of the gyres of time representing the various phases of history positioned on a 28-cycle wheel of time. “The Second Coming” is his first attempt to express the phase of history in which Ireland (and the world) then stood. In the early drafts, he utilized a combination of mystical imagery and historical facts.

The earliest drafts of the poem include allusions to the Irish war for Independence. Lines such as, “the mob fawns upon the murderers” and “the judge nods before his empty dock” are clear references to the IRA and to the failed attempt of the first Dáil Éireann to establish an Irish legal system independent of British courts. As soon as he began to introduce “the gyre” representing the cyclical nature of history, Yeats began to broaden the scope of his historical references by including direct references to Marie Antoinette, Edmund Burke, and the German army’s defeat of the Russian imperial forces. In the very next draft, however, all of these references are gone and replaced by a general reference to tyrants and murderers. It would take six more complete revisions of the poem before Yeats was satisfied with the language and the imagery. He selected references to broad, general phases of history instead of the phase in which the world stood at that point in time. Yeats ultimately achieved a foreboding sense that the horrors
of the early twentieth century had happened before and would happen again; the specifics did not matter.

Yeats makes a direct allusion to the Christian concept of the “second coming” of Christ, but alters it in such a way that it becomes a harbinger of death and destruction instead of salvation. In his note for the poem in *MRD*, Yeats attempts to explain this in reference to the motion of the gyres. After presenting an illustration of two intersecting conical gyres as a representation of the cycles of life, he explains:

This figure is true also of history, for the end of an age, which always receives the revelation of the character of the next age, is represented by the coming of one gyre to its greatest expansion and of the other to that of its greatest contraction. At the present moment the life gyre is sweeping outward, unlike that before the birth of Christ which was narrowing, and has almost reached its greatest expansion. (*MRD* 33-34)

Yeats is essentially saying here that the historical conditions at this point in history were the exact opposite of those that ushered in the birth of Christ, a symbol of peace. In order to arrive at this message, it took Yeats six complete revisions of the poem. His new philosophy was not yet fully formed and realized (nor would it be for eighteen more years), and his personal struggle to both understand it and express it in poetic form are clear from the fits and starts that comprise the drafts.

The poem often connected thematically with “The Second Coming,” and which also proved very difficult for Yeats to write, is “A Prayer for My Daughter.” In this poem (as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter) the poet struggled through several drafts. What separates this poem from “The Second Coming,” and what makes the connections by Ross and Cullingford premature, is, not only the timing of the composition, but also
the nature of Yeats’s personal connection to the content of the poem. The poem, started more than two months after “The Second Coming” was completed, is about the fear he feels as a father for the future of his defenseless, month-old daughter lying in her bed.

The genesis of the poem began as nine fragments of verse spread across a standard sheet of loose-leaf paper, five of which are rejected by the author. The remaining lines read:

Having my self grown barren with much hate
My mind, because those things
I know, because those things that I have loved
Let her thoughts be a

These lines, separated by much space on the page, remain only unconnected fragments at this stage. The rejected lines offer no alternative content, but merely alternate attempts at saying the same things. The idea that the poet’s mind is filled with hatred is clear, and he seems to be setting up an alternative to what he hopes for his daughter in the last line. These ideas will remain with the poem until completion, but comprise only eleven words spread out between stanzas VII and VIII. There is no indication as to the source of his hatred, nor any details, other than gender, about the recipient of the poem’s message.

The next draft, which Yeats dated “April 1919,” comprises much of the material that will be in the completed poem. The draft takes up four densely crowded notebook pages filled with crossed-out lines, entire stanzas written then rejected, lines connecting one section to another, and new material squeezed into the margins. Among much that

---

117 On the fourth and final page of this draft, Yeats wrote near the bottom, “May 1919,” but then struck out the month and replaced it with the word, “April.” His stated writing routine of producing only a few lines per day, and his convention of dating poems at their date of earliest composition suggests that he began this draft in April and completed it in early May of that year. He also refers to his daughter on the first page of this draft as, “My month old child,” which indicates that he began this draft in early to mid April since his daughter was born on February 26 (NLI 13,588 (15), 5r and 2r).
will remain (or return, as is the case with the winds mentioned at the start of this chapter),

Yeats includes the source of the hatred that he feels in the first draft.

    Because those causes I have most approved
    And certain things & people I have loved
    Have prospered little my mind of late
    Has grown half barren from much hate

The “causes” and “people” he refers to will be rejected in the next draft in favor of the concept of beauty. The timing of this draft suggests that “people” is a reference to Constance Markievicz and Maud Gonne, and that the causes are their involvement with Sinn Féin and the Irish socialist movement At this time Ireland was determined to break free from England, and the rebel leaders, including Markievicz, had declared independence, set up their own government, and had passed official motions to marginalize or ostracize British police and military establishments. Of particular concern to Yeats was the formation of the “Limerick Soviet,” which was established as a protest and boycott of the “Special Military Area” set up by the British army around the city.

Yeats was not a supporter of Russian Communism, which he made clear in a letter to George Russell (AE) at the same time he was drafting the poem:

    What I want is that Ireland be kept from giving itself (under the influence of its lunatic faculty of going against everything which it believes England to affirm) to Marxian revolution or Marxian definitions of value in any form. I consider the Marxian criterion of values as in this age the spear-head of materialism and leading to inevitable murder…. Do you ever remember a European question on which Ireland did not at once take the opposite side to England?—well, that kills all thought and encourages the most miserable kind of mob rhetoric. (Letters 656)

Yeats was dismayed and angered that many of his friends and colleagues not only supported the Russian revolutionaries, but also supported a similar movement in Ireland.
While he was still an ardent supporter of Irish independence, he did not believe in blind objection to every British political position. What Yeats saw as an attack on the idea of any form of an aristocracy (to which he personally aspired) was to most Irish a beacon of hope and a model for finally freeing themselves from British colonial power. Tensions were rising quickly, and all-out war with England seemed inevitable at this point, which put Yeats in a delicate position regarding his hopes for an independent Ireland and his aristocratic dreams.

For this version of the poem, Yeats wrote three entire stanzas that he would struggle with over four more revisions before abandoning completely. In these stanzas he imagines his daughter, now grown, visiting Coole Park in remembrance of her father. He includes references to the familiar swans in the lake, the large catalpa tree under which he and Lady Gregory often sat, and the woods that surrounded the estate. By June Yeats would abandon all of these references to himself and his past in favor of a lines about the home her future husband would provide for her:

And may her bridegroom bring her to a house
Where all’s accustomed, ceremonious;
For arrogance and hatred are the wares
Peddled in the thoroughfares.
How but in custom and in ceremony
Are innocence and beauty born?

These lines express his political hopes for a communism-free future for Ireland as much as for his hopes that his child live a life free of struggle and hatred.

The subject matter of “A Prayer for My Daughter” was much closer to home for Yeats than was the content of “The Second Coming.” The challenges he faced in their
composition arose from his passionate personal connection to each, but one was a
philosophical struggle with politics, while the other was familial. He would publish “A
Prayer for My Daughter” twice as a single poem before finally deciding to place it after
“The Second Coming” in the collection Michael Robartes and the Dancer (1921) where
it finally gained the connectivity that Ross and Cullingford note. It appears that Yeats,
too, made this connection, but there is no indication that he intended this before he
submitted the poems together to the Cuala Press for the collection in late 1920.

When viewed together, the three poems that were the most difficult to write
establish Yeats’s politics as decidedly pro-independence and anti-colonial (“Easter,
1916”), despondent about the future of all nations, but especially Ireland (“The Second
Coming”), and hopeful that his infant daughter will live to see an era of national and
personal peace and prosperity (“A Prayer for My Daughter”). Yeats’s newly found
synthesis between the personal, political, and philosophical, or as he phrased it, “a
discrete expression of a single conviction,” proved a great struggle for him to achieve at
this point (“If I Were Four-and-Twenty” 25). The five other political poems published in
the collection express a strong political message, but without the deep connection to his
family or his newly discovered philosophy and were, relatively speaking, much easier for
him to write.

Each of the poems, “Sixteen Dead Men,” “The Rose Tree,” “On a Political
Prisoner,” “The Leaders of the Crowd,” and “A Meditation in Time of War,” was largely
complete on the first draft with only minor alterations to phrasing, spelling, punctuation,
or the title in subsequent drafts. These poems all deal with the political fallout resulting
from the Easter Rising and the “terrible beauty” that was born of it. “Sixteen Dead Men” and “The Rose Tree” each deal directly with the executions of the rebel leaders and the resulting rise in support of their cause among the Irish. Foster argues that “The Rose Tree,” while not as accomplished as the other poems “stands as his most unequivocal ‘rebel ballad’” (189). Yeats argues in “Sixteen Dead Men” that Pearse was the last hope for a peaceful resolution to the matter:

You say that we should still the land
Till Germany’s overcome;
But who is there to argue that
Now Pearse is deaf and dumb?

Now that Pearse and the others are dead, in other words, any hope for calm negotiations has faded. Yeats likens their new status as martyrs to that of “Lord Edward” (Fitzgerald) and (Theobald) “Wolfe Tone” who both gave their lives to the cause of freedom more than a century earlier, essentially saying that the fate of the Irish fight for independence was sealed, not by the Irish rebels, but by their execution at the hands of the British government.

The poem “On a Political Prisoner” is a reprisal of sorts of the section of “Easter, 1916” that gave him so much trouble and some of the abandoned ideas from “A Prayer for My Daughter.” The prisoner is Constance Markievicz who was once again incarcerated, this time for her alleged involvement in a plot to obtain weapons from the Germans. Her sentence lasted from May, 1918 to March, 1919. The first draft of the poem is dated only with the month, January, but was most likely January 1919 while Markievicz was still imprisoned. The poem once again extolls her beauty as a young girl
in Sligo before “her mind / Became a bitter and abstract thing,” both “blind and leader of
the blind.” The rejected lines from “A Prayer for My Daughter,” “Because those causes I
have most approved / And certain things & people I have loved / Have prospered little”
seem to speak directly to Markievicz’s situation. This poem, then, is the culmination of
those ideas about the countess brought to its unfortunate poetic fruition. Since he had
already worked out these ideas in previous poems, this poem came together very quickly
in spite of the personal connection that troubled the earlier ones.

The short poem “A Meditation in Time of War” was a very last-minute addition to
the collection. Yeats wrote the poem on November 9, 1914 at the outset of World War I,
but did nothing with it until he hastily decided to write the poem by hand on the
typescript sent to The Dial for the political sequence that ran there in late 1920, and also
included it in the sequence sent to his sister at the Cuala Press and among the four
political poems sent to The Nation at the same time. Yeats also selected this poem to send
to the Freeman’s Journal in Dublin where it ran November 26, 1920, just five days after
the tragic events of Bloody Sunday.118

The five-line poem begins with a reference to Blake’s “Milton,” which Yeats was
fond of quoting:

Every Time less than a pulsation of the artery
Is equal in its period & value to Six Thousand Years.
For in this Period the Poet’s Work is Done; and all the Great

---

118 On November 21, 1920 Michael Collins organized an operation to assassinate a group of British spies
working undercover in Dublin who were known as The Cairo Gang. All fourteen men were killed. Several
hours later, a group of Black and Tans, along with members of the RIC opened fire on a crowd of civilians
gathered in Croke Park to watch a Gaelic Football match. Fourteen Irish civilians were killed. That
evening, three suspected IRA members being held at Dublin Castle were beaten to death by their captors.
“Bloody Sunday” quickly became a rallying cry, and the events increased the popular support for the IRA
among average Irish citizens.
Events of Time start forth & are conceiv’d in such a Period,  
Within a Moment, a Pulsation of the Artery. (Blake 127)

In his first draft, Yeats replaces Blake’s word “pulsation” with “throb.” This makes the word “artery” the only multi-syllabic word in the line, and one of only a few in the entire poem. The following couplet recalls his many walks through the woods on the Gregory estate, and the final couplet breaks away into religious and philosophical assertions.

For one throb of the artery,  
While on that old grey stone I sat  
Under the old wind-broken tree,  
I knew that One is animate,  
Mankind inanimate phantasy.

Norman Jeffares (1968) points to two essays by Yeats (one written before and the other after the poem) that help explain the final two lines—one from *The Celtic Twilight* (1902) in which Yeats describes a single moment of spiritual revelation, which he understood to be “the root of Christian mysticism,” and another essay from *Per Amica Silentia Lunae* (1918) in which he explains that “the [spiritual] condition alone is animate, all the rest is fantasy” (247-248). Yeats seems to be saying that “the One”—possibly a unified spiritual presence or God—is the only truly animate object, whereas mankind is not.

This complex poem certainly falls into the category that Yeats warned readers about in his preface to the collection, “A few of these poems may be difficult to understand, perhaps more difficult than I know;” but he placed it among the other, more overt, political poems as part of his over-all message. These poems, when finally brought together in *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, leave no doubt as to the poet’s political stance and his personal connection to the people and events of the early days of the
revolution. Yeats’s fear of making a political statement in haste no longer seemed to prevent him from declaring his position through his art, and as the revolution gathered steam and war became inevitable, Yeats clearly wanted to make his allegiances known.

V. A Transitionary Fragment

On August 12, 1920 Terence MacSwiney, the Lord Mayor of Cork and leader of the local branch of the IRA, was arrested, tried for sedition, and sentenced to two years in Brixton Prison in London. He immediately went on a hunger strike to protest his sentence and quickly attracted world-wide attention to his case. On October 20, despite several attempts to force-feed him, MacSwiney fell into a coma and died five days later after seventy-four days without food.119

Seventeen years earlier, Yeats staged a play at Molesworth Hall entitled, *The King’s Threshold* in which the poet, Seanchan, employs a hunger strike as a means of protest against his removal from the state council. Seanchan eventually reconciles with the king in what Yeats called “a happy moment in the Theatre” (*Seven Poems* 24). In September 1920, during MacSwiney’s highly publicized hunger strike, Yeats decided to revisit this “happy moment” and write a new, tragic and politically charged ending to the play.

He wrote, in a letter to Lennox Robinson at the Abbey Theatre, that he was going to rewrite the play because “the Lord Mayor of Cork may make it tragically

---

119 Both Joyce and Beckett refer to this event in their fiction. Joyce inserted a reference to “The Lord Mayor of Cork” in his revisions of the “Circe” Episode, and Beckett’s title character in *Malone Dies* notes that “The Lord Mayor of Cork lasted for ages, but he was young, and he had political convictions” (*Three Novels* 273).
appropriate” (Foster, Arch-Poet 182). While this may seem opportunistic and insensitive, Yeats’s motives were sincere. He had originally intended to end the play with Seanchan’s death, but was convinced to alter it in the original 1903 version (Seven Poems 24). He wanted to express the tragedy of the poet’s death, and the power that his death had to influence public opinion. The revised ending contains the dying poet’s final words:

…When I and these are dead
We should be carried to some windy hill
To lie there with uncovered face awhile
That mankind and that leper there may know
Dead faces laugh.
(He falls and then half rises.)
King, king, dead faces laugh.
(He dies.)

The poet’s final words are repeated by one of his unnamed pupils who helps carry away the body proclaiming, “coming times will bless what he has blessed / And curse what he has cursed” (21).

This new ending shows the power to influence popular opinion that Yeats knew was inevitable if MacSwiney died in prison. He revived the play with the new ending at the Abbey in the spring of 1922. A few weeks later, he sent just the final pages of the play to the Cuala Press along with seven poems, four of which contained equally powerful political messages. Only five hundred copies of Seven Poems and a Fragment were made, and although all seven poems would eventually find their way into The Tower (1928), this was the only time this new ending to the play would be printed as an independent piece.
Yeats was planning for this new ending to the play at the same time he was completing and arranging all of the political poems listed above that would be published in *Poetry* magazine, *The Irish Statesman, The Dial, The Nation*, and finally in *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*. Irish politics and Irish independence were at the forefront of Yeats’s creative efforts at this time, and he wanted the political message of the hunger strike of the poet in his play to evoke memories of the death of MacSwiney. Yeats denied this connection publicly, but the letter to Robinson and the timing of the revision say differently (*Variorum Plays* 315). Yeats remained wary of making political statements in haste in fear that it might harm his profits at the Abbey, but the message, despite his denials is clear. While the fragment was not republished in *The Tower*, it belongs to the same body of political work that Yeats was creating at the time. Along with the poems of *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* and those of *The Tower*, this fragment speaks to the desires of the Irish people to free themselves from an unjust oppressor, and deserves consideration as a poetic work in its own right.

VI. Political Poems of *The Tower*

As his notebooks make clear, after his 1919 proclamation that his poetry had become “a discrete expression of a single conviction,” combining his passions for poetry, politics, and philosophy, Yeats struggled to achieve this synthesis in several poems with which he had deep personal connections. Over the next few years, however, he got better at achieving this single conviction in his poems. He still occasionally struggled with individual poems, but the content of these more challenging pieces does not tie directly to
his personal life as it previously did. The short poem “The Three Monuments,” for example, largely consists of material Yeats was only happy with by the third and fourth drafts. It makes no reference at all to his family or to his nascent spiritual philosophy, yet he made drastic changes to it over the course of its composition. The deeply personal “A Prayer for my Son,” however, came together very quickly for the poet, and only saw a few minor revisions that he settled on only after its first publication. The political poems that eventually came together in The Tower are split nearly evenly between those that went quickly from conception to finished product and those that took much more effort to reign in, and the personal associations vary among the two groups.

The only political poems in the collection that presented a great challenge to Yeats were “The Tower,” “The Three Monuments,” and to a lesser extent, “Leda and the Swan.” “The Tower,” which would eventually lend the collection not only its title but also its cover image and theme, was the most troublesome for Yeats. The bulk of the poem did not come together for him until the fourth and sixth revisions. The earliest drafts remain part of the poem, but were much revised and pushed back to the first two stanzas of section III. He even dropped a section of eight lines completely in the sixth revision only to bring them back for the eighth and final draft.

This earliest section of the poem deals with Yeats writing his last will and testament. The poet was nearly sixty years old while drafting this poem, and, though he would live another fifteen years, felt his advancing age and referred to it in several other poems. The first two notebook pages for this poem are typical of Yeats’s early drafts. They each contain about twenty lines of nearly indecipherable script that was meant for
only his eyes, but nearly all of the material on these two pages is rejected and crossed out. Yeats wrote the opening lines of this section five times and was left with little progress other than the vague ideas of writing a will, choosing a strong, outdoorsy man from Sligo to be his heir, and a few references to the Sligo countryside. Over the next twelve notebook pages, Yeats will struggle with this section of the poem drafting entire pages of new text that remain unedited, but then following them with crossed-out sections, rejected stanzas, and replacement ideas scattered in the margins and on the verso pages.

Yeats finished these drafts with a seamless combination of the poetic, political, and philosophical based upon his own personal desires for controlling his own legacy. He dropped all specific references to the Sligo area and replaced them with general mountain scenery so that his heirs could come from any part of Ireland. He leaves to them his pride, which he says is “the pride of the people” and specifically names Grattan as a model for the type of person he admires and to which he compares himself. He will later add Synge to stand alongside Grattan, but would quickly replace him with Burke. These references to Grattan and later to Burke speak to the tradition of the Anglo-Irish fighting for justice and independence from England. He transitions from this declaration of his pride to a declaration of his faith in which he proclaims:

Death and life were not
Till man made up the whole,
Made lock, stock and barrel
Out of his bitter soul,
Aye, sun and moon and star, all,
And further add to that
That being dead, we rise,
Dream and so create
A second\textsuperscript{120} Paradise.

This first completed section establishes the trimeter of the entire poem, and also brings together Yeats’s politics and philosophy. Happy with the as yet unnamed poem at this stage, Yeats set it aside for over a year. Between August, 1924 and October, 1925, he did nothing with it. He then began to draft new material that would become the bulk of the poem. He composed 120 new lines of verse that he placed before the “last will and testament” section. After this equally difficult stage of writing spread across fourteen loose-leaf pages, he set the poem aside again for another year, and in November, 1926 finally began to add the finishing touches, including fifteen new lines that would close the poem. This process, spread over three years, shows Yeats working toward his continued goal of combining all three major aspects of his life’s work, and it shows that this could still be a great struggle for him.

In June 1925, Yeats penned one of his lighter, more humorous political poems, “The Three Monuments.” By this time both the Irish War of Independence and the Irish Civil War were over, and Ireland was enjoying its self-determination as the Irish Free State. Yeats was now a household name for both his poetry and his position. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature two years earlier, and he was beginning his second term as a Senator in the Seanad Éireann. He was also adding the final touches to the first version of his spiritual/philosophical treatise, \textit{A Vision}. Like “The Second Coming” “The Three Monuments” began as a draft filled with specific political references, which were

\textsuperscript{120} In the eighth and final revision to the poem, Yeats replaces “A second” with “Translunar.”
later removed. The earliest draft of the poem takes a jab at France and Egypt, pitting their
“Courtesy, genius, intellect” against the virtue of the Irish people.

Since we are a virtu people
Let the empire

Let modern

Franj & Egypt put their trust

In Courtesy, genius, intellect (TMSS 525)

He also specifically names Parnell, Nelson, and O’Connell and their monuments standing
over the crowds on O’Connell Street. Within two more drafts, he adds Persia, ancient
Rome, and Greece to the list of his targets. After several revisions and many revised and
rejected stanzas, Yeats removed all specific references to other countries as well as to the
three Irish figures. The contrast is no longer between Ireland and other countries, but is
now a contrast between the pristine image the Irish have of their former leaders, and the
reality of their all-too-human failings. The monuments are now simply referred to as
“The patriots in their glory,” and the other nations are referred to only by the voice of a
nameless speaker who first appears as “some public speaker” but in later drafts is
multiplied and changed into “the public preachers” and then finally to “the popular
statesmen,” implicating himself among them. The final version of the poem has the
statesmen preach from the shadows of the former leaders, “That purity built up the state /
And after kept it from decay.” The statues of the men, to whom Yeats now refers as “The
three old rascals,” find this assertion to be ridiculous and laugh at the modern statesmen.
The composition of this poem shows that Yeats still found certain subjects much more
difficult to express than others and found success when the subject matter was
generalized rather than specific.
Much as in “The Second Coming,” the generalization of the revisions opens the audience up to a far larger number of people from any part of the world, but unlike the earlier poem, in “The Three Monuments” Yeats is poking fun at politics, and points the finger directly at himself in the process. In the midst of several tragic and serious political poems, “The Three Monuments,” which Yeats placed near the end of the collection, provides some relief for the readers and brings them into the current, peaceful condition of the country as opposed to the violent and tragic past.

The politics of “Leda and the Swan” are far less overt than that of “The Tower” or “The Three Monuments.” From the first drafts, Yeats set up the Leda and Zeus story as a metaphor for the future of Irish politics. Because the politics became so deeply buried, Yeats provided a note for the poem in order to prevent misunderstanding of the violent imagery:

I wrote Leda and the Swan because the editor of a political review [AE] asked me for a poem. I thought, “After the individualist, demagogic movement founded by Hobbes and popularized by the Encyclopaedists and the French Revolution, we have a soil so exhausted that it cannot grow that crop again for centuries.” Then I thought, “Nothing is now possible but some movement from above preceded by some violent annunciation.” … as I wrote, bird and lady took such possession of the scene that all politics went out of it, and my friend tells me that his “conservative readers would misunderstand the poem.” (VP 828)

The potential that AE saw for misunderstanding was warranted. The violent annunciation that would precede the next political era in Yeats’s vision comes in the form of the rape of Leda by Zeus who has taken the form of a swan. Lady Gregory, who was privy to the compositional process of the poem, noted in her diary that Yeats was struggling to use this metaphor. She says that Yeats believes
that the reign of democracy is over for the present, and in reaction there will be a violent government from above, as now in Russia, and is beginning here. It is the thought of this force coming into the world that he is expressing in his Leda poem, not yet quite complete. (Lady Gregory’s Journals 477)

In much the same vein as in “The Second Coming,” Yeats employs Christian religious imagery in order to introduce the extreme opposite meaning of his philosophical model. The early drafts of the poem are entitled, “The Annunciation.” The biblical annunciation ushered in the Christian era and hopes for peace. The annunciation Yeats envisions is bringing destruction and power from above that cannot be resisted.

The composition of this poem was difficult for Yeats, but to a lesser extent (as noted above) than the other two. In the earliest draft, Yeats had established the metaphor and much of the language that would stay with the poem until completion. The image of the “terrified” Leda realizing that her resistance would fail was intact from the start, as were the ideas that this “annunciation” would usher in the fall of a civilization, and that the unstoppable power from above was “indifferent” to human concerns of fear and pain. Where Yeats struggled was with the opening lines. Yeats revised these lines over six drafts and even continued to make adjustments after it was published in The Dial in June 1924.

The first three versions of the opening all begin with the image of Zeus as “the swooping godhead” hovering over his victim with “webbed toes” and a “powerful bill.” In the next version (the second consecutive revision labeled “Final Version”), Yeats opts for the synecdoche of the disembodied wings, but at this point, they still “swoop” and are “hovering” above the nameless “her.” He returns to “the bird,” which will remain until
after the poem’s first publication, and he replaces the pronoun “her” with the name Leda in the third revision, but abandons it in the fourth for “the staggering girl.” The opening stanza saw significant changes in every revision until Yeats believed that he had properly introduced his metaphorical personae to represent his prophecy of Ireland as victim to unknown powers from abroad. While it was only the first four lines that gave Yeats so much trouble in this poem, the extent and frequency of the revisions was significant, but his poems would not all be such a challenge.

The deeply personal “A Prayer for my Son” was written as a companion to “A Prayer for My Daughter.” Both poems begin with an image of a sleeping child, and the poem then looks into the future of the infant in relation to Irish history and politics. Michael Butler Yeats was born on August 22, 1921 while the family was staying in Oxfordshire, England avoiding the most intense fighting of the War for Independence, but they returned for his birth so that he could be born in Ireland.\(^{121}\) The first and only holographic draft of the poem consists of two unlined pages containing five stanzas. All of the substantive revisions to the poem were made at this stage, and there were very few. Yeats altered only one line in the second stanza opting for the shorter phrase, “planned his murder” in place of “plot against his life.” The entire third stanza is crossed out with two vertical lines and started fresh at the top of the next page. He struggled only with the phrasing, not the content, of this stanza.

\(^{121}\) While the draft pages are undated, Richard Finneran, Editor of the Cornell Yeats volume for *The Tower Manuscript Materials*, dates the composition of the poem between the date of Michael’s birth, August 22, 1921, to mid-December 1921 (xlii).
The third stanza marks the transition between the two halves of the poem. In the first half, Yeats expresses his wish that a ghost watch over his son as he sleeps and protect him from those “who have planned his murder, for they know / Of some most haughty deed or thought / That waits upon his future days.” These images reflect those of the sleeping child in “A Prayer for My Daughter” as Yeats worries about the infant Anne’s safety in a world full of political and cultural upheaval, but in this case, the threat to his child is all too real. The war that was just beginning when his daughter was born was now in full swing, so much so that the family had to leave Thoor Ballylee for the safety of England in order to ensure their survival. The second half of the poem sets up a metaphor comparing young Michael with the infant Christ as the new savior for Ireland, and the Yeatses with Mary and Joseph who protected him from the Slaughter of the Innocents through the power of the love between parents and their child. The deep personal connection to the subject matter of the poem would previously have indicated a difficult composition process, but Yeats had spent the previous three years mastering his technique for melding his personal life with his politics and philosophy in his art.

The last remaining political poem in the collection—and political only by association with Yeats’s previous work—also defied the earlier pattern of difficulty based on personal connections, politics, or philosophy as in the poems of *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*. The poem “The Hero, the Girl, and the Fool” saw only two major drafts, although Yeats broke the poem up and reassembled it several times over eleven years. It began with the familiar figure of Cuchulain in the title role of the Hero. While this poem—first drafted in 1917 just days after his marriage to George and withheld from the two
major collections published since that time—is largely about Yeats’s obsession with Iseult Gonne. The figure of Cuchulain ties it in with Irish myth and Yeats’s use of mythological figures to promote nationalist ideas. Cuchulain was at once a flawed hero representing the both the Irish people and the nation, and also Yeats’s mythological alter ego. Ross explains that, to Yeats, the hero “represents the mind and body united, unfettered by self-consciousness” (453). This union of mind and body was also Yeats’s own aspiration, and so the poet felt a deep personal connection to the hero. Written in the early days of Yeats’s marriage to George, when he thought that he had made a terrible mistake and had married the wrong woman, this poem expresses his regret that things did not work out with Iseult.

The mere mention of the name “Cuchulain,” however, also ties the poem inextricably to Yeats’s project of reviving the Irish myths as inspiration for the nationalist movement. Just as Cathleen ni Houlihan was a personification of Ireland, Cuchulain was a personification of the Irish revolutionary. Speaking of the hero as presented by Lady Gregory in her 1902 book, *Cuchulain of Muirtheimne*, Yeats concludes that “If we but tell these stories to our children the land will begin to be a Holy Land, as it was before men gave their hearts to Greece and Rome and Judea” (*Explorations* 12-13). Yeats realized that these stories could re-inspire the nation to be free and proud once again, and he thus returned to the figure of Cuchulain over and over throughout his career. Beginning as early as 1897, he was still writing about the hero and even making revisions to *The Death of Cuchulain*, quite literally, on his deathbed in 1939 (Ross 453-54). “The Hero, the Girl, and the Fool” was first published in the Cuala Press collection, *Seven Poems and a
Fragment in 1922 under the title, “Cuchulain, the Girl, and the Fool.” He published just the final words of the fool on its own in *A Vision* (1925), but then finally opted to replace the name of Cuchulain with the simple description, “the Hero” when he included the poem in *The Tower*.

VII. The Politics of Publication

While the poems discussed in this chapter each carry political significance on their own to varying degrees, Yeats knew that his nationalist ambition could be amplified by selective publication of the poems. He selected individual poems to stand as clear messages and had them published in journals with particular political agendas, including *The New Statesman, The Irish Statesman, The Nation* (London), and *The New Republic*. He also collected groups of poems that, when read together, delivered a magnified message of Irish nationalism. These groupings were published by the journals *The Dial* and *The Nation* as well as by The Cuala Press, operated by Yeats’s sister. Each publication of a single poem or a group of poems allowed Yeats to target a particular audience with a carefully drafted message. At times Yeats sent poems to be published simultaneously in more than one journal, and would then publish them again, in a different order, or with other poems in order to reinforce his political intentions.

Writing specifically about Yeats’s poetry, Chaudhry (as noted above) asserts the significance of a poem’s initial publication as superior to all subsequent publications. Citing Benjamin’s concept of “the fabric of tradition,” Chaudhry claims that anything
other than the first appearance of a poem “dims its ‘aura’, denudes its ‘authority’, and undermines its historical testimony” (1).

What makes the context of a text’s first publication more significant than the contexts of republication—even if these republications have authorial sanction—is the fact that it represents a text’s original purpose and function, as opposed to the subsequent uses to which it is put through republication by the author and his editors … This does not mean that the first publication is the most authoritative for purposes of study, but merely that it is the most interesting for what it can reveal about the author, the influences shaping the text, and the historical circumstances to which it may have been responding (2).

In his analysis “September 1913,” and its various publications, Chaudhry concedes “that republication of texts, especially with Yeats, is a means of manipulating and controlling the view posterity takes of an author … and the range of meanings generated by his texts” (251). He points specifically to Yeats’s republication of the poem in the aftermath of the Easter Rising and observes that “republication and the accompanying annotations have misled critics about the purpose and function of that poem.” Chaudhry is absolutely right in this case, but this assertion does not apply to all of Yeats’s poetry, and especially not to the poems written as part of his reaction to the events leading up to and including the Irish War of Independence and the Irish Civil War. In the case of the poems under investigation in this chapter, republication served, instead, as a means for Yeats to reestablish, add emphasis to, or reach a wider audience with the poems’ original purpose and function.
The Politics of Journal Publication

Yeats often took a multi-faceted approach to publication when it came to literary journals and small magazines. He selected audiences for his poetry in England, the United States, and at home in Ireland, sometimes simultaneously. These publications resulted in Yeats’s political message being interpreted by different audiences and in different ways. George Bornstein explains that simultaneous publication in different magazines produces different poetic texts. As each magazine used different formatting and printed the poem alongside works from various other writers, the message received would be altered according to those contexts. Bornstein argues that changes in “the bibliographic and contextual codes changes the meaning of the poem, even though the words remain the same” (99). This means that the same poem can carry very different meanings according to the context in which it is presented. While Yeats could not have much (if any) control over that context, he was keenly aware that the socio-political contexts differed greatly between Ireland, England, and the United States and that American audiences in general would be far more sympathetic to the Irish nationalist effort than the English.

The political poems that would be included in *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (1922) were all published during the Irish War for Independence. As the intensity of the fighting increased, so did his rate of publication and republication of his revolutionary political messages. With the exception of the private printing of “Easter, 1916,” Yeats’s release of these poems began with “A Prayer for My Daughter,” which he sent to both

---

122 As noted above on page 143, U.S. publications also secured the copyright and protected Yeats from pirate publishers.
Poetry and The Irish Statesman. The poem was printed in both publications in November 1919. Harriet Monroe founded the American magazine Poetry in Chicago in 1912. While the magazine itself was politically neutral, it attracted the biggest names in the avant-garde movement, resulting in a de facto politically progressive publication. It maintains the “open door” policy established in the first issue to this day, printing “the best poetry written today, in whatever style, genre, or approach.” By 1919, Yeats had already been sending them his poetry for years. “A Prayer for My Daughter” appeared as the first poem in this issue, the only poem by Yeats. He was by far the most well-known of the poets in the issue, and his prayer for his infant daughter to be free from the violence and abuses of British power, obscured through multiple revisions, would set the tone, not only for this issue of the magazine, but also for all of his subsequent American publications. This was a tentative political move for Yeats, but one that gave him the confidence to send out stronger messages in the future.

The short-lived Irish Statesman, as noted above, was a devoted political publication dedicated to achieving Dominion status for the entire island. The Dominion League began the magazine in the hope that “it would draw support away from militant nationalism as well as keeping the country unified” (Shovlin, Irish Literary Periodical 13). This was an attractive prospect for Yeats, who was asked to serve on the board of the magazine, and he chose this magazine as the best vehicle to present his veiled political message to the Irish people. Yeats was most likely still concerned about making his political views known in haste at this point in the war, but this would change drastically

---

123 see note, page 144
within a year. By October 1920 Yeats would be practically shouting his political views across the English Channel and the Atlantic.

Yeats finally decided to widely publish his now four-year-old reaction to the Easter Rising, “Easter, 1916.” He sent the poem to *The New Statesman* in London for publication in October 1920. This overtly socialist and pro-Labour publication seems at odds with his own anti-Marxist political views, but Yeats had an established relationship with the magazine going back to 1914. “Easter, 1916,” however, would be the last poem he ever sent them. A month later, Yeats made what might be the boldest political move of his life.

Yeats collected several of his new political poems and sent them to *The Nation* in London (a rival publication to *The New Statesman*), to *The Dial* in America, and to his sister, Elizabeth, at The Cuala Press. The politically liberal Joseph Roundtree Social Service Trust purchased *The Nation* as well as several other magazines “less with a view to making a profit than to influence political thought” (Brooker and Thacker 516). To test the waters with *The Nation*, he sent them “The Second Coming” and “The Rose Tree,” which they printed in their November 6, 1920 issue. The following week they printed “On a Political Prisoner” and “A Meditation in Time of War.” The poems printed in back-to-back issues were clear attempts by Yeats to win the sympathy of English readers for the Irish cause in the conflict. He was very well known by this point in his career, and he knew his political statement would carry with it the weight of his reputation.

---

124 *The New Statesman* had previously published several poems from *The Wild Swans at Coole*. Due to editorial ineptitude regarding the arts, and the editor’s (Clifford Sharpe’s) descent into alcoholism, Yeats opted to send all further poems to the *Nation* in order to reach English audiences (Smith 5, 198).
Yeats then sent a group of six poems to The Dial, which was under the new management of Scofield Thayer and James Sibley Watson Jr. and for which Ezra Pound was the London Editor. The Dial began in the 1840s as a magazine dedicated to Transcendentalist philosophy, but only lasted until 1844. It was revived successfully in Chicago in 1880 as a progressive political and literary magazine. Margaret Anderson, who would later found The Little Review, worked for the magazine during this period. After more than thirty successful years, the politics of World War I divided the editors, and they parted ways, selling the magazine to the pacifist Thayer and his Harvard associate, Watson. In 1920, The Dial was revived again in its most successful incarnation as a modernist literary magazine. This new incarnation attracted the biggest names in art and literature until its closure in 1929. The six poems that Yeats sent to The Dial included the four poems sent to The Nation as well as “Easter, 1916,” and “Sixteen Dead Men.” The November 1920 issue of The Dial published all six poems together projecting the strongest public declaration of support for Irish independence by Yeats, and the strongest singular political statement he would ever make. While The Dial was an American magazine, Yeats was aware that its readership and influence extended all across Europe as well, and he wanted his message to be heard.

Concurrent with this bold, international statement of nationalist solidarity, Yeats also gave these same six poems, as well as the previously published “A Prayer for My Daughter” and several spiritual and philosophical poems to his sister Elizabeth at the Cuala Press. Yeats chose the title Michael Robartes and the Dancer, referring to his occult works, for this local publication in place of a more overtly political title. Instead of
a strictly political message, this collection allowed Yeats to maintain his reputation as Ireland’s preeminent poet, but who now also had strong opinions about recent political events as well as occult spirituality. The political implications of this Cuala Press edition will be discussed further below.

Soon after Michael Robartes and the Dancer was published and sold, Yeats began to gather more political poems that expressed his support for Irish independence. He sent “Nineteen Hundred Nineteen” to both The Dial and to its literary polar opposite, The London Mercury. Joy Grant describes the magazine as a “self-confessedly conservative organ, disapproving of unbridled experiment, taking its stand on common sense” (132). The London Mercury was expressly opposed to the forms of modernist literary experimentation being embraced and celebrated by The Dial and others like it. Both Pound and Eliot expressed their disfavor for the magazine and its editors. While it may seem an odd pairing of outlets for Yeats’s highly polemic poem, he was keenly aware that the conservative magazine had a readership of over 20,000, and that it held “great cultural influence over most of the London literary reviews” (240). A publication in The London Mercury was both a political and professional success for Yeats. This tactic worked so well for him that he employed the exact same pairing of magazines again two years later.

Before he was to return to international outlets, however, the Anglo-Irish Treaty was signed, and the costly war with England officially came to a close. Yeats focused his attentions on his readers at home once again with a new Cuala Press collection. Seven Poems and a Fragment contained “Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen” as well as the first appearance of “A Prayer for My Son,” “The New Faces,” “Cuchulain, The Girl, and the
Fool” (later renamed “The Hero, the Girl, and the Fool”), and the tragic and politically charged new ending to his play *The King’s Threshold*.

Over the next few years the Irish Civil War and Yeats’s position as a senator slowed his poetic production. The only political poem he published in 1923 was “Meditations in Time of Civil War,” which he, once again, sent to both *The Dial* and *The London Mercury*. In 1924 Yeats sent “Leda and the Swan” to *The Dial* and to the newly formed and short-lived local magazine *To-Morrow*, which Shovlin calls “a journal designed to confront and to offend” (“From Revolution to Republic” 742). While it only lasted for two issues in as many months, *To-Morrow* made a bold political statement. The first issue (Aug 1924) contained a Lennox Robinson story about a rape victim who later claimed her pregnancy was the result of immaculate conception. Frank Shovlin calls the story “a gauntlet thrown down at the feet of the Church and State” (744). “Leda and the Swan” also used rape as a metaphor for political power, which set a tone of bold defiance to the conservative politics of the new Irish Free State. The editorial note in the first issue claimed that “new subject matter must flow from the human soul restored to all its courage, to all its audacity.” It was credited to editors H. Stuart and Cecil Salkeld, but it is speculated that Yeats was the author of the editorial (Shovlin 742n). It claimed to be against “technical investigation and experiment” but, according to Shovlin, the contents were almost completely unorthodox, and he calls the magazine’s cultural credo “hopelessly confused” (744). This confusion and the overtly rebellious posturing of the magazine led to its failure after just two issues.
Yeats would not send a political poem to a magazine or journal again for three more years. In June 1927 he sent “The Tower” to both *The New Republic* and *The Criterion*. This powerful expression of his artistic and political legacy was published almost simultaneously in America and England. *The New Republic*, which began in 1914, was a radically left-wing political and literary journal. The editors encouraged U.S. intervention in World War I, and supported the early Soviet republic’s communist efforts. It was a powerful and influential magazine that has survived to this day and remains a left-leaning political voice. Yeats oddly considered this magazine as an appropriate outlet for this poetic expression of his life’s work, considering that he was so vocally opposed to communism in any form. *The Criterion*, however, was not such an odd choice for Yeats. T. S. Eliot founded and edited the magazine in 1922 and remained at its helm for seventeen years until he shut it down. Eliot’s goal was to promote modernist literature primarily through critical review and secondarily through the publication of literature. (Brooker and Thacker 349). By the mid 1920s “Eliot’s growing prestige made *The Criterion* the foremost magazine outlet in London for literary modernism” (351). Michael Levenson goes even further in his assessment of the magazine’s influence:

> If we look for a mark of modernism’s coming of age, the founding of *The Criterion* in 1922 may prove a better instance than *The Waste Land*, better even than *Ulysses*, because it exemplifies the institutionalization of the movement, the accession to cultural legitimacy. (213)

Eliot's goal was to make it a literary review dedicated to the maintenance of his very high standards and the reunification of a European intellectual community. This blend of progressive ideas and artistic integrity made *The Criterion* an ideal outlet for Yeats, but
“The Tower” would be the only poem he would publish there. Yeats was selective with the outlets for his political messages, but his most frequent and supportive publisher was his sister, Elizabeth, at The Cuala Press.

The Politics of The Cuala Press

Yeats once said of his sister Elizabeth that “the only patriotic thing Lollie ever did was to sit down when God Save the King came on the radio” (qtd in G. Lewis 3). Her years as a casual observer of politics slowly came to an end as her sympathies were replaced with concerns for her fellow citizens and her hatred of the brutality of the British soldiers during the war. While they were not revolutionaries like Maud Gonne or Constance Markievicz, Elizabeth and her sister Lily carved out a position in Irish politics that remains visible to this day in the very texts and crafts they produced.

What would later become The Cuala Press began as a strictly Irish arts and crafts cooperative in 1902 called Dun Emer Industries. It was started by Evelyn Gleeson, described by Gifford Lewis simply as “an Anglo-Irish woman with some art training” (54). Gleeson sought out Lily and Elizabeth Yeats to help run the organization’s embroidery and printing departments, respectively. Her objective was “to find work for Irish hands in the making of beautiful things,” and she wanted all of these “hands” to be women. Within a year, Elizabeth’s department had published its first book—W. B. Yeats’s *In the Seven Woods*. This book contained the first publication of *On Baile’s Strand*, which was the inaugural play at the Abbey earlier that year. Yeats wrote this play about the tragic hero Cuchulain with Parnell and his futile fight with England in mind (Ross 355).
While this first cooperation between brother and sister went well, not all of them went so smoothly. Tensions were frequently high between Elizabeth and her brother. After assuming full charge of the press duties, she became much more critical of her brother’s notoriously poor spelling and punctuation. It was no small matter that she could actually read his handwriting, which proved impossible to many typists and publishers throughout his career, and this helped to keep her in her in older brother’s good graces. While they maintained a working relationship, they fought each other viciously at times, often, as siblings do, appealing to their father to settle their disputes, which frequently became public. One such public manifestation of their arguments came in the 1914 printing of Yeats’s *Responsibilities*, in which Elizabeth included an errata slip stating, “These are alterations that our brother made after the book was printed—so they are not our misprints.” In a letter to her father, she once wrote, “it is no joke publishing with Willie’s finger in the pie—one has to be as wily as a serpent” (qtd in G. Lewis 114).

Dun Emer Industries became famous in both Ireland and in England, not only for their extremely high-quality productions of embroidery and small-press books, but also for the fact that this level of quality was produced by a company entirely operated and staffed by women. Their work began to appear in art journals and articles throughout Europe and America. Politics at the cooperative, however, began to cause tensions between Gleeson, who was still overseeing all of the work, and the Yeats sisters. Gleeson, while a devoted suffragist, was also a highly class-conscious Unionist, and the Yeats
sisters sympathized more with the nationalists, and not at all with the women’s suffrage movement.\textsuperscript{125}

These political differences soon became too much for either side, and they agreed to part ways. AE (Russell) helped the sisters negotiate the separation agreement, which resulted in Elizabeth keeping the printing press and type, but all embroidery and weaving went to Gleeson. The sisters began their enterprise anew under the name Cuala Industries with Lily waiting the agreed-upon five years before resuming her embroidery work. The Cuala publications continued to impress critics of small-press books with their simplicity, elegance, the selective use of red ink, and the fact that they were made entirely by women set them apart from other small presses.

The early news of the Easter Rising struck the Yeats sisters much as it did their brother. Lily referred to the rebels as “poor fools,” both sisters thought the whole rebellion was “the uttermost madness” (G. Lewis 131). Once the executions began, however, their opinions changed, and they sided firmly with the nationalists. In the wake of the executions, the sisters became much more involved in local politics. They joined the Sinn Féin Rural Council and helped to organize social events, they openly defied threats by the Royal Irish Constabulary and the often violent Black and Tans and continued to go about their business in town. Lewis comments of the sisters that “all activities seemed to have a connection with the war, the aftermath of war, or politics” (150). They both supported the war effort by helping families in need and refugee children. Lily commented in a letter to her father, “as you know I was no Sinn

\textsuperscript{125} Both sisters had a very low opinion of the women’s suffrage movement and considered Hannah Sheehy Skeffington, a leading Irish suffragist, to be a “troublemaker” (G. Lewis 107).
Feiner a year ago—just a mild nationalist—but now….”[126] All the while, however, they continued their work at Cuala and continued to impress critics with the quality of their productions.

The books published by the Cuala Press all carried inside them Elizabeth’s strong nationalist message in the closing colophon. On the last page of each book appeared a square block of bright red ink announcing its Irish provenance. The colophon for *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, for example reads:

Here ends ‘Michael Robartes and the Dancer’ by William Butler Yeats. Four hundred copies of this book have been printed and published by Elizabeth Corbet Yeats on paper made in Ireland, at the Cuala Press, Churchtown, Dundrum, in the county of Dublin, Ireland. Finished on All Souls Day in the year nineteen hundred and twenty.

Elizabeth noted, not only the title and number of copies, but also information that seems unnecessary except for political purposes. She identified herself as the sole publisher, she made it clear that the paper itself was made in Ireland, she repeated the name of the press that also appeared clearly on the title page of each volume, and she identified the neighborhood, town, county, and, for the second time, named the country of Ireland. Even with the several moves the press made over the years, the colophon continued to identify the location with clarity and specificity.

---

[126] The remainder of this sentence was made unreadable. (See G. Lewis 151).
Other than the title and date, the other individual elements of the colophon carry with them great political weight. The fact that each book was both “printed and published” by, not just a woman, but an unmarried woman was a bold statement for women’s claims to equality and responsibility in business ventures. The next element is, perhaps, unique to Cuala publications, Elizabeth made it clear to all readers that the very paper they were holding and reading was made in Ireland. They did not rely on the easily-obtained and affordable paper mass produced in England, but rather selected craft paper made in Ireland by Irish people. The specificity of the press location was also a careful political statement. Identifying Dublin or Churchtown as the location was not enough for Elizabeth. Instead she provided much more information than was necessary, but information that reiterated the importance of its position inside Ireland. This specificity also allowed for the repetition of the word “Ireland” for the second time in the short paragraph.

This statement of national pride and solidarity with the Irish people lent every publication from the press an element of authenticity that other publishing venues could not offer. For Yeats to select his sister’s publishing business as his chosen printer was a political statement in itself. While Yeats was eager to reach international audiences with his poetry, and sent them to various magazines and journals, he left many of his collections in the hands of his sister. It would have been much easier for him to choose another publisher, but he remained faithful to his family and to the level of care Elizabeth put into creating a uniquely Irish product.
By the time Yeats was ready to take his bold nationalist position with the poems in *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, he could likely have taken his pick of publishing houses in London, New York, or Chicago. He was very well known, and his poetry was well received by both progressive and artistically conservative critics. Instead he chose to have his sister present his message to the world. He arranged the political poems with several others that reflected his spiritual work with George and his new family and asked that they be published by Cuala. This was far more than dedication to family, as Yeats would certainly have preferred to work with someone who did not fight him at every occasion. It was, instead, a dedication to his country, its people, and its fight for independence. It was a clear anti-British message that he was sending to his readers.

After *Michael Robartes and the Dancer*, Yeats would return to Cuala Press fifteen more times before his death in 1939. Five of these appeared during the two wars in Ireland and during Yeats’s two terms as a senator. *Seven Poems and a Fragment* (1922), published just a year after *Michael Robartes*, contained five pieces with political messages, *The Cat and the Moon and Certain Poems* (1924), contained only two political poems, but the lengthy “Meditations in Time of Civil War” took up nearly a third of the book. Likewise, *October Blast* contains two political poems that provide and thematic and literal frame for the collection. The other Cuala publications from this time are: *Four Years* (1921), a memoir; *The Bounty of Sweden* (1925), a memoir about his visit to receive the Nobel Prize and a summary of his speech before the Royal Swedish Academy; and *Estrangement* (1926), extracts and musings from his 1909 diary.
Yeats’s dedication to the nationalist cause grew from the early days of his poetry and plays in which he sought to unite the various factions under the umbrella of a shared history and mythology into that of a dedicated, anti-colonial patriot. He later experimented with alternative forms of political philosophy like Fascism, but soon realized their shortcomings. During the revolutionary period in Ireland, however, Yeats remained a loud and consistent voice of a nation that was fighting for the right to define its own future and to define its own national and cultural identity.
A line will take us hours maybe;  
Yet if it does not seem a moment’s thought,  
Our stitching and unstitching has been naught.  
Better go down upon your marrow-bones  
And scrub a kitchen pavement, or break stones  
Like an old pauper, in all kinds of weather;  
For to articulate sweet sounds together  
Is to work harder than all these, and yet  
Be thought an idler ….

— W. B. Yeats, “Adam’s Curse” (VP 204-205)

Afterword
The Future of Ireland’s Literary Past

Perhaps nowhere else is the work of literary art and the process of creating it so precisely placed at odds with one another as they are in the opening stanza of Yeats’s poem “Adam’s Curse.” Yeats describes the creation of a single line of poetry as a labor more difficult than the bone-grinding work of scrubbing pavement by hand, or than the breaking of stones while exposed to the elements. Yet for all his work, his desire is that when readers encounter the solitary line he created at such cost, it appears to be nothing more than “a moment’s thought.” It is this process of creation that is intentionally kept from readers that can remind us, or perhaps show us for the first time, that the genesis of a great work of literature is a window into the conditions that brought it into being. These conditions, or what Louis Hay calls “the socio-historico-cultural circumstances” of a piece of literature, provide a window into the writing process that allows us to see both the writer and his work as products of their society, history, and culture. Wim Van Mierlo
asserts that “no work ever comes into being completely ex nihilo. The author’s productive work exists within a network of external influences.” In other words, the finished product is only one element among many involved in the creation of a work, and these other elements are just as crucial to our understanding of the works and their authors as is the final product itself. As Yeats makes clear in “Adam’s Curse,” a single work of literature often acts as a veil hiding the productive work that created it.

Many writers believe that this veil hiding the messy, time-consuming, and often unflattering process should never be lifted in order to preserve the illusion of teleological creation of a poem, play, or piece of fiction. Yeats went so far as to place a curse on anyone who “brings to light of day / The writings I have cast away,” in order to preserve this public image of a master poet producing works of creative inspiration in place of the drudgery of the actual writing process. He wanted the world to know that his was a labor-intensive craft, but he did not want anyone to see how the sausage is made. Joyce, at the opposite end of the spectrum, was never shy about saying how hard he worked and would even sell his notes and drafts to the highest bidder as long as it provided him with an income suitable to keep his family fed and to allow him to keep writing. In several cases, he even reproduced discarded early drafts of Ulysses by hand in order to sell them to the American collector John Quinn. Despite what authors may or may not want, the ability to use their notes, drafts, and manuscripts as a tool for understanding the social, historical, and cultural conditions in which it was created can bring us closer to both the artist and the work of art. Under these conditions, as Stallworthy argues, “the end justifies a slight irregularity in the means.”
It has been my goal in this investigation to pull back this veil on James Joyce, Seán Ó’Casey, and William Butler Yeats in order to bring my readers closer to the artists and their works, specifically as their *avant textes* reveal their similarities and differences regarding Irish nationalism during their nation’s struggle to secure political self-determination and to implement a new government. I have explored a particular type of *avant texte* by each author in order to learn more about their nationalist positions as well as the way they arrived at the artistic expression of that position. In each case the result is a better understanding of how a particular author felt about Ireland and its struggle for independence. An additional result, and one that could only come from the examination of the prepublication materials and personal documents, is a better understanding of the artists as people with genuine passions, concerns, doubts, and frustrations, and the manner by which they transfigured these into their art.

In Chapter One I primarily examined the revision documents that Joyce used while preparing *Ulysses* for publication. The typescripts, *placards*, and page proofs that he revised over and over again reveal (among many other things) that Joyce was determined to change the character of Bloom from a man unconcerned with politics to one who thought a great deal about local politics and frequently pondered both the current state and the future of his country. Other original documents, like Joyce’s notebooks and letters, helped to support the conclusions I derived from the publication materials. Tools created by other scholars, like Richard Ellmann’s biography, Hans Walter Gabler’s *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, and Luca Crispi’s many resources for *Ulysses* at *Genetic Joyce Studies*, made this type of investigation possible.
Chapter Two employed a different approach to genetic criticism in that I only used two versions of what I argue is a single Seán O’Casey work. I employ the recently found play, *The Cooing of Doves*, as an early draft of *The Plough and the Stars*. The result is a clear understanding of the enormous role that the former play played in the development of the latter as well as a deeper look into the way O’Casey used his plays to express his political opinions. O’Casey was never one to hold his tongue about such opinions, but being able to see the process by which he altered, revised, and expanded his ideas greatly enhances our understanding of his artistic mission and his unflinching dedication to the Irish working poor.

Chapter Three, perhaps the most challenging from a genetic standpoint, employs the much more traditional approach to genetic studies in that it explores multiple versions of particular works as they developed over time. This challenge was enhanced by the fact that I consider multiple poems by W. B. Yeats that each saw many drafts before publication, and sometimes several more drafts afterwards. As in Chapter One, however, the foundational scholarship of previous generations of textual scholars like Roy Foster, Thomas Parkinson, and Jon Stallworthy made this investigation possible.

While I attempted to be as thorough as possible regarding the material at hand and what it can teach us about the authors and their works, my investigation remains limited in many ways. The primary limitation lies in the parameters of the study. I scoured the avant textes only for clues to the political expression of the three authors, and only where that expression relates to the Irish struggle for independence. There is far more potential for future research regarding other political eras and ideas remaining in the source.
material, and there is nearly unlimited potential to explore other subjects expressed in the texts. Another limitation is the number of political voices presented. I chose only three authors at the expense of many others. Joyce, O’Casey, and Yeats represent the three primary genres of literary expression in early twentieth century Ireland—fiction, plays, and poetry—and each of them is considered to be the greatest Irish voice in his particular genre. While these authors are representative of many other political voices at the time, they are by no means exhaustive. As discussed at length in Chapter Two, there were many Irish nationalist groups, each with its own political objectives, and these three authors represent only a small fraction of the highly complex political landscape in revolutionary Ireland.

Conspicuously missing from this study are the voices of Irish women. The lack of scholarship of Irish women writing during the peaks of both high modernism and The Irish War of Independence would lead scholars to believe that women were not producing literature as part of either movement, when, in fact, this is far from the truth. Names like Joyce, Yeats, and O’Casey, as well as others like Padraig Pearse, George Russell (AE), Padraic Colum, James Stephens, Joseph Plunkett, and George Moore, frequent the pages of current studies at the expense of the women who were writing alongside them. Anne Fogarty observes that “the privileging of this male-centered literary canon and its aesthetic precepts blocks from view a women’s modernism frequently rooted in popular literary modes,” but also that

the reconceptualization of several crucial aspects of modernism in recent decades, together with the archival work of literary critics and historians who have reclaimed forgotten corpuses of writing, permit us now to consider Irish
modernism in a more inclusive fashion and to take better account of the achievements of women artists. (147)

Fogarty points to the achievements of women like Eva Gore-Booth, Lady Augusta Gregory, Alice Milligan, George Egerton (Mary Bright), and Dorothy Macardle as examples of women who were contributing “as much to collective political endeavors as to the creation of an oeuvre of their own” (148). The works of any or all of these writers could be included in a future expansion of this study in order to illustrate the same concepts of nationalism and artistry as seen through the process of composition. My reasons for not including these women writers has less to do with the “pre-eminence,” to use Fogarty’s term, of Joyce, Yeats, and O’Casey in previous studies of revolutionary Irish modernism, and more to do with the availability of resources and the accessibility of the authors’ notes and manuscripts, if they exist at all. While there is a tremendous amount of work to be done regarding the work of women modernists and revolutionaries, practical matters have kept them out of this investigation. Many women writing at the same time as these men were also standing alongside the soldiers and revolutionaries as they fought for Irish independence, and their stories are equally compelling and will also be explored further in the future of this project.

With the present text as a starting point, I have developed tentative plans for three potential future projects. I will not be able to pursue all of these in the immediate future, but the following are rough ideas for projects that grew out of my research, and each is something in which I could easily invest my time and energy. The projects follow in order of relationship to this project, and not my plans for pursuing them. My first plan
is to expand this study to include the political perspectives of more Irish authors from all sides of the political spectrum. As a result of exploring the authors individually, I have come to realize that, in order to turn this dissertation into a book, the organization must change dramatically to view the authors’ views on these historical events together. I plan to restructure this project according to an historical timeline and present the various perspectives that the authors presented regarding the events as they happened. I will include works by Padraig Pearse, Padraic Colum, George Russell, Elizabeth Bowen, Lady Gregory, and Somerville and Ross, among several potential others, where the *avant textes* exist to investigate.

My second proposed project will look into several new areas regarding Joyce’s revisions for *Ulysses* that became apparent during my research. In addition to the well documented insertion of elements enhancing the experimental techniques of each episode and the reinforcement of the Homeric parallels, I have found several other patterns in the revisions for individual episodes and for the novel as a whole. I have identified patterns regarding Joyce’s amplification of humor throughout the novel, the development of Bloom’s background from childhood through his life with Molly, the inclusion of early-twentieth-century popular culture references (primarily in the Bloom episodes) and far more political allusions than were able to fit in the single chapter I have written thus far. Each of these patterns carries implications for both textual and theoretical interpretations, and I hope to work on a book-length project that explores many of these aspects of the genesis of *Ulysses*. 
As a third potential project related to this investigation, I would like to pursue research into both professional and amateur voices of the Easter Rising. Current resources like archives of local newspapers and magazines and the quickly expanding *Letters 1916* public humanities project hosted by Trinity College Dublin will provide both a public and private perspective of revolutionary Irish politics as reflected in the creative expression of the Irish people. Considering that the one-hundred-year anniversary of the Easter Rising is only a year away, it is my hope that this revised project will be attractive to scholarly presses as renewed interest in the Easter Rising and its consequences make their way into the popular media once again.

In my future work within the field of genetic criticism, I hope to provide a bridge between textual scholarship and theoretical approaches to the texts. While my primary focus has been on the writing process as it encounters politics, reader reception, and publishing, I understand that the implications of my findings can reach far beyond my area of expertise and speak to the fields of authorial, psychoanalytical, and structural theories as well as cultural studies and the history of the Irish people. As my research progresses, I will follow the findings wherever they may lead in the hope that I can continue to reveal both the tremendous amount creative effort behind the works and the critical implications of such knowledge. It is my hope to continue revealing the “stitching and unstitching” that gave rise to each line of poetry or prose in order to provide new ways of looking at these familiar texts, to see “what they were like as children,” and to expose the laborious creative process behind the works that we love so much.
## Appendix A

Additions to the text of *Ulysses* with some connection to Irish nationalism, British imperialism, or the conflicts between England and Ireland

---

**Episode 1 "Telemachus"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingstown</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 Aug-2 Sep</td>
<td>Reference to Kingstown and not just the mailboat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogshabdy</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27 June-Aug 2</td>
<td>A Royal Navy term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Horn of a bull, hoo of a horse, smile of a Saxon.&quot;</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27 June-Aug 2</td>
<td>Expression of mistrust of the British</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Episode 2 "Nestor"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Evilious, pious, and immortal…Croppies lie down.&quot;</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29 June-Aug 2</td>
<td>Reference to history of abuses against Irish Catholics by the British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A faithless wife…prince of Breffini.&quot;</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-18 June</td>
<td>Comic demonstration of the Anglo-Irish not knowing their history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Episode 3 "Proteus"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The seeds of Mananaan</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29 June-Aug 2</td>
<td>Reference to Irish myth—a common expression of nationalism during the Irish Literary Renaissance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Episode 4 "Calypso"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;mice never squeal&quot;</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[June]-2 Aug</td>
<td>Metaphor for Irish rolling over to British colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;potato I have&quot;</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[June]-2 Aug</td>
<td>One of many potato references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland's breadvan&quot;</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>TS overlay 1921</td>
<td>Possible allusion to Harry Boland, nationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Findlater or Dan Fallons&quot;</td>
<td>4.128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[June]-2 Aug</td>
<td>Both figures sympathetic to the British cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National School</td>
<td>4.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-23 June</td>
<td>Schools part of the English effort to control Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivity to captivity&quot;</td>
<td>4.225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[June]-2 Aug</td>
<td>Metaphor for Irish population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Who's he when he's at home&quot;</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 Aug-1 Aug</td>
<td>Reference to John Bull, became colloquial. (See notes on CSE pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stephens&quot;</td>
<td>4.401</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 Aug-1 Aug</td>
<td>Fenian, revolutionary figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The king was in his counting house&quot;</td>
<td>4.498</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[June]-23 June</td>
<td>Nursery rhyme: joke/allusion to British monarch on the toilet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Episode 5 "Lotus-Eaters"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brady's Cottages</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27-30 June</td>
<td>One of many large sections of Dublin owned by British landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School&quot;</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-17 June</td>
<td>Bloom went to National School system (See Winston regarding indoctrination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting poster</td>
<td>5.66-75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-30 June</td>
<td>Bloom's critical view of recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise and the port&quot;</td>
<td>5.132-33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-30 June</td>
<td>Thomas Moore poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen was in her bedroom…&quot;</td>
<td>5.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-17 June</td>
<td>Additional reference to nursery rhyme from &quot;Calypso&quot; and the king on the toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Ardilaun has to change his shirt four times a day…&quot;</td>
<td>5.306-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-12 Sep</td>
<td>Ardilaun (Guinness) was Unionist conservative, but also philanthropist (Bloom is ambiguous about him)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene in church</td>
<td>5.322-337</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>27-30 June</td>
<td>Bloom friendly but critical of both Catholics and Protestants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Carey&quot;</td>
<td>5.380-382</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TS Overlay 1921</td>
<td>Added detail about Phoenix Park Murders; Bloom got name wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wheatley's Dublin hop Bittens or Cantrell and Cochranes. &quot;</td>
<td>5.389</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 Aug-17 Sep</td>
<td>Wheatley’s = Irish product, Cantrell’s = British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army blatant imitation&quot;</td>
<td>5.433</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 Aug-17 Sep</td>
<td>Bloom critical of Salvation Army as were many Irish pub owners for stealing clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Albany…&quot;</td>
<td>5.497-499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 Aug-17 Sep</td>
<td>Bloom taking part in rumors about British Monarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Episode 6 "Hades"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UCSE Level</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins and Ward</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>TS 1918</td>
<td>Actual Dublin solicitors, representatives of British law (changed from fictional Holles and Wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in an Eaton suit&quot;</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Aug-2 Sep</td>
<td>A popular suit patterned after the uniform of the prestigious English school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in Raymond Terrace&quot;- seargent</td>
<td>6.78-79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sep-19 Sep</td>
<td>Specific location of barracks combined with change to British military officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith O'Brien statue</td>
<td>6.226</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sep-19 Sep</td>
<td>Hero of 1848 rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;huge cloaked Liberator's form&quot;</td>
<td>6.249</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sep-19 Sep</td>
<td>Daniel O'Connell statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...Gray's statue&quot;</td>
<td>6.258</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sep-19 Sep</td>
<td>Nationalist Irish politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event/Character</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early Oct</td>
<td>save the giant ashe...acre of foliage</td>
<td>This change to the Citizen's words add error to his knowledge of Irish history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Earl of Desmond</td>
<td>Desmond fought against British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>none of your Henry Tudor's harps...sion of Milesius</td>
<td>Patriotic Irish heritage defining British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Kathleen ni Houlihan</td>
<td>Yeats and Gregory's 1902 hyper-patriotic play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>We fought for the royal...broken treatystone</td>
<td>Betrayal by English Royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Tay Pay's dinner party</td>
<td>Tay Pay was criticized for acting too British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>His Satanic Majesty's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to the Citizen's words add error to his knowledge of Irish history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Red Bank oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>The much/measured...incurations of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Marked for a softened bullet</td>
<td>Hanned bullet developed by British forces in Calcutta ca. 1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>tromides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>the volume of the word of God...from the girl hands</td>
<td>Additional criticism of British royalty added to Citizen's words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Droopy</td>
<td>Joyce gives the Citizen droopy, disease typical of drunkards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>If the man in the moon...If the man in the moon...</td>
<td>Change from patriotic song to racist/anti-Semitic song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Queen's Royal Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Episode 13 &quot;Nausicaa&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Lady's Pictorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Mrs. Reggy Wylde E. C. D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Parson's Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Martin Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Lord Talbot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Episode 14 &quot;Oxen of the Sun&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Episode 15 &quot;Circe&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Junior Army and Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>seargent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>gallants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>The Castle is looking for him</td>
<td>Authority of the British monarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>galant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>service of our soverign</td>
<td>Reinforces that the RDF served the King of England, not the people of Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Who hoosed Joe Chamberlain?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>under general Lough in the park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>The King versus Bloom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Acclaimed Britisher...British...Britanniametabound</td>
<td>This statue was the site of many anti-British demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Oxford rag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Queen of Dublin society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>February nineteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>&quot;blossom of the homegrown potato plant&quot;</td>
<td>Name changed from existing family name to extinct Anglo-Irish family name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep-Oct</td>
<td>Talboys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Davy Stephens confronted Edward VII on his visit to Dublin. He became an Irish folk hero.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>&quot;He dons the black cap.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Zoe takes Bloom's potato.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Zoe puts potato in pocket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Story of Raleigh bringing potato to Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Royal Dublin Fusiliers...Welsh Fusiliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Imperial eagles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Reference to the authority of the Monarchy in Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>After them march the guilds...contractors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>(Ceremony details).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Bloom claims to be successor to Parnell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Green socks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Hereditary enemy at Ladysmith.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>&quot;Half a League onward.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Charge of the Light Brigade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Bluecoat schoolboy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Thirtytwo workmen...L.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Echoes celebration of Hungary's independence while Ireland is still not free.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Irish patriot who turned on his fellow nationalists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>An insult to true Irishmen, Stage Irishmen pandered to British stereotypes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>He's as bad as Parnell was.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Condensed milk tins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Irish Evicted Tenants - Sjambok him!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Don Emile...covered with gravy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Daughters of Erin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Leading a black bogoak pig...tear in his eye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Out of the Hanaper and Petty Bag office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Bloom asks for the return of his potato. Zoe returns potato.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Ingredients of Irish stew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Another reference to Wild Geese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Edward the Seventh...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Leopards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Ingredients of Irish stew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Don Emile...covered with gravy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Bloom asks for the return of his potato. Zoe returns potato.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Another reference to Wild Geese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Edward the Seventh...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Leopards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Ingredients of Irish stew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Deathflower of the potato blight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Bleeding Horse in Camden Street</td>
<td>16.198-99</td>
<td>3 11-Mid Jan 1922 Center of low scheming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Eblana ... Out of repair</td>
<td>16.237-238</td>
<td>2, 3 13-Dec-Jan 1922 Boat with name of Dublin broken down (critical allusion to Dublin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Battle Royal</td>
<td>16.558</td>
<td>4 16-25 Jan 1922 Inclusion of Customhouse again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Fort Camden and Fort Carlisle</td>
<td>16.607-08</td>
<td>8-Mid Dec Wrong date; actually 1882 – Bloom’s “vivid recollection” is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Inclusion of Customhouse again</td>
<td>16.621</td>
<td>4 16-25 Jan 1922 Inclusion of Customhouse again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Dr. Tible’s Vi-Cocoa</td>
<td>16.680</td>
<td>2 13-Late Dec English beverage supplement accompanied by lengthy ads describing medical benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Sherlockholmesing</td>
<td>16.751</td>
<td>1 8-Mid Dec English popular culture – First Holmes story was 1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Eighty-one to be correct</td>
<td>16.831</td>
<td>1 16-25 Jan 1922 Reference to anonymous famine ballad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Battle Royal</td>
<td>16.840</td>
<td>8-Mid Dec Second reference to Shakespeare as national poet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Fort Camden</td>
<td>16.876</td>
<td>B Feb 1930-Early Dec Existo Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Denis or Peter Carey</td>
<td>16.953</td>
<td>3 11-Mid Jan 1922 Bloom gets name of Invincible James Carey wrong twice – Joyce added second attempt at level 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>submerging tenth</td>
<td>16.926</td>
<td>4 16-25 Jan 1922 Salvation Army founder called the 10% living in abject poverty in England “the submerging tenth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Letter from his Grace, William x.</td>
<td>16.924</td>
<td>1 8-Mid Dec William Walsh turned against Parnell during divorce scandal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Insuppressible</td>
<td>16.1334</td>
<td>2 13-Late Dec Bloom cannot remember which was the pro- and which was anti-Parnellite paper (Insuppressibles were anti-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>(much detail added about Parnell scandal)</td>
<td>16.1358-1400</td>
<td>B 1, 2, 3, 4 Feb 1921-Jan 1922 New details about Parnell added in clumps over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Linley Murray</td>
<td>16.1435-36</td>
<td>1 8-Mid Dec Bloom proud that photographer who worked the queen and royal family also took Molly’s sexy pic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Insuppressible</td>
<td>16.1435-36</td>
<td>B Feb-Early Dec Metalistic grammarian who wrote the standard grammar book for English and American schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>(detail added about Parnell affair)</td>
<td>16.1500</td>
<td>2 13-Late Dec Second instance of Bloom not remembering which was which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Blackhot Foster days</td>
<td>16.1583</td>
<td>3 11-Mid Jan 1922 Yeats poem, “Who Goes with Fergus,” Bloom mistakes for a girl’s name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>(cricket details added)</td>
<td>16.1683-85</td>
<td>2, 3, 4 13 Dec-25 Jan 1922 Cricket is a traditionally British sport popular also in the colonies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>_preferred Catholic music</td>
<td>16.1740-43</td>
<td>4 16-25 Jan 1922 Addition of Bloom’s preference for Catholic hymns as opposed to Protestant hymns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Queen Victoria, Their Royal Highnesses, Theatre Royal</td>
<td>16.429-436</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec Additional reference to Royal family running Irish institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>“...preferred Catholic music”</td>
<td>17.1940-43</td>
<td>4 16-25 Jan 1922 Addition of Bloom’s preference for Catholic hymns as opposed to Protestant hymns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Episode 17 “Ithaca”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Beresford Place</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec The Beresford family ran Customs House, collected taxes and helped to punish Irish rebels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>The Irish Nation</td>
<td>17.15-16</td>
<td>I Mid-Late Dec Added to a list of topics that Bloom and Stephen discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>“assigning the date of the Irish Nation...”</td>
<td>17.30-35</td>
<td>1 Oct-Early Dec Agreement between LB and SD that the date of Ireland’s conversion by St. Patrick was anachronistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>“consistent part”</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>C Oct-Early Dec “democratic” added to the qualities of water that Bloom admires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>“If Brian Boru could but come back...”</td>
<td>17.419</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec Another political term used to describe water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Queen Victoria, Their Royal Highnesses, Theatre Royal</td>
<td>17.424-436</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec Additional reference to Royal family running Irish institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>names of the new lord mayor, high sheriff, and solicitor general</td>
<td>17.444-45</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec More British subjects in charge of Irish government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Union Jack</td>
<td>17.128</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer Among items in Bloom’s living room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Connemara marble</td>
<td>17.1335</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec Changed from generic marble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Lawrence Bloomfield in Ireland</td>
<td>17.1338</td>
<td>2 29 Dec-Jan 1922 Book about Anglo-Irish landlord sympathetic to the Irish peasants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Major Brian Cooper Tweedy</td>
<td>17.142</td>
<td>3 Mid-Dec-Jan 1922 Bloom’s father-in-law and member of British military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>“left Kingston for England”</td>
<td>17.1606-15</td>
<td>B Oct-Early Dec Bloom imagines himself as ascendency-type landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>“confiscation of estate, real and personal, to the crown”</td>
<td>17.1621-22</td>
<td>1,2 Mid-Dec-Jan 1922 Potential penalty for Irish land-holders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>list of Irish patriots</td>
<td>17.1647-1651</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer Irish nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Queen Alexandra of England</td>
<td>17.1779</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer Among items in drawer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>stamp commemorating Queen Victoria</td>
<td>17.1815</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Wonderworker</td>
<td>17.1820-21</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer Identified as a British product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>list of Irish tourist attractions</td>
<td>17.1974-78</td>
<td>[Draft] Spring-Summer National pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Molly blames ex-maid of stealing potatoes

The first socialist

Molly making potato cakes

Lucan Dairy

Lord Roberts

Sinner Fein

Griffiths

Stanley Gardner died

Prince of Wales own...lancers

Battle of Tugela

Lord Mayor looking at me with his dirty eyes

Tossing it back like Kitty O'Shea

HRH in Gibraltar

"the Queens own"

Queens birthday... Ulysses S. Grant

Mrs. Rubio critical of Imperialism

their war and fever

"soldiers daughter I am..."

"king of the country"

"Queen the potatoes"

"Sinner Fein" and "the little man he showed me"

If they saw a real officers funeral..."

Milly refuses to buy potatoes

lord Fauntleroy suit

"and the sailors playing...their tall combs"
### Appendix B
Correspondences Between Characters in *The Cooing of Doves* with Those in *The Plough and the Stars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Cooing of Doves</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Plough and the Stars</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>JACK CLITHEROE (<em>a bricklayer</em>), Commandant in the Irish Citizen Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>NORA CLITHEROE, his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE FORESTER</td>
<td>PETER FLYNN (<em>a labourer</em>), Nora’s uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE REPUBLICAN LABOURER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SOCIALIST CLERK.</td>
<td>*THE YOUNG COVEY (<em>a fitter</em>), Clitheroe’s cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SOCIALIST LABOURER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ORANGE SELLER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BALLAD SINGER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>MRS. GOGAN (<em>a charwoman</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CARPENTER.</td>
<td>MOLLISER, her consumptive child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>*FLUTHER GOOD (<em>a carpenter</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>CAPT. BRENNA (<em>a chicken butcher</em>), of the Irish Citizen Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>CORPORAL STODDARD, of the Wiltshires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE MAN ON THE SEA.</td>
<td>SEARGENT TINLEY, of the Wiltshires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NATIVE SPEAKER.</td>
<td><em>ROSIE REDMOND, a daughter of ‘the Digs’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td><em>A BAR-TENDER</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>A WOMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>THE FIGURE IN THE WINDOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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