CONTENTS

Introduction

> I'm not at all impressed by the expression that he was not interested in politics, that he was interested in style: I have the impression of somebody who had walked so much faster than the others, that he got there first, and he had to sit down and wait for a long, long time for the others to come along.
>
> —MARIA JOLAS, 1975[1]

THIS IS A POLITICAL AND INTELLECTUAL biographical treatment of James Joyce before he left Ireland in 1904, and in the first phase of what he characterised as exile in Trieste, and afterwards in Zurich.

Little has been written directly on Joyce's political formation. Dominic Manganiello's excellent *Joyce's Politics* (1980)[2] is a thematic analysis of Joyce's politics in its Irish and European aspects. I have taken an approach that is closer to that of political biography. Joyce was not of course a politician, nor was he politically engaged, but he was observant of politics and had an acute sense of the significance of the political, and his oeuvre stands in a defined relationship to the politics of Irish independence. The exercise of mapping Joyce as exactly as possible to

1. J. Aubert and M. Jolas, eds., *Joyce and Paris, 1902 . . . 1920–1940 . . . 1975: Papers from the Fifth International James Joyce Symposium, Paris, 16–20 June 1975* (Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1979), 14. Jolas was participating in a *colloque* on 'political perspectives on Joyce's work'.

2. Dominic Manganiello, *Joyce's Politics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980).

contemporary issues, movements, and personalities reconfigures the political understanding of Joyce. The warrant for that approach is principally in relation to the Joyce of Ireland and the Joyce of early exile, the focus of this book, but it also affords the most fecund approach to his political thinking in his middle and late periods of exile, when he wrote *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, and shows how his political thinking contributed to his literary modernism and set that modernism apart, and how those works which had Irish settings were as European in conception as they were 'Irish'. It is an approach that does something to retrieve the originality and coherence of Joyce's apprehension of the political in Ireland and in Europe, as he negotiated the vicissitudes of his era, from the late nineteenth into the first half of the twentieth century.

This narrative of Joyce's intellectual development in Ireland and early exile seeks to frame his life, thought, and writings in their political and cultural settings in Ireland and Europe. Its subject is Joyce's revolt against the post–Parnell Split Catholic Ireland in which he grew up, and the origins of his endeavour to understand and render imaginatively the political culture of Ireland. What Joyce observed and experienced before he left Ireland in 1904 informed his treatment of his country in his writings through his career; most obviously it fills the pages of *Ulysses*, which he set on a date some four months before his leaving. This coincided with the moment, immediately precipitated by his relationship with Nora Barnacle, when his mind had begun to turn towards imminent exile.

Joyce left Dublin with Nora from the North Wall on 8 October 1904 on a journey that took them through London, Paris, Zurich, and then Trieste to Pola, which they reached on 30 October. At the start of March 1905, they found their way back to Trieste. This was the commencement of Joyce's long exilic odyssey. He was to make three return visits to Ireland between 1909 and 1912. The third visit ended catastrophically with the aborting of an Irish publication of *Dubliners*. On

11 October 1912, he left Dublin with Nora and their children, Giorgio and Lucia. He would never again return to Ireland.

The span of Joyce's twenty-two and a half years in Ireland, while cut short—he was to live twice as long on the continent of Europe as he had in Ireland—encompassed an immensely significant period of Irish history. At the date of Joyce's birth, 2 February 1882, Charles Stewart Parnell was establishing his leadership of Irish nationalism. Parnell's fall in the Split of 1890–91 imposed itself on Joyce's political consciousness as a child. His adolescence was passed in the years of disenchantment that followed Parnell's death, but which saw the first stirrings of what would become the successor movements to the Irish Parliamentary Party that Parnell had led.

Joyce entered into elective political consciousness with the death of Parnell. He had some vague awareness of the inception of the Parnell Split in December 1890 (when he was eight) and an exposure—albeit at second hand, in school and at home—to the death of Parnell on 6 October 1891 (when he was nine) and its immediate aftermath. The Split had a searing effect on Joyce, deeper than that on other members of his age cohort. The reasons for the Split's peculiar impact on him are hard to calibrate with precision: some combination of extreme intellectual precocity, the refusal of a child to acquiesce to an unjust outcome, and the manner in which the Split and Parnell's death—which were his induction into the political—were communicated to him; the uninhibitedness of his father's expression of his Parnellite sympathies; and the bitter grief of John Kelly, the friend of the family who had been the most selfless of Parnell's close supporters. The depth and directness of the impact of the Split on Joyce as a child was unusual and left him with a sense of temporality different from that of his contemporaries. In University College, Dublin, he observed the politics of the immediate post-Parnell generation and became familiar with the thinking of the Irish writers he read, most of whom he had contrived to meet by the time of his departure. He was steeped in the political print culture of Dublin, its contemporary newspapers and weeklies. He observed the stirring of new nationalist modes of expression and incipient movements.

Joyce had in his curtailed but formative years in Ireland a wide exposure to the Irish political that enabled him to comprehend the Ireland that had just passed, and the Ireland that was beginning to emerge. The distanced clarity of his apprehension of post-Split Irish politics set him apart. His experience of the Irish political scene would, in turn, mark him out from contemporary internationalist modernist writers. Joyce never ceased to draw on the deep well of his years in Ireland both in his political construction and imaginative treatment of the country he had left and in his larger conception of politics.

A 'political life' of one who was not a politician, professional controversialist, or proponent of political ideas might seem an anomalous undertaking. Averse to intellectual proselytisation or Tractarianism, Joyce came after 1912 to profess the principle of 'silence' outside his fiction. That reticence came to condition in some degree how his work was read, and to be misconstrued as an avowal on Joyce's part that he was personally and authorially apolitical, without politics, as an exile from Ireland and a modernist writer.

The idea that Joyce was in any significant sense a political writer would have been disputed in his lifetime and was negated in most of the early critical readings of his work. In Ireland this was due principally to the fact that he had left the Catholic Church and his country, as well as to the perceived exoticism of his art. It was also because in Ireland the term 'politics' was understood in partisan and overtly patriotic terms. Beyond Ireland, Joyce's consecration as an international modernist writer who had in exemplary fashion transcended the political divisions and controversies of the country of his birth—a transcendence that seemed to have much to commend it in the aftermath of the Second World War—negated the idea that he was political, either personally or in his work. The establishment of a conception of Joyce as political was strangely retarded for these reasons. It is true that Joyce had renounced all forms of conventional political engagement in Ireland, but his opinions while he was in Ireland were neither actively concealed nor deeply buried. It is almost as if he was waiting for some of the more astute of his contemporaries to divine what his Irish political beliefs actually were, but his contemporaries were post-Parnellite, and so preoccupied with the

politico-cultural themes of the turn of the century in Ireland, and so accepting of Joyce's mask as an aloof 'literary artist', that few queried his reticence.

A writer's political convictions and the political import of his or her writing are, it will be said, quite different things. But they are connected, and in the case of Joyce the connection is close.

To comprehend Joyce's political convictions in Ireland, it is necessary to elucidate what they meant in their contemporary setting. It is a doubtful proceeding to banish the fierce particularity of his responses to Irish nationalism and its controversies, or to render those responses in an unhistorically selective way and thereby forfeit any sense of their integrity. Joyce's political reticence is a considered protest that is intended to be intelligible; it is not to be treated as open ground that can be filled by critical or ideological conjecture.

The exercise of tracking Joyce through childhood to early exile yields an outcome at odds with the once regnant idea of Joyce as austerely politically disengaged through rigid and unyielding artistic conviction. The portrait of the young Joyce that emerges is of someone far more intimately familiar with contemporary Irish controversies than had been suspected; and of a writer in the making—'a literary artist'[3]—of highly sophisticated political sensibility who observed an heroic intellectual discipline in a patient striving for understanding. It is that exigent discipline which gave Joyce—however protean his art and his self-conception as a writer would become—his remarkable political and intellectual consistency. His approach to the political was highly considered and intellectually scrupled. It was also in significant respects consciously strategic. His thinking was guarded, sometimes to the point of diffidence. From early on, he knew that there were aspects of the Irish political he could not afford to get wrong, notably the emergence of the revival of the Irish language as a political issue. As it transpired, he was never to find himself obliged to recant or to significantly modify the stances he had adopted. For all his disregard, occasionally verging on the staggering, for political and historical exactitude, no contemporary

3. In *Stephen Hero* we read, 'Stephen had begun to think of himself as a literary artist' (*SH* 122).

Irish writer or commentator—or politician—came close to rivalling Joyce's strategically distanced political acuity. In the now somewhat petrified contest between the canonisation of Joyce as a modernist and its more recent postcolonial rebuttal, what is lost is an appreciation of the extraordinary intelligence of Joyce's close treatment of the political. The recognition of Joyce's high political intellectuality—and shrewd intuitiveness—has been too long deferred.

Was Joyce an Irish nationalist? It is a question of some importance. My assertion that he plainly was is not part of a project for an Irish re-appropriation of Joyce. It is not necessary to that belated repossession: Joyce was born and grew up in Ireland, and his writings in exile pertained to Ireland, and his contemporary reception in Ireland has not been premised on the belief that he was an Irish nationalist insofar as it has ever been considered. The question is of importance in elucidating Joyce's Irish politics and his relationship to Ireland, and for an understanding of his broader politics.

In the critical writing touching on Joyce's politics in the last three decades or so, there has been a reluctance to acknowledge his Irish nationalism, which is central to how one construes his treatment of the Irish political.[4] If anything, there has been something of a regression. In his 1939 biography, Herbert Gorman wrote that 'Joyce, if anything, was an Irish nationalist at heart'.[5] Richard Ellmann observed more elliptically in 1982 that 'if he was not a nationalist of anyone else's school he was his own nationalist'.[6] That same year, shortly before the publication of the revised edition of his biography, Ellmann commented in an interview, 'Joyce undoubtedly disapproved of the excessive nationalism that he saw so popular in Ireland at the time. On the other hand, he was

4. For further discussion of critical writing on Joyce's nationalism, see chapter 1, 'The Shade of Parnell', 38–43.

5. Herbert Gorman, *James Joyce* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1939), 186.

6. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce's Hundredth Birthday: Side and Front Views* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1982), 16.

a nationalist in his fashion'.[7] Robert Scholes, one of the few Joyce scholars to confront squarely the issue of Joyce's politics, observed in 1986 that the Joyce of 1906–7 was 'antibourgeois, anticlerical, antiparliamentary, antimilitaristic, antibureaucratic, an Irish nationalist', though he contends—I believe wrongly—that Joyce abandoned 'all political commitment' some time before the outbreak of the First World War.[8]

Postcolonial critics have been notably wary of characterising Joyce as an Irish nationalist. An acceptance that Joyce was an Irish nationalist ought not to be controversial and is only rendered so by a strange coalescence of postcolonial theory and the residues of what was once the prevalent view of him in Ireland and of the early critical reception of his work.

For Irish nationalists, the idea that Joyce could have been retrospectively a supporter of the cause of the dead leader without having nationalist sympathies is a contradiction in terms. To argue that Joyce was Parnellite but not an Irish nationalist one is driven back on two possible arguments. The first is that Joyce's Parnellism was a boyhood infatuation that was not carried forward into his convictions and thinking in adulthood but endured as a fond relic of his Dublin boyhood—a proposition that is not maintainable on any considered reading of Joyce's fictional and non-fictional writing. The second is that his nationalism waned, but his identification with Parnell endured, so that Joyce came to sever his Parnellism from Irish nationalism, an act of some conceptual violence which would need clear attestation in what Joyce wrote.

Joyce, famously, never avowed himself a nationalist. Defending Sinn Féin against the criticisms of his brother Stanislaus, he wrote from Rome in late 1906, 'If the Irish programme did not insist on the Irish language I suppose I could call myself a nationalist. As it is, I am content

7. Richard Ellmann, interview by Craig Raine, broadcast on BBC Radio 3 on 5 February 1982, published in *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 February 1982, and republished in John Gross, ed., *The Modern Movement* (London: Harvill, 1992), 66.

8. Robert Scholes, 'Joyce and Modernist Ideology', in *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium*, ed. Morris Beja and Shari Benstock (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 95, 102. Scholes is writing about Joyce's 'turn away from politics' (97) principally in relation to socialism.

to recognise myself an exile, and, prophetically, a repudiated one.'[9] That was as close as he ever got, in his extant correspondence or what is known of his conversations on the subject. In that letter he put forward the most convenient and straightforward of the many reasons why he declined to proclaim himself a nationalist when it became possible for him to consider doing so: it was an exorbitance for an exile to do so. It was an early instance of Joyce's invocation of the contingencies of absence which derived from the strategising of his exile. The following year he gave his lecture in Trieste entitled 'L'Irlanda: Isola dei santi e dei savi' ('Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages'). Having characterised with extravagant inaccuracy Irish complicity in the Norman invasion and the Act of Union, he said, 'In my opinion, these two facts must be perfectly explained before the country in which they took place has even the most elementary right to expect one of its sons to change his position from that of detached observer to convinced nationalist'.[10] The idea that Joyce could not avow himself a nationalist until these two facts were accounted for was a thin contrivance and at odds with the reason he had advanced to Stanislaus the previous year, though it had a certain rhetorical force. Joyce's inferential self-characterisation as a 'detached observer' was tactical rather than substantive, part of the long game he had played of seeking out and maintaining 'his ground of vantage' in relation to Ireland and its controversies.[11]

It may be objected that being opposed to British dominion in Ireland and sympathetic to Irish independence is not enough to establish whether a writer was a nationalist. One might also expect a receptiveness to some version of an Irish national narrative, and an identification with a significant strain or strains of the political heritage or tradition of Irish nationalism. Both are present in Joyce in his recognition that Ireland had historic claims to nationhood; that it had a literary culture of

9. Joyce to Stanislaus Joyce, 6 November 1906, *Letters II* 187. The first sentence suggests that Joyce is referring to the nationalism of Sinn Féin rather than of the post-Parnell Irish Parliamentary Party. That, however, is secondary to the argument advanced here that objectively Joyce has to be considered a nationalist.

10. *OCPW* 116.

11. *PSW* 218.

some importance that reached back in time; that it had endured conquest which it had not overthrown but had never ceased to protest against; and that the aspiration to self-determination had found expression in periodic rebellions and acts of socio-political resistance. There is something else that speaks to Joyce's nationalism: the way he wrote of the Irish people and their beliefs, taken with his sense of the rhetorical power of nationalism in engendering a sense of a common political identity, even if his rendering of that power tends to be most discernible when he is resisting or parodying it. It is difficult to conceive of someone inhabiting the communicative space of nationalism with the connoisseurship that Joyce did without being a nationalist, however dissentient.

He disdained, and sought to move beyond, the Irish preoccupation with England. In Irish politics he was intellectually revolutionary in refusing to treat the English subjugation of Ireland in isolation from the Irish response. Joyce was both provocative and rigorous in his refusal to subscribe to a narrative of Irish history as British conquest in which the Irish were passive victims. If he did not forgive the iniquities of English conquest and governance, he was unsparing on the subject of Irish disunion, enfeeblement, passivity, or objective complicity in the depredations of the conquering power. The English conquest and the Irish response had to be set side by side and understood integrally. This was an aggressively revisionist model of Irish history. Rather than a flat Irish saga of oppression, it was dialectical. What this came down to was Joyce's disdain for a political and historical narrative in which the subjugated Irish were acquitted of all responsibility for their fate and self-beatified as victims of history. For many of his contemporaries that was an anti-nationalist posture, but it was for Joyce a translation of the axiom that Ireland had responsibility for its own destiny. He was an Irish nationalist who refused to think in conventionally nationalistic terms.

One finally comes back to the strategically chosen vantage from which Joyce wrote. His fiercely Parnellian critique of Ireland and Irish nationalism is only politically intelligible as written from *within* Irish nationalism, if on an outer refractory edge. It is an argument addressed to Irish

nationalists. The paradox of Joyce's nationalism is that it is in his critique of nationalism that his nationalism is most evident.

Joyce's non-avowal of nationalism was a strategic ploy which he sedulously pursued with adroitness and pertinacity. His proclaimed refusals to avow himself an Irish nationalist tended to be formulated in a way that was strangely redolent of the high vein of Irish patriotic rhetoric. Whether Joyce was an Irish nationalist cannot be determined by whether he accepted the designation.

Joyce's strategic position was one that he maintained across the contingencies of political time, which included the achievement of Irish independence, the central preoccupation of Irish nationalists, something which Joyce foresaw—not especially controversially—would be achieved in his lifetime, whether through Home Rule or otherwise. That he held aloof from the independent Irish state did not signify that he was, or became retrospectively, opposed to the achievement of Irish independence. Irish nationalism did not entail acceptance of the policies an independent state might pursue. In withholding acceptance, Joyce remained within the logic of Irish nationalism, and of democratic statehood. In considering Joyce's nationalism, it is important to appreciate that what he did *not* do was engage in the vain (in both senses) and incoherent intellectual exercise of conditioning his support of the idea of Irish independence. His realism, and his understanding of nationalism, ran too deep for that. Joyce instead embarked on an elaborate nominalist game in which he refused to avow himself an Irish nationalist. This has its origins in *Stephen Hero* as applied to Stephen Daedalus, when Home Rule seemed a distant prospect, and it is maintained almost playfully in the exegetics of exile of Shem the Penman in *Finnegans Wake*, written after the establishment of the Irish state.

Why is a recognition of Joyce's Irish nationalism of consequence? A number of reasons might be advanced. The first is that it reveals just how political Joyce was. If the idea that Joyce was apolitical from artistic principle no longer has much currency, there remains a lingering suggestion of detached unconcern: in 1969 the Joyce scholar Phillip Herring astonishingly imputed to Joyce an 'inherent lack of interest in the

human condition'.[12] It is not simply that Joyce had and retained political convictions; his Irish nationalism attested to a belief in democratic self-determination. The second is that Joyce's Irish nationalism affects how one situates his broader politics and has filiations to other strains of political thought. A defining characteristic of Irish nationalism in its mainstream expressions (subtracting its vicious manifestations such as that of the Citizen in the 'Cyclops' episode of *Ulysses* or the Provisional Irish Republican Army) is its sceptical resistance to the claims of ideology and ethnicity, and a pragmatism that seems unbounded. Irish nationalism mediated or tempered Joyce's response to contemporary politics.

The virtuosity of his observation of and analysis of Irish nationalism—rarely if ever acknowledged as a discrete attribute—informed his apprehension of the political beyond Ireland. His sceptical interrogation of ideologies originates in his experience of Ireland. The core premise of this book is that the analysis of Joyce's politics is best approached through his relationship to the Irish political, his intellectual point of departure.

The Irish nationalism that Joyce came to espouse was one that was pared to its conceptual core of independent statehood, shorn of the incidental chauvinistic and religious excrescences that many of his contemporaries had come to regard as defining features of nationalism.

The principal change wrought by exile—or at least that was coincident with exile—is that Joyce ceased to perceive Ireland as having nothing to impart to continental Europe by reason of its economic backwardness and political stagnation. He continued to think comparatively of Ireland in relation to European states and nations, but the terms of comparison shifted. Ireland might after all have something to impart, as an island in the Atlantic with a historical rhythm of its own that had set it apart from the Continent, and as a country whose independence had been denied by conquest but which had as a corollary been spared entrapment in the rigidities of statehood or empire other than

12. Phillip F. Herring, 'Joyce's Politics', in *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium*, ed. Fritz Senn (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), 11, 10.

involuntarily as a constituent of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Ireland has escaped the imposition of rectilinearity. Joyce seized on the idea of Ireland having a strange exemplarity or imaginative plasticity, even if only in the abstract, deriving from the statal inchoateness of Ireland. That sense of the tractability of the narrative of Ireland became the breach through which coursed all of Joyce's conception of historical and cultural cycles of change and continuity. It permitted him to move beyond his straitened analysis of Ireland as it stood in 1904, and to negotiate the bleakness of his assessment of contemporary Irish politics. It found expression in his 1907 Trieste lecture 'L'Irlanda: Isola dei santi e dei savi' and came lastingly to inform how he rendered Ireland in his art:[13] it would be hard to conceive of *Finnegans Wake* had the country whose history provided its principal political subject been an established nineteenth-century European state or empire with a settled narrative of statal advance or colonial aggrandisement.

Philosophically, Joyce's Irish nationalism derives from a combination of political realism and European romantic nationalism. He was not an ideological nationalist. He was hostile to ethnocentrism and scornful of ideas of cultural purity. He was intrigued by, and not disapproving of, articulations of national cultures and narratives and could be scathingly funny about them. He was accepting of the historically sanctioned arrangement of human societies as nation-states. He conspicuously did not look to a dissolution of the state or nation-state, an idea that had a considerable currency in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Europe. Edmund Epstein in 1971 wrote that both Joyce and the Stephen of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* 'really believed in the existences of national races: neither of them was a modern internationalist. Joyce was an old-fashioned nationalist, of the school of Herder and Matthew Arnold and Mazzini. . . . His nationalism was the nineteenth century liberal variety which was prevalent in the Ireland of his time'.[14] This relates

13. *OCPW* 108–26.

14. Edmund L. Epstein, *The Ordeal of Stephen Dedalus* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), 90–91. The judgement of Leslie Fiedler four years later, at the Paris symposium, conveys the depth of the misapprehension created by the early readings of Joyce as divorced from Irish nationalism and an internationalist critic of the nation-state: 'There is one

to Joyce's acceptance of the nation-state; one has nonetheless to allow for the imaginative fluidity of Joyce's conception of national identity, while his consciousness of the unceasing cultural interpenetration particularly of European nations made 'national races' a relative concept.

The development over time of his views on the role of the nation-state in contemporary Europe is harder to elucidate, and open to debate, in part because while Ireland became a state in 1922, it was never a great power. It is certainly possible to read *Finnegans Wake*, written across the terrible interval between two world wars and completed three months after the outbreak of the second, as a critique of the idea of the European nation-state, though the stronger argument is that he remained bleakly realistic in relation to the institution of the nation-state.

To say that Joyce was an Irish nationalist is not to suggest that Irish nationalism exhaustively defined his political thinking. He believed in Irish independence and was sympathetic to Ireland's nationalist tradition. His Irish nationalism was not a politically exclusive belief. It is true that Joyce's expressions of sympathy with Sinn Féin had an approximate synchrony with his loss of interest in Italian socialism, but he did not posit any linkage between those developments of affinity. He did not conceive them as alternatives.

His Irish nationalism had nothing in common with and was deeply antipathetic to the reactionary (and typically anti-Semitic) ideological nationalism that found contemporary expression, for example, in France in L'Action Française. Joyce's was a nationalism that was explicitly European. The early Joyce is the first thoroughgoing exponent of an Irish nationalism that was consciously European—a title conventionally

---

fundamental political error which Joyce made in his work in terms of political analysis of the world. . . . What Joyce did not understand is that nationalism would indeed remain the sole dynamic force in the world in the decades and centuries which lay ahead of him'. Having said that Joyce in *Ulysses* treats Zionism and Irish nationalism as dead, he continues, 'As a political prophet, Joyce is simply wrong, wrong, wrong. Since I myself grew up as a young man sharing Joyce's illusions and thought that internationalism would be the politics of the future, it's a shock to me to realize that it in fact is the politics of the past, and there is something essentially therefore nostalgic and reactionary in the art of James Joyce.' Fiedler in 'Political Perspectives on Joyce's Work', symposium chaired by Morris Beja, in Aubert and Jolas, *Joyce and Paris*, 112. Fiedler's misreading of Joyce is total.

conferred on his most politically prominent contemporary in University College, Thomas M. Kettle, whose Europeanism was, however, of a more aspirational order and was politically hemmed in by his commitment to the Irish Parliamentary Party and acquiescence in the established Irish social order and the role of the Catholic Church in particular.

It could, of course, be asserted that even if Joyce was an Irish nationalist in Ireland and early exile, he ceased to be such as he passed into extratextual political 'silence' during the First World War, and by the time of writing *Ulysses* was not an Irish nationalist. That argument is really a subset of the proposition that, in passing into 'silence' outside his work, Joyce became apolitical, which I believe is incorrect. The idea that Joyce could have chosen to excise nationalism from his Irish political sympathies—which would have been a highly problematic exercise—reflects a misreading of Joyce, connected to a reductive understanding of Irish nationalism.

Even if one were to continue to resist the idea of his Irish nationalism, Joyce took from his experience of the fierceness of political and historical controversy in the inchoate Irish polity a scarred wisdom that set him apart from contemporary modernist writers, who were scions of established states and empires. It framed all that he wrote. In the broadside 'The Holy Office', written some two months before he left Ireland, Joyce wrote of

> Those souls that hate the strength that mine has
> Steeled in the school of old Aquinas.[15]

He was steeled also by the fierceness, and the intermittent passion, of the Irish political.

15. *PSW* 99.

INDEX