

IO

MEGAN QUIGLEY

Ireland

1922 – that great year of literary modernism with the publications of both *The Waste Land* and *Ulysses* – was also the year of the formation of the Irish Free State and the beginning of the Irish Civil War. This historical coincidence reveals the intertwined nature of Irish politics and anything we might call Irish modernism. From the political reasons behind Lady Augusta Gregory's and W. B. Yeats's founding of the Irish Literary Theater in 1899 – “We will show that Ireland is not the home of buffoonery”¹ – to the explosion of fervent unionist, nationalist, revisionist, and feminist responses in the Irish press to the 1996 *Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*, literary events spanning twentieth-century Ireland are deeply imbricated in the political strife of a divided nation. And yet for a long time the most canonical Irish modernists – Yeats, Joyce, and Beckett – were often plucked from the Irish context, denuded (as much as possible) from purely Irish concerns, and heralded as cosmopolitan modernists free from any kind of Irish national interest or bias. As Joyce himself lamented: “condemned to express themselves in a language not their own, [the Irish] have stamped on it the mark of their own genius and compete for glory with the civilized nations. This is then called English literature.”²

This chapter will lay out several thematic consistencies among twentieth-century Irish writers by connecting the self-evidently cosmopolitan Irish modernists – James Joyce, Elizabeth Bowen, and Samuel Beckett – to the Irish writers a generation before them, particularly Bram Stoker, Oscar Wilde, George Bernard Shaw, W. B. Yeats, and Lady Gregory. In doing so, it will also make a claim for the modernist tendencies of some of the other major figures of the Celtic Revival, including John Millington Synge and Elizabeth and Lily Yeats at the Cuala Press. Conventional accounts read Stoker, Wilde, and Shaw as barely meriting an Irish label, while the provincialism of the Irish Literary Revivalists, led by Yeats and Lady Gregory, forced the later cosmopolitan modernists to flee Ireland. In this modernist story, the Celtic Revival is expelled as the ugly stepsister, a late-Romantic creation by

Anglo-Irish Ascendancy figures whose fixation on a rural past compounded the Irish modernists' need to flee a fictionalized Emerald Isle. To be modern is to leave Ireland and Irish things behind: a modernity epitomized in the multilingual *Finnegans Wake* and the Francophile Samuel Beckett. Simultaneously, nothing is more modern than the Irish condition because in their state of alienation, emigration, and internationalism, Irish writers incarnate the globalism of modernity. Yeats, however, has always disturbed this literary story, troubling the clear-cut antipathy between the Revivalists and modernists by his firm placement in – indeed, arguably leadership of – both camps.

In more recent years, post-colonial approaches to Irish literature, following the lead set by Edward Said and Seamus Deane, have worked to debunk the high modernist cosmopolitan myth. The particularities of the colonial Irish experience gave many works by Irish writers a modernist flair long before the conventional early twentieth-century demarcation of literary modernism. If modernism is characterized by a sense of exile joined with experimental technique, complete with self-conscious linguistic experimentation and a fiery anger against the status quo in sexual, political, and religious matters, many Irish writers neatly fill that bill. More specifically, key modernist obsessions – the splintering of the exiled subject, a focus on primitivism and myths, and a fascination with the idea of translation – were running themes throughout the writing that we could call Irish modernism, whether it was written in Dublin, Belfast, London, Trieste, or Paris. “Irish modernism” simultaneously adds to our concept of international modernism, confirming that many modernists were thoroughly enmeshed in national politics, and that ideological investments often underscored the apparent apolitical nature of *difficult* modernist art.

Although post-colonial approaches help to underscore the connections between twentieth-century Irish literature and the modernist movement, an important debate in contemporary Irish literary studies focuses on whether Ireland merits “post-colonial” status. Was Belfast a colonized locality akin to New Delhi or Lagos, or was it, as Joyce claimed, the “second” capital of the British Empire? Edna Longley has suggested (perhaps with tongue in cheek) that adopting the term “post-Ukanian” in reference to the Irish Free State would help to keep the specificities of the Irish colonial experience distinct from those of India or Africa.³ Not all of Ireland, of course, is post-Ukanian; Northern Ireland rejoined Great Britain, forming the United Kingdom, two days after the declaration of the Free State in 1922. Indeed both the borders (what constitutes Ireland?) and the citizenship (who counts as “Irish?”) are violently contested. Ireland also has a long history of failed attempts of rebellion against British rule, from the “Flight of the Earls” in 1607, when

the Gaelic Aristocrats fled to Catholic Europe, to the United Irish Rebellion of 1798, to the failed Easter Uprising in 1916. Under English rule, the Anglo-Irish landowners, known as the Protestant Ascendancy, held political and economic power. Many of Ireland's most illustrious writers, from Swift to Yeats, stemmed from this seat of power, though the Ascendancy constituted a small minority of the population. Religious and economic suppression of the rural Irish Catholic majority; the devastation of the Great Famine (1845–48) and the resulting huge waves of emigration; a violent civil war (from 1922–23); and the aftermath of partition, including the religious violence in Northern Ireland known as “the Troubles,” make modern Irish history particularly divisive and violent. These historical dynamics make taking a post-colonial approach to Irish literature necessary. That said, they must always be carefully weighed against other historical factors, such as women's movements or Ireland's intimate relationship with Catholic Europe, which stretch beyond any simple Ireland / England, colonized / colonizer binary. Indeed, a simplistic post-colonial approach to Irish literature tends to reduce the complexities of Irish writing into too confining a mold. Contemporary approaches to Irish writing seek to balance post-colonial theory with a more nuanced emphasis on each Irish writer's aesthetics, influences, political commitments, and social identities.⁴

Irish history is also well suited to Marxist theories connecting literary modernism to the impact of capitalism. Joe Cleary's “Toward a Materialist-Formalist History of Twentieth-Century Irish Literature” builds on Fredric Jameson's and Perry Anderson's theories of “uneven” development to argue that Ireland's unique history made it fertile ground for breeding the canonical figures of Irish modernist literature. Modernism, according to Anderson, required in Western Europe three historical and cultural circumstances: a holdover of formal academicism and high culture from the fading aristocratic classes, new emerging technologies with the Industrial Revolution, and a sense of the imagined proximity of social revolutions. Cleary notes that in many ways Ireland's history accords perfectly with Anderson's categories. The Anglo-Irish aristocracy, in whose hands much of the production of cultural capital lay, correctly sensed the changing tides and the growing political power of the often Catholic lower classes. The aristocratic hierarchy in Ireland and its ensuing anxieties are depicted in the Irish Big House genre (portrayed in works stretching from Maria Edgeworth's *Castle Rackrent* [1800] to Bowen's *Bowen's Court* [1942]). The coexistence of old ways of life with new technologies and industries is revealed in the contrast between the largely rural and agricultural landmass of Ireland with Belfast's industrial strength. Finally, the decimation that the Great Famine caused to traditional modes of existence, leaving one million people dead and two

million lost to emigration, and consequently the creation of a “global Irish populace,” created exactly the sense of the “clash between old and new” that underscores much modernist aesthetics.⁵

Intriguingly, such Marxist approaches to Irish literature have often emphasized the resounding conservatism of anything called “Irish modernism.”⁶ Indeed, most of the canonized modernist Irish writers – Joyce and Flann O’Brien being the great exceptions – stemmed from Protestant middle- or upper-class society, and have been seen as speaking for a marginalized elite minority. For certain aspects of Yeatsian thought, for example *On the Boiler*, the conservatism is clearly true, and modernism and conservatism are not antithetical, as Marinetti, Eliot, or Pound demonstrate. However, Wilde’s dandy, Joyce’s Bloom, and Beckett’s *Watt* undermine conservative conventions and traditions, while the modernism of the Celtic Revival collapsed the clear-cut division between “tradition” and “novel” in Irish literary history. Moreover, much of the writing deemed Irish modernism, from both sides of the political divide, formally depicts what Astradur Eysteinnsson denotes a modernist “aesthetics of interruption,”⁷ registering the conflicts at the heart of this divided society.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that in some ways this chapter might be working at cross-purposes with others in this volume in stressing this “Irish” modernism rather than the cosmopolitan flair of these Irish writers. To a certain extent this works to correct a historical error: Yeats, Joyce, and Beckett are too easily treated as purely international figures, with nothing in common with figures like Douglas Hyde or even Lady Gregory. Moreover, Irish literary history undermines the Irish nationalist / cosmopolitan binary – history may be a nightmare from which Stephen Dedalus is trying to awake, but Irish history, in its complex colonial past, is inevitably cosmopolitan.

Stage Irishmen: Shaw, Wilde, and Stoker

“England is the land of intellectual fogs but you have done much to clear the air: we are both Celtic, and I like to think that we are friends.”

(Wilde to Shaw⁸)

“The blood is the life! The blood is the life!”

(Stoker, *Dracula*)

In “On the Study of Celtic Literature” (1867), Matthew Arnold outlines the qualities of the Celtic character, in many ways affirming the caricature of the “Stage Irishman,” a stereotype appearing on the stage in various guises since Shakespeare’s Captain Macmorris in *Henry V*. Arnold variously defines the Celtic nature as “sentimental,” “gay,” and “always ready

to react against the despotism of fact.”⁹ Though Arnold writes ostensibly to praise the Celtic temperament and to promote the creation of a Chair of Celtic Studies at Oxford University, his version of the Celt accords with the Irish buffoon all too well. Therefore Arnold vehemently warns against too much Celtic blood in the English character – “We shall perish by our Celtism!”¹⁰ The writings and careers of George Bernard Shaw, Oscar Wilde, and Bram Stoker, all Irish men of the stage who also called themselves Celts, directly challenge Arnold’s stereotype of the sentimental, feckless Celt. Arnold, the eminent Victorian man of letters, promotes a progressive vision of English civilization’s hegemony for the good of all, which the later writers attack through various modern subversions; Shaw inverts the English–Irish stereotypes in *John Bull’s Other Island* (1904); Wilde mocks even the moral standpoints that such an idea would foster in the dandyism of *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1895); while Stoker’s gothic *Dracula* (1897) underscores the fears of miscegenation at the heart of Arnold’s question of bloodlines.

Shaw, Wilde, and Stoker, all born of Protestant Anglo-Irish stock, also all left Ireland for London at a young age. In this they were hardly unique, following in the footsteps of figures such as Jonathan Swift and Edmund Burke, because as Shaw remarked:

Every Irishman who felt that his business in life was on the higher planes of the cultural professions felt that he must have a metropolitan domicile and an international culture: that is, he felt that his first business was to get out of Ireland... For London as London, or England as England, I cared nothing... But as the English language was my weapon, there was nothing for it but London.¹¹

Shaw’s comment recalls Henry Craik’s infamous question, “Was there ever an Irish man of genius who did not get himself turned into an Englishman as fast as he could?” – with an important difference.¹² Shaw’s addition of the idea of the English language as a “weapon” highlights an adversarial rather than a submissive attitude towards the English populace, reaffirmed by his comment that “England had conquered Ireland, so there was nothing for it but to come over and conquer England.”¹³ All three men’s chosen vehicle for “conquering” was the London stage. Shaw’s theatrical career, spanning over seventy years and including over five dozen plays (as well as novels and theater criticism), earned him the accolade of being the only Nobel Prize winner also to win an Academy Award (for the screenplay of *Pygmalion*). Wilde’s star burnt brightly before his fatal fall; within the three years 1892–95 he was so popular that *Lady Windermere’s Fan, A Woman*

of *No Importance*, *An Ideal Husband*, and *The Importance of Being Earnest* all had successful runs on the London stage. Stoker left Dublin to work for over thirty years as the actor Henry Irving's stage manager at the Lyceum Theater, and his most famous creation, *Dracula*, is in part an ambiguous embodiment of the seductive power of Irving's dynamic theatrical persona.

Shaw's career was arguably the most international of the three, as he was powerfully influenced by Henrik Ibsen (his first work was entitled *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* [1891]); he organized a theater that staged Ibsen, Hauptmann, Schnitzler, and Maeterlinck; and gained fame abroad before making his name in London. While in his lifetime he was seen as a radical, a socialist, and a consistent activist against theater censorship, contemporary critics highlight the conflicts in both his literary and political legacies. On the one hand, Shaw lambasted the idea of "the most obsolete claptrap of the stage Irishman," arguing elsewhere that "Ireland is in full reaction against both servility and the stage Irishman."¹⁴ *John Bull's Other Island*, first staged in London, turns the feckless Irish stereotype on its head. Instead, Larry Doyle, the Irishman, is a cynical realist while the Englishman Tom Broadbent is the Romantic idealist. On the other hand, rather than appearing threatening to English audiences, *John Bull's Other Island* entertained even the British politicians superbly; the Prime Minister Arthur Balfour attended the play four times while King Edward VII allegedly broke his chair when laughing heartily at the play. In the end, after all, Broadbent does win the day, suggesting that his romantic temperament may have just been a Machiavellian act. Critics have found Shaw's play to appear to undermine Irish stereotypes while subtly affirming them and placating British audiences.¹⁵ To a certain extent Shaw foresaw this reaction, insisting that he was really "[w]riting the play for an Irish audience" to warn and instruct them about Irish complacency, and he did not care if the English audiences "smacked their lips over it."¹⁶

Like Shaw, Wilde, it has often been argued, barely merits the label Irish writer, since his writing so seldom concerned itself with Irish characters or contexts. Yet in plays like *The Importance of Being Earnest*, Wilde's aestheticism, his concern with the question of heredity, and the quips of his characters assault British Victorian social niceties and morality. Indeed, very early on, Yeats tapped into Wilde's Irish viewpoint, describing Wilde's career as "an extravagant Celtic crusade against Anglo-Saxon stupidity."¹⁷ "Never speak disrespectfully of society," Lady Bracknell warns her nephew in *The Importance of Being Earnest*, "Only people who can't get into it do that." Yet, speak disrespectfully of British aristocratic society and of nearly

everything else Wilde certainly did. *Earnest* mocks marriage, religion, the foundation of the family and even the concept of “nature.” By the time Jack finally learns that his name is indeed Ernest and declares, “Well it is Ernest after all. I mean it naturally is Ernest,” the audience realizes that in Wilde’s farcical world there is nothing “natural” about a name or identity: it all appears as haphazard as Jack / Ernest’s origins in a handbag in a train station. Indeed, Wilde’s play particularly parodies the British characters’ obsession with family name and origin, satirizing a heredity fixation like that of Matthew Arnold.

Wilde’s aestheticism is also at the forefront in *Earnest*, a world where a baby can easily be exchanged for a three-volume novel and where appearance trumps content: “In matters of grave importance,” Wilde writes, “style, not sincerity is everything.” Wilde’s interest in promoting “art for art’s sake,” in *Earnest* as well as in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, shows the influence of John Ruskin and Walter Pater, Wilde’s teachers at Oxford. Dandyism, however, was always a cosmopolitan movement, embracing characters as diverse as Beau Brummell, Baudelaire, and Huysmans; and Wilde’s effort to escape British confines can also be seen through his decision to write *Salomé* in French (though it was nonetheless banned on the British stage). Wilde’s aestheticism furthers his attack on conventional morality and on the Victorian idea that art must teach an ethical lesson. In his Preface to *Dorian Gray* he warned: “*There is no such thing as a moral or an immoral book. Books are well written or badly written. That is all.*” Recent critics claim that for Wilde the dandy acts as a kind of terrorist and that through the Dandy Wilde worked, like Lord Henry Wotton in *Dorian Gray*, to undermine British morality and society’s stability.¹⁸ While the political efficacy of the dandy might be questionable, Wilde’s social critique, in connection to his Irish upbringing, further destabilizes any nationalist or cosmopolitan label affixed to his works.

Stoker’s *Dracula*, a gothic tale of vampire hunting set in Transylvania and England, might not appear to have anything to do with Ireland or with modernism on the surface. Usually considered a British Victorian novel, *Dracula* owes much to Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and to the vogue of gothic vampire and crime tales of the period. However, the rise of post-colonial studies has led to a flurry of interest in the “Irish Dracula.” For a long time critics assumed that Stoker was of Anglo-Irish descent, though through his mother he was actually Anglo-Celtic and baptized twice in the Catholic Church as well as in the Protestant faith.¹⁹ Is *Dracula*, perhaps showing Stoker’s Irish sympathies, a figure of the absentee Anglo-Irish landlord, sucking the blood of the Irish peasants to stay alive? Evidence from

the text to support this point includes Dracula's faded great house in Transylvania, anglophilically full of English books and maps, his obsession with blood and purity, and his need to bring Transylvanian soil in coffins to England, off of which he lives (just as the absentee landlord lives off of the Irish soil). In contrast, Dracula's ship, which crashes on the English shore, certainly resembles the coffin-ships of famine times, which brought starving Irish peasants by boat to England. In that case, showing Stoker's English sympathy, Dracula could represent the threat of nationalist or middle-class peasants bringing illness and bad Celtic blood to English shores. Dracula himself has simultaneously been compared to Henry Irving – the British actor sucking the lifeblood of the hardworking Irish Stoker – and to Parnell – the “master” of a new race.²⁰ *Dracula* is certainly an “overdetermined figure” demonstrating the “ideological controversies inherent in Irish studies.”²¹

In fact, it is just this resistance to precise meaning that lends *Dracula* a modernist flavor, in addition to the novel's embrace of new technologies, investment in new scientific and psychological theories, and textual status as a hodge-podge of different diaries, letters, and newspaper articles. Dracula's status as a collection of rearranged “true” documents, mirrors Wilkie Collins's detective novel *The Moonstone* (1868) – another novel focused on the sinister effects of the British Empire at home in England. However, the end of *The Moonstone* expels doubt, whereas *Dracula* concludes with the suggestion that Dracula might live on yet, in the tainted blood of the young British offspring of the Dracula hunters. Through this heir, Stoker suggests that the mixing of English and Irish blood is inevitable – what the results will be, however, is a horror the novel leaves for the readers' imaginations.

What links the works of Shaw, Wilde, and Stoker together and to the high modernists who followed is the sense of being an eternal *exile*. T. S. Eliot claimed that he was always a *metoikos*, or alien, and he suggests through characters like J. Alfred Prufrock or *The Waste Land*'s Tiresias that we are all inevitably estranged from modern life. Similarly, being Irish for Shaw made him feel a “foreigner in every other country.”²² Stoker's *Dracula* insists he is a “stranger in a strange land” because, even when he speaks the native language, his accent always gives him away. Wilde incarnates this sense of alienation through artificiality and the idea of the “mask,” an idea Yeats, too, will foster. Indeed, even in describing themselves as Celts rather than Irish, Shaw, Wilde, and Stoker highlight their sense of otherness. Laura O'Connor notes: “To declare that ‘I am a Celt’ is to allude to a personal identity encompassed by the pan-ethnic tag, to differentiate oneself as ‘not Anglo,’

and to embrace otherness in a characteristically ‘*je est un autre*’ modernist gesture.”²³ Calling oneself Celtic highlights the artificiality behind the very idea of natural “Irish” character, as Wilde emphasized: nature is not the “great mother who has borne us. She is our creation.”²⁴

Modernist revivals: W. B. Yeats, Lady Gregory, and the Celtic Revival

I write it out in a verse –
 MacDonagh and MacBride
 And Connolly and Pearse
 Now and in time to be,
 Wherever green is worn,
 Are changed, changed utterly:
 A terrible beauty is born.
 (Yeats, “Easter 1916”)

Thematically focused on his turbulent, changing times, Yeats is considered both a modernist in content but not in form, and a modernist in form but a romantic in content. Though he initially followed the same path to England as Wilde, Shaw, and Stoker, Yeats returned to Dublin to incite a cultural renaissance. One fact seems definite: it is impossible to claim Yeats as a great modernist poet without also accepting the modernism – and cosmopolitanism – of many of the members, techniques, and literary products of the Irish Literary Revival that he spearheaded.

It is an “odd coincidence” as John Wilson Foster notes in his revisionist work on the Revival, that the dates given for the Revival and for literary modernism are often the same: 1880–1925.²⁵ Prominent members of the Revival include Yeats, Lady Gregory, and Edward Martyn, founders of the Irish Literary Theater in 1899; the poet, painter, and philosopher AE (George Russell); the playwrights J. M. Synge, Douglas Hyde, and Sean O’Casey; and Jack B., Elizabeth, and Susan Yeats as painters and printers. Indeed the borders of the Revivalist group are hazy, as the Revival intertwined with many other simultaneous movements occurring in Ireland. As Cleary has noted, the Revival “is best seen not as a singular phenomenon but as a matrix of cultural responses to this wider post-Famine institution-building drive to create hegemonic national institutions and a national public”; movements that include the building campaigns of the Catholic Church, the Gaelic Athletic Association (1884), The National Literary Society (1892), the Gaelic League (1893), the cooperative movement (1894), and the Irish Literary Theater (1899).²⁶ What was continuous throughout these movements – and which seems remarkably anti-modernist – was the nostalgic cultural nationalism driving them.

In 1892 Charles Davan Guffy gave a rough outline of the goals of the Revival, highlighting the nationalist fervor of the movement and yet somehow sounding remarkably like a young Ezra Pound:

A group of young men, among the most generous and disinterested in our annals, were busy digging up the buried relics of our history, to enlighten the present by a knowledge of the past, setting up on their pedestals anew the overthrown statues of Irish worthies, assailing wrongs which under long impunity had become unquestioned and even venerable, and warming as with strong wine the heart of the people, by songs of valour and hope; and happily not standing isolated in their pious work, but encouraged and sustained by just such an army of students and sympathizers as I see here to-day.²⁷

The Revivalists, through works like Lady Gregory's collections of Irish Folklore, Douglas Hyde's staging of *The Twisting of the Rope* (*Casadh an tSugain*), the first modern production of an Irish language play, and Yeats's fervent resurrection of ancient Gaelic mythology, worked to bring the Celtic past to the Irish present. The modernist mantra to *Make it New* and the Revivalist's goal to *revive* a lost past seem patently at odds. Indeed, the Revival is usually characterized as an anti-modern movement, at best a demonstration of Celtic patriotism, at worst the product of a declining Anglo-Irish elite desperate to appropriate the Gaelic past.

And yet, without meaning to minimize either the nationalist aspirations or the political ramifications of the Literary Revival, it is important to remember that the movement shared many philosophical underpinnings with international modernism – particularly in its perception of history and the use of myth. Where the modernists turned to primitivism (African masks, poetry's origins as a “savage beating a drum in the jungle”), the Revivalists turned, using similar new anthropological ideas, to the “local primitive” in the Gaeltacht (Irish-speaking areas).²⁸ Where modernists turned to classical myth, Revivalists turned to Celtic mythology. The most famous articulation of the modernists' avowed Classicism (Hulme, Pound, Eliot, H. D.), their desire to skip over the recent past to tap into the strengths of a “stricter” era, was a gloss on the methods of an Irish author, Eliot's “*Ulysses, Order and Myth*” (1923).

The Revivalists, as Guffy noted, similarly “dug up relics,” collecting folklore and the myths of famed Gaelic heroes to recapture a lost glorious past in order to give meaning to the present. From his early *The Wandering of Oisín*, and “Cuchulain's Fight with the Sea” to his final collection's “Cuchulain Comforted,” Yeats consistently used Irish myth to underscore his own mystical symbolism, and his early reputation was based on his three collections of folklore. (In fact, Eliot pointed out that Joyce

had borrowed the “mythical method” from Yeats.) Standish O’Grady’s translations of the Cuchulain and Finn MacCool sagas, Lord Dunsany’s (Edward Plunkett’s) *The Gods of Pegana* and *King Argimenes and the Unknown Warrior*, and Lady Gregory’s *Cuchulain of Muirthemne*, similarly used Irish myths and traditions. Perhaps most memorably, Yeats and Lady Gregory embodied the simultaneity of past and present Ireland through the figure of *Cathleen Ni Houlihan* (1902). In that play, Cathleen symbolizes Ireland’s past and comes to make the young Michael abandon marriage plans to fight for Ireland. The play forces the past into the present, so that Michael goes to join the pantheon of Irish heroes, and Cathleen, though initially seeming old and frail, finally reveals herself to be a young girl walking like a queen. When Maud Gonne played this role to packed audiences and great acclaim in Dublin in 1902, her intoxicating patriotism made Shaw ask whether it was a play which “might lead a man to do something foolish.”²⁹ Similarly, Yeats later wondered about the way the play used the past to encourage nationalism and particularly its influence on the Easter 1916 uprising: “Did that play of mine send out / Certain men the English shot?”³⁰

The methods of the Revivalists, including its coterie qualities, manifestos, small presses, and little magazines solidify its modernity. In collecting folklore, collaborating, and “translating” existing Gaelic oral traditions or written texts into English modern versions, the status of the texts as a constructed document also shares much with the aesthetic of modernism, such as Pound’s “translations” from Cathay or the collaboration of Eliot and Pound on *The Waste Land*. Terence Brown succinctly notes about the Revival: “a literature so dependent on versions, redactions, editions, translation could scarcely have avoided making literature itself seem a matter of construction rather than creation, of objective, impersonal work, rather than an opportunity for personal expression.”³¹ Coole Park, Lady Gregory’s estate, where Yeats stayed for twenty summers and where other figures such as George Moore, Synge, Hyde, Shaw, and O’Casey frequently visited, and the powerful Abbey Theatre, established 1904, created a “coterie” aspect to the Revival, mirroring other modernist groups such as London’s Bloomsbury or Gertrude Stein’s Paris soirées. Lady Gregory’s urgent letter setting forth the necessity of the Irish Literary Theater resounds with manifesto-like language mirroring that of the futurist manifesto or the imagist manifesto. Arguing for “that freedom to experiment which is not found in theatres of England,” Lady Gregory urges her essential “new movement in art.” Small presses, like the Cuala Press, formerly the Dun Emer Press, where the Yeats sisters published beautiful editions of works by authors including W. B. Yeats, Bowen, Oliver St. John Gogarty, and Louis MacNiece, paralleled small presses like

the Woolfs' Hogarth Press. Finally, 1892–1922 has been called “the second golden age of Irish literary magazines”: small periodicals like *Irish Homestead*, *Beltaine*, and *Dana* flourished, publishing not only short stories by writers like George Moore and Joyce, but also modernist Irish artwork by painters like Jack B. Yeats.³²

Though Terry Eagleton has declared that there was no avant-garde equivalent in Irish modernism, the reactions by audiences to many Abbey Theatre productions were as outraged as the Parisians were to the Paris art salon of 1905. From Yeats's first play at the Irish Literary Theatre, *The Countess Kathleen*, where a Protestant noblewoman trades her soul to help her tenants who have traded their souls for food, the Abbey productions were sure to lead to complaints of being anti-Irish, anti-Catholic, or conversely of being too nationalistic and anti-English. Synge's *Playboy of the Western World* (1907) led to nightly riots at the Abbey due to its portrayal of the rural peasantry who support a father-murderer. Sean O'Casey's *The Plough and the Stars* (1925) similarly led to riots amongst nationalists, leading Yeats to need to defend O'Casey's genius. On the flip side, the staging of Shaw's *Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet* (1909), which was censored on the British stage because of alleged blasphemy, led to a show-down between Lady Gregory and the British authorities, who accused the Abbey of defying the King's authority. “GLORIOUS RECEPTION SPLENDID VICTORY WHERE IS THE CENSOR NOW,” gloated the telegram from Lady Gregory and Yeats to Shaw as his opening night was greeted with cheers inside the theater and from crowds in the street outside.³³

In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Joyce shows Stephen hearing the angered cries of his fellow students against *The Countess Kathleen*, “A libel on Ireland! Made in Germany! Blasphemy!” And, indeed, the parallels between the Irish Literary Revival and international modernism were often due to cross currents between Ireland and mainland Europe, England, and the United States. Lady Gregory's nationalism was encouraged by her youthful affair with Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, the British poet and anti-imperialist whose opinions about British affairs in Egypt caused her, slowly, to rethink her attitude toward Home Rule. Synge lived in Paris for much of his short life, reading Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Darwin, Marx, and Ibsen. John Quinn, the New York lawyer and patron of modernism, often assisted Lady Gregory and Yeats as well as Joyce, Eliot, and Pound. Paige Reynolds points out that George Moore, Maud Gonne, James and Margaret Cousins, and Mary and Padraic Colum, who are often considered isolated Revivalists, were actually involved with international modernist movements.³⁴ Yeats himself spent nearly as much of his life in cosmopolitan London as in Dublin or Thoor

Ballylee (his Norman Tower constructed in Galway), and he traced his own symbolism to the international flow of ideas: “That mood which Edgar Poe found in a wine-cup . . . passed into France and took possession of Baudelaire, and from Baudelaire passed to England and the Pre-Raphaelites, and then again returned to France, and still wanders the world . . .”³⁵ Yeats’s own late “modernization” is – contestedly – often ascribed to his relationship with Ezra Pound and the winters they spent at Stone cottage. As Yeats wrote to Lady Gregory, he “helps me to get back to the definite and the concrete away from modern abstractions. To talk over a poem w/ him is like getting you to put a sentence into dialect . . . all become clear and natural.”³⁶

Elizabeth Bowen’s *The Last September*, a novel set in County Cork in 1920 in the last days of British rule, depicts the violent conflict between nationalism and a cosmopolitanism fostered by British imperialism. The novel simultaneously resounds with Revivalist nostalgia and presents a modernist exploration of time and identity. *The Last September* acts as the *Bildungsroman* of the young Lois Farquar, whose attempts to find love and friendship prove fruitless in the face of the bloody struggle for Irish independence that surrounds her. As the Big House she lives in and its aristocratic traditions go up in flames, Lois sets out for a European tour with hopes of art school. Lois acts as another figure of the Irish “artist” in exile, though a female Irish artist, conflicted about her artistic, gendered, and national identities.

Ireland in translation: Joyce, Beckett, O’Brien

About 1900 anyone who foresaw International Modernism might have expected its language to be French; what would have been absent from his calculations was the birth in a Dublin suburb, 1882, of James Joyce.

(Hugh Kenner, *A Colder Eye*)

In “The Necessity for De-Anglicizing Ireland” (1892), Douglas Hyde, the first President of Ireland and founder of the Gaelic League, called upon Ireland “to keep alive our once great national tongue.”³⁷ Indeed, for any Irish writer after Hyde’s Gaelic Revival, the choice to write in Gaelic, English, both or neither, constituted a politicized decision even before pen touched paper. Yeats’s ambivalence crystallizes the bind of the English-speaking Irish writer: “Everything I love has come to me through English; my hatred tortures me with love, my love with hate.”³⁸ And, in one of the most cited passages on Joyce’s relationship to language, Stephen Dedalus in *A Portrait*

of the Artist as a Young Man thinks to himself when speaking to the English dean of studies:

The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words *home, Christ, ale, master*, on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be for me an acquired speech. I have not made or accepted its words. My voice holds them at bay. My soul frets in the shadow of his language.

For Joyce, this sense of an “acquired speech” – enforced by the English Crown and the Roman Catholic Church – leads to the stylistic and linguistic revolutions of *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. For Samuel Beckett and Flann O’Brien, writing in Joyce’s wake, questions about language and translation remain key to their withering satires on nationhood and subjectivity. Indeed, reading Beckett’s defense of *Works in Progress* in the light of Ireland’s bilingual history underscores the links among high modernism, politics, and translation studies: “Here form *is* content. Content *is* form. You complain that this stuff is not written in English. It is not written at all.”

Though the writers’ paths diverge in most other ways, Joyce, Beckett, and O’Brien shared a mocking attitude toward the Irish Literary Revival and nationalist rhetoric. Joyce opted for exile over the “paralysis” of his childhood Dublin, choosing instead to write, mostly in English – and in a multi-lingual, idiosyncratic language in *Finnegans Wake* – in Europe: in Trieste, Zurich, and Paris. Beckett, in contrast, after 1946 wrote mostly in Paris in French, self-translating famed works like *En attendant Godot* (*Waiting for Godot*) and *Fin de Partie* (*Endgame*) into English later. O’Brien decided to stay in Dublin where he (or Myles na gCopaleen, Brother Barnabas, John James Doe, Peter the Painter, Winnie Wedge, George Knowall, etc., which – like Flann O’Brien – were all pseudonyms for Brian O’Nolan) wrote his comic masterpiece, *At Swim-Two-Birds* (1939) in English, though many of his other works, including his column “Cruiskeen Lawn” [a full jug], were written in both Irish and English.

While critics have amply documented the animosity of Joyce, Beckett, and O’Brien toward the nationalist rhetorical strategies of the Revival, this antagonism has led to the myth of Irish modernist apolitical art, an error that occurs particularly often in the case of Joyce. Joyce’s own comments about politics, “Don’t talk to me of politics, all I am interested in is style”; his dismissive portrayal of Ireland as “an old sow who eats her farrow” and the Irish as having GPI (General Paralysis of the Insane); and his exile status, lend support to reading his works as providing a purely cosmopolitan world

view. Beckett, too, with his existentialist themes set in minimalist waste lands has earned a reputation of universality.

However, both post-structuralism and post-colonial studies have fostered an upsurge in politicized readings of all three figures.³⁹ Joyce's verbal and stylistic experimentation, from Stephen's loss of faith in the logos in *Portrait* through to the Tower of Babel that is *Finnegans Wake*, is fueled by his anti-imperialist ideology, particularly connected to language. In his critical writings this ideology is clear, although he also rebukes Ireland for its own participation in its subjugation. As early as 1899, as part of a university essay, Joyce laments the impact of an "overcoming power" which can lead to "the complete disuse of the original tongue, save in solitary, dear phrases, spontaneous in grief or sadness."⁴⁰ In "Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages" (1907), Joyce writes "I do not see what good it does to fulminate against English tyranny while the tyranny of Rome still holds the dwelling place of the soul," insisting, as does Stephen throughout *Portrait* and *Ulysses*, that the Catholic Church as well as the British Empire are guilty in Ireland's oppression.⁴¹ Joyce wraps up the essay by imagining a new dream Ireland: "a rival, bilingual, republican, self-centred and enterprising island next to England . . ." ⁴²

Joyce's imagined multilingual Ireland recurs in Bloom's dream of the "new Bloomusalem":

New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem, and gentile . . . General amnesty, weekly carnival with masked license, bonuses for all, Esperanto the universal language with universal brotherhood . . . Mixed races and mixed marriage.

Of course, a nationalist like the Citizen in "Cyclops" would prefer a more Irish Ireland than Bloom's utopia; and, if the Citizen embodies the figure of the nationalist (Joyce arguably modeled the character after Michael Cusack, the founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association), then in *Ulysses* nationalism leads to prejudice, exclusion, and bloodshed, encapsulated in the Citizen's anger and violence toward Bloom. In contrast, Bloom embodies the new cosmopolitan citizen, defining a nation as "the same people living in the same place [. . .] Or also living in different places." The endeavor in *Ulysses* to write Ireland's new epic – since the genre of the epic is connected to the program of creating a national history and myth – may very well be Joyce's own answer to the question of how to form a community, not based on blood or a national tongue, in a multi-cultural, inclusive Dublin. And *Finnegans Wake*, a linguistic epic of sorts, takes this conception of the Irish epic one step further, using as its dialect Bloom's "universal language." Indeed, if Joyce begins in *Portrait* to divorce the word from the word of

God, as Stephen realizes that language is not God-given but “acquired,” *Finnegans Wake* represents the fulfillment of this new deconstructed speech, which throws off the yokes of both the logos and imperial English.

Beckett, who began his career as a writer in the shadow of Joyce’s *Wake*, chose bilingualism and made a consistent theme of the need to speak even when the failure to communicate is inevitable. In “Dante . . . Bruno. Vico.. Joyce” (1929), Beckett defends Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*: “His writing is not *about* something; *it is that something itself.*” Beckett proclaimed this “de-sophisticated language” to be the ultimate union of form and content. Ironically, however, while Beckett’s “Dante” piece can be seen as the ultimate artistic credo of high modernist autotelic art, apparently making the task of the translator impossible, Beckett himself was soon engaged in translating the ALP section of the *Wake* into French.⁴³ Beckett’s early demonstration that autotelic art must inevitably fail, a breakdown of the modernist dream, contributes to his reputation as the first postmodernist.

Indeed, if Joyce in *Finnegans Wake* wished to create an omnivorous language that could overtake an imperial tongue, Beckett instead chose to pare language down to its barest bones, revealing the “impoverishment” of all communication. “Joyce had gone as far as one could in the direction of knowing more,” Beckett wrote, “I realized my own way was in impoverishment, in lack of knowledge and in taking away, in subtracting rather than adding.”⁴⁴ In works such as *Waiting for Godot* and *The Unnameable*, Beckett emphasizes his characters’ ignorance and their lack of power, and yet their need to communicate regardless: “I can’t go on, I’ll go on!” (*The Unnameable*). Critics have tied Beckett’s nihilism to many factors including his readings in philosophy (particularly Hegel, Husserl, and Heidegger) and his wartime experiences serving in the Resistance (he was awarded both the Croix de Guerre and the Médaille de la Reconnaissance Française). In addition, recent studies read Beckett in the Irish tradition, suggesting connections between the style of Irish oral storytelling and the narrative repetitions in his trilogy, *Molloy*, *Malone Dies*, and *The Unnameable* as well as understanding the negativity of *Watt* as potentially a savage satire on Ireland’s neutrality during the war. Indeed, most of Beckett’s settings are implicitly or explicitly Irish, suggesting that his nihilistic human comedy was tied to that landscape. Finally, critics have suggested that Beckett’s anger against Irish censorship contributed to his decision to move abroad and to write in French.⁴⁵

“Flann O’Brien” wrote in the new de Valera Ireland, and takes as one of his targets the new Irish citizenry (The “Plain People of Ireland”) who support censorship in their new free Irish state. His other major target is high modernism. Although O’Brien wrote that *At Swim-Two-Birds* has

“nothing in the world to do with James Joyce,” he was proud that the novel was allegedly the last book that Joyce read (and liked). It is clear why critics consistently trace a connection between O’Brien’s style and Joyce’s experimentalism: with multiple beginnings and endings, a narrative web deeply layered, characters borrowed from other novels, and extravagant punning, *At Swim-Two-Birds* delights in meta-fictional play. In his twenty-six years as a columnist for the *Irish Times*, writing under the name Myles na gCopaleen (or Myles of the little ponies), O’Nolan entertained his readership by forcing them to examine through parody the new bureaucratic society in which they lived.

Flann O’Brien found his place amongst a significant group of Irish-language modernists that arose as Irish writing flourished after the formation of the Gaelic League (1893) and *Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge* (*The Gaelic Journal*, 1882). The Great Blasket Island autobiographies that O’Brien satirizes in *An Béal Bocht* include *An tOileánach* (*The Islandman*) by Tomás Ó Criomhthain and *Fiche Bliain ag Fás* (*Twenty Years a-Growing*) by Muiris Ó Súilleabháin (Maurice O’Sullivan); but sentimental autobiographies were certainly not the only writing in Irish of the period. Patrick Pearse’s poetry and short stories revitalized Irish writing in these years with Pádraic Ó Conaire and Liam Ó Flaithearta further developing his lead. Máirtín Ó Cadhain (1905–70) provides the preeminent example of Irish language modernist fiction with his novel *Churchyard Clay* (1949) (*Cré na Cille*). *Churchyard Clay* is as much “about” the multiplicity of Irish dialects in which it is written as it is about life in an Irish small town recalled by the inhabitants of its local churchyard. Seán Ó Ríordáin, whose experimental poetics in collections such as *Eireaball Spideoige* [A Robin’s Tail] (1952) led him to be called the chief modernist in Irish poetry, noted the importance of “wordplay” to Irish writing:

I’m reading Joyce’s *Ulysses*. Corkery once said that eighteenth-century [Irish] poets wrung a music out of the [Irish] language that had never been wrung out of it before. They played tricks with the music and the language and a shower of music fell down on them. As for us [modern poets in Irish], we ought to play with the meaning of words and a shower of meaning will fall on us. So let’s play with the meaning of words. Wordplay.⁴⁶

Such self-conscious “wordplay,” perhaps stemming from the nation’s bilingual condition, is manifestly characteristic of Irish modernism, whether written in Irish or English.

The critical focus on the “universal” aspects of Irish modernists such as Joyce, Beckett, and O’Brien, has made the gap between Irish modernism and Irish nationalism (embodied in the Revival) seem at times unbridgeable. If,

as this chapter has traced, the “modernism” in much modern Irish writing stems from the social fragmentation incurred by a colonial history, the link between modernism and nationalism needs to be re-established. Nonetheless it remains true that texts like *Finnegans Wake* and *Waiting for Godot*, as well as predecessors like *The Importance of Being Earnest* and *Dracula*, might ultimately prove impotent as tools for political rebuilding, eviscerating national difference and lacking an Irish audience.⁴⁷ Yeats remains once again the great exception: politically suspect as a conservative loathing the majority of the Irish populace, yet capable of writing emphatically Irish lyrics like “Easter 1916,” which became synonymous with a rebellion, or “The Lake Isle of Innisfree,” whose lyrics greet you as you land at Dublin airport. The trend to realism in Irish fiction after the 1930s exhibits a turning away from the cosmopolitan experimentalism of the Irish modernists and towards more Yeatsian, self-consciously Irish, themes and settings. The popularity of “Irish” themes in contemporary culture – embodied in the poetry of the Nobel Laureate Seamus Heaney or in the fortune amassed by the band U2 – demonstrates the continued universal appeal of Irish experience in the twenty-first century. Joyce’s own advice to the Irish writer Arthur Power at once supports those who criticize the modernist drive to universality and highlights the importance of the Irish tradition to Joyce’s craft:

You are Irishmen and you must write in your own tradition. Borrowed styles are no good. You must write what is in your blood and not what is in your brain . . . For myself, I always write about Dublin because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities of the world. In the particular is contained the universal.⁴⁸

NOTES

1. Lady Gregory, *Our Irish Theatre* (Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 20.
2. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 217.
3. Longley adopts the term from Tom Nairn; Longley, “Multi-Culturalism and Northern Ireland: Making Differences Fruitful,” *Multiculturalism: The View from the Two Irelands* (Cork University Press, 2001), p. 4.
4. See for example, Emer Nolan, “Postcolonial Literary Studies, Nationalism and Feminist Critique in Contemporary Ireland,” *Éire-Ireland* 42 (2007): 336–61; John McCourt, “Joyce’s Well of the Saints,” *Joyce Studies Annual* (2007): 109–33; Glenn Hooper and Colin Graham, eds., *Irish and Postcolonial Writing* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Clare Carroll and Patricia King, eds., *Ireland and Postcolonial Theory* (Cork University Press, 2003).
5. Joe Cleary, “Toward a Materialist–Formalist History of Twentieth-Century Irish Literature,” *Boundary 2* 31 (2004): 207–41. See also Perry Anderson, “Modernity and Revolution,” *New Left Review* 144 (1984): 96–113; Jameson,

- “Modernism and Imperialism,” *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*, pp. 43–95.
6. See Terry Eagleton, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger* (London: Verso, 1995), p. 299.
 7. Astradur Eysteinnsson, *The Concept of Modernism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990).
 8. Wilde to Shaw (February 23, 1893), *The Letters of Oscar Wilde*, ed. Rupert Hart-Davis (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962), p. 332.
 9. Arnold, “On the Study of Celtic Literature,” *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, vol. III, ed. R. H. Stuper (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1980), pp. 343–44.
 10. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
 11. Shaw, *The Matter with Ireland*, ed. Dan. H. Laurence and David H. Greene (New York: Hill and Wang, 1962), p. 10.
 12. Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1995), p. 33.
 13. Shaw, quoted in Lillah McCarthy, *Myself and My Friends* (London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1933), p. 14.
 14. Shaw, *The Matter with Ireland*, pp. 100, 99.
 15. Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, p. 61.
 16. Shaw, Preface to *John Bull’s Other Island, Complete Plays with Prefaces*, vol. II, pp. 443–44.
 17. Karl Beckson, ed., *Oscar Wilde: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 111.
 18. Jerusha McCormack, “The Wilde Irishman: Oscar as Aesthete and Anarchist,” *Wilde the Irishman*, ed. McCormack (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 85. See also Stephen Calloway, “Wilde and the Dandyism of the Senses,” *The Cambridge Companion to Oscar Wilde*, ed. Peter Raby (Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 45.
 19. Joseph Valente, *Dracula’s Crypt* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), pp. 15–16.
 20. See Christopher Frayling, “Preface,” *Dracula*, pp. ix–x and Michael Valdez Moses, “Dracula, Parnell, and the Troubled Dreams of Nationhood,” *Journal X: A Journal in Culture and Criticism* 2 (1997): 67–111. For a largely nationalist approach to *Dracula*, see Terry Eagleton, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger* and Seamus Deane, *Strange Country* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). Bruce Stewart takes the opposite angle in “Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*: Possessed by the Spirit of the Nation?” *Irish University Review* 29 (1999): 238–55. Finally, for fantastic reproductions of 1880s newspaper cartoons, showing both the Irish peasant and the British Empire as bats feeding off the other, see Luke Gibbons, *Gaelic Gothic: Race, Colonialization and Irish Culture* (Galway: Arlen House, 2004), pp. 82–3.
 21. Moses, “Dracula, Parnell, and the Troubled Dreams of Nationhood,” 69, and Raphael Ingelbien, “Gothic Genealogies: *Dracula*, *Bowen’s Court*, and Anglo-Irish Psychology,” *ELH* 70 (2003): 1089.
 22. Shaw, *The Matter with Ireland*, p. ix.
 23. O’Connor, *Haunted English* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), p. xiii.
 24. Wilde, *De Profundis* (London: Penguin Books, 1973), p. 79.

25. John Wilson Foster, *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 1991), p. 44.
26. Cleary, "Toward a Materialist–Formalist History of Twentieth-Century Irish Literature," p. 220.
27. Gregory Castle, *Modernism and the Celtic Revival* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 239.
28. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London: Faber, 1933), p. 155.
29. Lady Gregory, *Seventy Years* (Gerrards Cross: Smythe, 1972), p. 444.
30. Yeats, *The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats*, ed. Peter Allt and Russell K. Alspach (New York: Macmillan, 1957), p. 632.
31. Terence Brown, "Ireland, Modernism, and the 1930s," in *Modernism and Ireland: The Poetry of the 1930s*, ed. Patricia Coughlan and Alex Davis (Cork University Press, 1995), p. 34.
32. See Gifford Lewis, *The Yeats Sisters and the Cuala Press* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1994); Frank Shovlin, *The Irish Literary Periodical: 1923–1958* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003).
33. See, for discussion, Lucy McDiarmid, "Augusta Gregory, Bernard Shaw, and the Shewing-Up of Dublin Castle," *PMLA* 109 (1994): 26–44.
34. Paige Reynolds, *Modernism, Drama, and the Audience for Irish Spectacle* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 7.
35. Yeats, *The Secret Rose* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981), pp. 143–44.
36. James Longenbach, *Stone Cottage: Pound, Yeats and Modernism* (Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 19.
37. Hyde, in *1,000 Years of Irish Prose*, ed. Vivian Mercier and David H. Greene (New York: Devin-Adair, 1952), p. 87.
38. Yeats, *Essays and Introductions* (New York: Collier Books, 1968), p. 519.
39. See Vincent Cheng, *Joyce, Race and Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 1995); John McCourt, ed., *James Joyce in Context* (Cambridge University Press, 2009); Pascale Casanova, *Samuel Beckett: Anatomy of a Literary Revolution*, trans. Gregory Elliott (London: Verso, 2006); Kim McMullen, "Flann O'Brien's Postmodern Dialogue with Irish Tradition," *Novel* 27 (1993): 62–84 and Gregory Dobbins, "Constitutional Laziness and the Novel: Idleness, Irish Modernism, and Flann O'Brien's *At Swim Two Birds*," *Novel* 42 (2009): 86–108.
40. Joyce, *Occasional, Critical, and Political Writings*, ed. Kevin Barry (Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 15.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
43. For discussion see Megan Quigley, "Justice for the 'Illstarred Punster': Samuel Beckett's & Alfred Peron's Revisions of 'Anna Lyvia Pluratsel'," *James Joyce Quarterly* 41 (2004): 469–87.
44. James Knowlson, *Damned to Fame* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 319.
45. See Brown, "Ireland, Modernism, and the 1930s," p. 36; Ann Beer, "Beckett's Bilingualism," *The Cambridge Companion to Samuel Beckett*, ed. John Piling (Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 216; and Brown, "Beckett and Irish

- Society,” *Samuel Beckett: 100 Years*, ed. Christopher Murray (Dublin: New Island, 2006), p. 19.
46. Quoted in Frank Sewell, “James Joyce’s Influence on Writers in Irish,” *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, vol. II, ed. Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004), p. 478.
47. See Seamus Deane, “Heroic Styles: The Tradition of an Idea,” *Ireland’s Field Day: Field Day Theatre Company* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), pp. 45–58, and Emer Nolan, *James Joyce and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1994).
48. Arthur Power, *From the Old Waterford House* (London: Mellifont Press, n.d.), pp. 63–64.

FURTHER READING

- Banville, John. *The Sea*. New York: Vintage, 2006.
- Beckett, Samuel. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*. Vol. I. Ed. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Lois More Overbeck, in association with Dan Gunn and George Craig. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Ó Cadhain, Máirtín. *The Road to Brightcity*. Trans. Eoghan Ó Tuairisc. Dublin: Poolbeg Press, 1981.
- Cronin, Michael. *Translating Ireland*. Cork University Press, 1996.
- Deane, Seamus. *Celtic Revivals: Essays in Modern Irish Literature*. London: Faber, 1985.
- Deane, Seamus, and Angela Borke, eds. *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*. 5 vols. Derry: Field Day, 1991–2002.
- Foster, R. F. W. B. *Yeats: A Life*. 2 vols. Oxford University Press, 1998, 2003.
- Kiberd, Declan. *Irish Classics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Lloyd, David. *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Postcolonial Moment*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993.
- New Voices in Irish Literary Criticism*. Vols. I–V. Dublin: Four Courts Press. Vol. I, ed. P. J. Mathews (2000); vol. II, ed. Alan A. Gillis and Aaron Kelly (2001); vol. III, ed. Karen Vandeveld (2002); vol. IV, ed. Fionnuala Dillane and Ronan Kelly (2003); vol. V, ed. Ruth Connolly and Ann Coughlan (2005).
- Toibin, Colm. *Lady Gregory’s Toothbrush*. New York: Picador. 2003.