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Introduction

--But do you know what a nation means? says John Wyse.
--Yes, says Bloom.
--What is it? says John Wyse.
--A nation? says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place. ... Or also living in different places. (Ulysses 12.1419-1428)

The definition of nation given by Leopold Bloom, the anti-hero of Ulysses, suggests that the place of nation and nationalism in James Joyce's novel is complex and often ambiguous. Even (and especially) the Irish citizens of his novel disagree over what defines Ireland as nation, and by extension, what Irish nationalism is or should be.

Perhaps as a result of the complex role of nationalism in Ulysses, many of the recent critical examinations of Joyce's work have focused on its elements of political engagement, specifically Irish nationalism. Vincent Cheng has examined these varying constructions of Irish self and national identity in Joyce, Race, and Empire, while Enda Duffy and Emer Nolan have both explored Irish nationalism in Ulysses from a postcolonial perspective.

In other recent work on Ulysses, critics such as Joseph Valente have brought the subject of gender – often with a focus on masculinity – to the discussion of Irish nationalism. Valente argues in his essay "Neither fish nor flesh'; or how 'Cyclops' stages the double-bind of Irish manhood" that the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century constructs of masculinity contemporary to Joyce and Ulysses are consistently associated with different brands of Irish nationalism. He argues that the imposition of British Victorian constructs of masculinity on Irish men and Irish nationalism works to undermine both. This happens by representing Irish nationalism and nationalists as either feminized or as victims of a simian, bestial hypermasculinity. Rather than explore how
specifically British constructs of masculinity are imposed on Irish nationalism to certain political ends, I will examine here how Irish men themselves understand the interweaving of Irish nationalism and masculinity throughout the novel. When examining how Irish men understand masculinity and nationalism among themselves, a different schema of Irish nationalism and masculinity emerges in *Ulysses*, one in which Irish nationalism is valorized (rather than undermined) by linking it with masculinity or “manliness.”

Many of the interactions among the male characters of *Ulysses* involve discourses, either explicit or implied, of Irish nationalism. These discourses suggest a link between Irish nationalism and contemporary conceptions and assumptions of masculinity. Specifically, I will argue here that Joyce takes advantage of these conceptions of masculinity to frame the discussion of nationalism that takes place among Irish men throughout *Ulysses*. The interactions among men in the novel can be read as being demonstrative of a continuum of masculinity with hypermasculine on one end and emasculated on the other.¹ I argue that the discourses on Irish nationalism that take place among Irish men throughout the novel are organized according to this continuum in order to valorize nationalism. In other words, nationalism and ultimately Irishness are given value based on the degree of masculinity associated with them. Significantly, the correspondences between Irish nationalism and masculinity on this continuum are subjective. As interactions among men create this continuum, the place of one man and his understanding of Irish nationalism on it is not fixed. Rather, that place can and does

---

¹ The idea of a masculine/nationalism “continuum” draws on Eve Sedgwick’s homosocial continuum, defined in *Between Men*. The concept of a homosocial continuum that defines how men act in the interest of men can be applied to a masculine/nationalist continuum. In this case of a masculine/nationalist continuum, Irish men as nationalists act in the interest of both one another and the nation as a whole.
change depending on the interaction that takes place. This suggests that these characters are implicitly aware of the correspondences between Irish nationalism and masculinity and conceive of themselves and others accordingly. What my argument will demonstrate is that Joyce writes not only with an awareness of the detrimental effects of British constructs of masculinity on Irishness, but also with a proposal for an alternative understanding of Irish national identity and masculinity. This alternative understanding reveals an additional, gendered aspect to Joyce’s critique of tenacious Irish nationalisms throughout the novel.

Many contemporary critics of Joyce use the term “Irish nationalism” to refer to a belief in Irish sovereignty and nationhood and thus a desire—or active agitation—for freedom from British colonial rule. I use the term similarly, but also to refer to different degrees of Irish nationalism; for example, Irish nationalism can refer to violent agitation for Home Rule and a jingoistic display of symbols of stereotypical “Irishness,” or a more sentimentalized attachment to an Irishness based on Celticism and folk revival. All of these types of Irish nationalism appear in Ulysses and have their own significances in relation to masculinity.

I refer to masculinity in the sense contemporary to Joyce and Ulysses, which is part of the polarized Victorian understanding of gender Valente refers to in his argument. In this sense, masculinity can be understood as the polar opposite of “feminine:” active, physical, with a rational capacity that in the ideal case prevails over inherent primal (even animalistic) traits. I will examine and refer to varying degrees of this understanding of masculinity, ranging from the hypermasculine to the emasculated, but not necessarily feminine.
I. Telemachus: Imperialism and fraternal Irishness

Telemachus, as the opening of *Ulysses*, is the episode in which the continuum of masculinity as a framework for a discussion of Irish nationalism begins to be defined and established. The episode consists entirely of the interactions among Stephen Dedalus, Buck Mulligan, and a British guest named Haines at the start of the day. The interaction among these three men – and to a lesser extent, their general representation throughout the episode – helps to establish early in the novel the correspondences between conceptions of masculinity and Irish nationalism that persist and are complicated later in the novel.

The importance of the interactions among the three men lies not only in their being an exclusively male group, but their particular national and nationalist positions and attachments. Stephen and Mulligan are Irish colonial subjects with different approaches to Irish nationalism. Haines, meanwhile, does not quite fit with the group on several levels. In terms of the male group and its dynamics, it becomes clear that he is staying temporarily with Stephen and Mulligan, and is a possibly unwelcome guest. On the level of national and nationalist attachments, he is a British citizen with, as I will discuss later, a fetishistic approach to Ireland as an object. Such a group allows for relatively basic correspondences between Irish nationalism and masculinity to be presented by way of the group’s interactions. These interactions involve primarily a close, and to some extent conspiratorial relationship between Stephen and Mulligan, with Haines figured as an “other.”
Haines' presence as a British other and his contributions to the interactions between the three men help to establish how the developing continuum of masculinity corresponds to discussions of Irish nationalism. Haines' place in the interactions and dynamics between himself, Stephen, and Mulligan are established early in the episode before he makes an appearance. Stephen and Mulligan's early discussions of Haines heavily emphasize his Englishness (and by extension, otherness):

God, isn’t he dreadful? [Mulligan] said frankly. A ponderous Saxon. He thinks you’re not a gentleman. God, these bloody English! Bursting with money and indigestion. Because he comes from Oxford. You know, Dedalus, you have the real Oxford manner. He can’t make you out.²

Mulligan’s rhetoric here – “bloody English,” “ponderous Saxon” – demonstrates disdain for Haines predicated entirely on his Englishness. By doing so, Mulligan identifies Haines not only as a simple outsider with regard to the relationship between himself and Stephen, but also as a specifically British outsider.

Hints of the conspiratorial aspect that the Stephen/Mulligan interaction assumes when Haines becomes a participant in that interaction begin to appear as well. This conspiratorial side of their relationship demonstrates what can be called the homosocial aspect of the masculinity/nationalism continuum, insofar as Irish men act conspiratorially to figure the non-Irish other as non-masculine. In response to Stephen’s remark about the “cracked lookingglass” as a symbol of Irish art, Mulligan suggests he “tell that to the oxy chap downstairs and touch him for a guinea. He’s stinking with money and thinks you’re not a gentleman. His old fellow made his tin by selling jalap to Zulus or some bloody swindle or other.”³ Haines’ Englishness is emphasized between the two not only as

---

² Joyce p. 4 (1.50-55)
³ Joyce p. 6 (1.154-157)
something to be regarded as “other,” but also as something to be exploited. Mulligan’s reference to “Zulus,” meanwhile, suggests that an awareness of British colonial power—and possibly an awareness of Haines as a representative of that power—consistently informs their approach to him. Cheng describes Mulligan at this moment as the “native informant who has discovered something else he can peddle to the ethnographer,” a label that accurately demonstrates the colonial power relationship Mulligan seeks to subvert.

Haines, for his part, asserts his British identity upon becoming an active participant in the interaction: “—Of course I’m a Britisher, Haines’ voice said, and I feel as one. I don’t want to see my country fall into the hands of German Jews either. That’s our national problem, I’m afraid, just now.” After Haines joins the conversation that has otherwise been restricted to Stephen and Mulligan, the relationship between the two takes on a more conspiratorial aspect and in so doing becomes more obviously fraternal. This conspiratorial relationship is one that seeks not only to underline Haines’ British and imperial identity, but one that seeks to undermine Haines’ own masculinity as a result of that identity.

The efforts of Stephen and Mulligan to figure Haines as the “other” among themselves continue with Mulligan’s order to “Chuck Loyola, Kinch, and come on down. The Sassenach wants his morning rashers.” Gifford notes that “Sassenach” is an Irish term for an English conqueror. Mulligan’s use of the word is significant on several levels: while the use of an Irish term suggests nationalist sentiment and reinforces Haines’ status as British, imperial, and other, the term suggesting a ruler refers to him in

---

4 Cheng p. 153
5 Joyce p. 18 (1.666-668)
6 Joyce p. 8 (1.231-232)
7 Gifford p. 18
a mocking, sarcastic way, which suggests images of Haines as spoiled and effete. In effect, Mulligan figures Haines as both British other and, despite his status as representative of colonial power that Mulligan (however mockingly) acknowledges, an emasculated figure. A conversation between Stephen and Mulligan earlier in the episode suggests that Haines possesses traits that are not entirely masculine by attributing a stereotypical, mock masculinity to him:

--He was raving all night about a black panther, Stephen said. Where is his guncase?
--A woful lunatic! Mulligan said. Were you in a funk?
--I was, Stephen said with energy and growing fear. Out here in the dark with a man I don't know raving and moaning to himself about shooting a black panther. You saved men from drowning. I'm not a hero, however. If he stays on here I am off.8

The image of Haines that is presented here is one that is stereotypical and linked once again with his British imperial identity — that is, the image of the imperial British male engaging in the traditionally masculine activity of hunting (one might even associate images of a safari with this) in an Oriental and presumably colonial setting, which the black panther suggests. That Haines, according to Stephen, appears to be dreaming of this activity (or this stereotypically masculine and British imperial identity) suggests that he is not in fact the hunter figure presented here. Rather, we see the masculinity Haines envisions openly mocked. The image of masculinity that Joyce satirically associates with Haines here is offset by more seemingly effete images later, when we find him “knotting easily a scarf about the loose collar of his tennis shirt”9 and stopping “to take out a smoother silver [cigarette] case in which twinkled a green stone.”10 Notably, the aspects

8 Joyce p. 4 (1.57-64)
9 Joyce p. 14 (478-479)
10 Joyce p. 17 (615-616)
of Haines that suggest a lack of masculinity are often linked with his imperial British identity.

Mulligan sets the tone for the rest of the interactions among the three men with the "Sassenach" comment; as the episode continues, Mulligan generally directs Stephen in the conspiratorial interaction with Haines. One example involves Stephen's supposed theory of Hamlet as one of several attempts to extort money from Haines; Mulligan begins this particular ruse against Haines: "Buck Mulligan kicked Stephen's foot under the table and said with warmth of tone: -- Wait till you hear him on Hamlet, Haines."\(^\text{11}\)

The exchange continues as Haines expresses curiosity about Stephen's theory, which curiosity quickly proves naïve:

\begin{verbatim}
--What is your idea on Hamlet? Haines asked of Stephen. ...  
--You pique my curiosity, Haines said amiably. Is it some paradox? 
--Pooh! Buck Mulligan said. We have grown out of Wilde and paradoxes. It's quite simple. He proves by algebra that Hamlet's grandson is Shakespeare's grandfather and that he himself is the ghost of his own father. 
--What? Haines said, beginning to point at Stephen. He himself?\(^\text{12}\)
\end{verbatim}

Mulligan largely directs the conspiratorial interaction with Haines in this instance, with Haines appearing naïve and gullible as a result. Stephen, meanwhile, is a reluctant participant, suggesting that the basic dynamic between the two is preserved even as Haines becomes an active participant in the interactions among themselves. Haines, meanwhile, is exploited for the entertainment (and for the monetary gain) of Mulligan and Stephen. A clear dynamic with regard to Irish nationalism, national identity, and masculinity begins to emerge among the three men by this point – masculinity among Irish men is acknowledged as a means of valorizing both Irishness and nationalist

\(^{11}\) Joyce p. 14 (1.485-487)  
\(^{12}\) Joyce p. 15 (1.545, 553-557)
sentiment. Conversely, masculinity, being a valorizing factor, is denied to a figure who not only lacks Irishness, but represents British imperial authority.

Mulligan’s role as the driving force behind the conspiratorial interaction with Haines is further highlighted when we encounter Stephen and Haines interacting without Mulligan’s presence. One exchange between the two indicates that Stephen, though a more reluctant participant in the more conspiratorial interaction that Mulligan directs, is not necessarily at odds with the basic principles behind that interaction:

--I am a servant of two masters, Stephen said, an English and an Italian.
--Italian? Haines said. . .
--And a third, Stephen said, there is who wants me for odd jobs.
--Italian? Haines said again. What do you mean?
--The imperial British state, Stephen said, his colour rising, and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church.13

The attempts to deceive and ridicule Haines are absent here; Stephen nonetheless communicates his awareness of his position as colonial subject to Haines in a manner that is scathing enough to suggest a basic dissatisfaction with and resentment for that position.

These examples of interaction among the three men throughout the episode establish a dynamic in which masculinity is allowed to accrue to both Irishness and demonstrations of nationalist feeling. This correspondence between masculinity and Irish nationalism does not occur on its own; rather, it is contingent on the interactions between Stephen and Mulligan and is underlined by the presence of the British other (Haines).

However, while Haines’ presence places emphasis on this dynamic, the links between Irish nationalism and masculinity for Mulligan and Stephen persist and are unchanged by Haines’ participation in the interactions that occur throughout the episode.

13 Joyce p. 17 (1.638–644)
Significantly, Haines’ British national identity and his own masculinity – essentially, his place on the masculine/nationalist continuum – are determined entirely by Stephen and Mulligan themselves as a result of what Haines contributes to the interaction. As a result, Haines is presented as someone not quite masculine, with his position as British other continually underlined by both Mulligan and Stephen. Haines’ position on the masculine/nationalist continuum appears, then, to be one in which an emasculated position is associated with a basic opposition to Irish nationalism (in Haines’ case, a tendency to fetishize the literary and folk culture that informs Stephen’s approach to nationalism). Haines simply contributes to these interactions; that Mulligan and Stephen establish his place on the masculine/nationalist continuum suggests a dynamic in which Irish men become the arbiters of masculinity as a means of organizing ideas of Irish nationalism. With the tendency of masculinity to accrue to the specifically Irish established, we can examine the more subtle relationships between masculinity and Irish nationalism as represented by Stephen and Mulligan.

Although Stephen and Mulligan demonstrate a close, conspiratorial relationship throughout the episode and particularly in the presence of Haines, it is important to note that they do not function in lockstep with one another. One major way in which this distinction is made is through their differing approaches to Irish nationalism. As Irish subjects and nationalists, Stephen and Mulligan represent as individuals and in their relationship a normative Irishness. Much of the evidence of this normative Irishness and their nationalist attitudes appear early in the episode.

Stephen’s nationalist feeling can be read as more “conventionally” nationalist than that of Mulligan, insofar as it involves an emotional (possibly sentimental)
attachment to Ireland as a subject. His approach, which involves promotion and valorization of art and Celtic folk revival, is suggested in several moments early in the episode; the first is when he refers to a cracked mirror “with bitterness” as “a symbol of Irish art. The cracked lookingglass of a servant”.14 His evaluation of the mirror as belonging to a servant (in this case, servant as colonial subject) suggests that he understands Irish art and Irish nationhood as inherently linked. Shortly after, as Mulligan and Stephen recall a past episode that took place in England,15 Stephen reflects briefly on the phrase “To ourselves”.16 Don Gifford explains the significance of this phrase as a variation on the motto Sinn Fein (“We Ourselves”), “first the motto of Irish patriotic groups formed in the 1890s for the revival of Irish language and culture”.17 As Gifford notes, the phrase appears as Stephen’s reflections on Irish literary revival. Each instance suggests a preoccupation on Stephen’s part with art, literature, and Celticism as fundamental components of Irish national identity.

Mulligan, meanwhile, takes what might also be described as a heritage approach to nationalism. However, where Stephen’s approach is based on a sentimental attachment to Ireland, Mulligan’s approach valorizes “heritage” values found outside of Ireland. Mulligan’s approach to nationalism is in the interest of Ireland as a subject – his aim is to improve Ireland, independence from British colonial rule being the goal of that improvement. As such, it takes on political overtones that Stephen’s approach appears to lack by comparison. Mulligan demonstrates most clearly his approach to Irish nationalism in this episode with his statement to Stephen: “God, Kinch, if you and I could

14 Joyce p. 6 (1.146-147)  
15 See Gifford p. 17  
16 Joyce p. 7 (1.176)  
17 Gifford p. 17
only work together we might do something for this island. Hellenise it.”“Hellenisation” refers to an impulse to “know” in a detached, aesthetic sense and, as the name suggests, is a heritage approach focused on Greece and stereotypically Greek values. That Mulligan cites Hellenization as a (if not “the”) means of working in the interest of Ireland suggests a break from the sentimentalized conception of Ireland that Stephen appears to espouse. He seems to believe that an attachment to a sentimental conception of Ireland is ineffective as opposed to engagement, if only in the aesthetic and intellectual senses, with the wider world as a means of Ireland’s “knowing” itself as a nation.

Mulligan and Stephen engage with each other with regard to their own styles of nationalism, which helps to underline their own nationalist positions as well as pointing out the subtle differences between their approaches. Mulligan tends to mock Stephen’s more literary and Celtic-centered style of nationalism, responding to Stephen with such statements as (after Stephen has handed him his handkerchief) “The bard’s noserag! A new art colour for our Irish poets: snotgreen. You can almost taste it, can’t you?” Such a characterization of Stephen as “bard” and the association of him with Irish poets in general suggests disdain for his brand of nationalism. His characterization of “snotgreen” as an Irish “art color” is in its own right an obvious attempt at mocking Celtic literary and art revival as a form of Irish nationalism. In so doing, Mulligan distances himself from Stephen’s Celtic heritage approach and rejects the idea that an approach to nationalism based on Celticism is in Ireland’s interest.

---

18 Joyce p. 6 (1.157-158)
19 See Gifford p. 16
20 Joyce p. 4 (1.73)
The correspondences between each character's approaches to Irish nationalism and basic conceptions of masculinity become most apparent by way of their interactions. With the basic approaches of each character to Irish nationalism established, it is possible to see the initial indications of a discussion of Irish nationalism organized according to a continuum of masculinity emerge through their interaction.

Mulligan, first in his general representation and later in his interaction with Stephen, appears as a highly masculine figure, yet certain cues remind us that his own nationalist position is not very far removed from Stephen's. Our initial images of Mulligan during the mock Mass with which the novel begins are ones that refer to positions of traditionally male authority, primarily a priest and a “prelate, patron of the arts.”21 Gifford notes that the “patron of the arts” refers to a fifteenth-century pope22; this suggests that Mulligan is figured, however satirically, in the realm of traditional Catholic religious authority. He is nonetheless associated with the arts, albeit in the quasi-paternal position of patron. That implication of a paternal sort of authority extends to his interaction with Stephen; his demand of “Come up, Kinch! Come up, you fearful jesuit!”23 as the novel opens is one of the earliest implications of that paternal authority. Gifford notes that “Kinch,” Mulligan’s nickname for Stephen, can refer to a child24; while Mulligan uses the other referenced meaning for the name as well (“Kinch, the knifeblade”25), the “child” connotation of the nickname carries its own implications. Mulligan, despite the images of paternal authority associated with him, only explicitly
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21 Joyce p. 3 (1.32)
22 See Gifford p. 15
23 Joyce p. 3 (1.8)
24 See Gifford p. 13
25 Joyce p. 4 (1.55)
uses the “knifeblade” connotation of the nickname, suggesting that the seemingly paternal relationship is in fact fraternal. Evidence of a more fraternal relationship between the two predicated on their nationalist tendencies becomes greater when Haines enters the interaction between the two.

Stephen’s contribution to the interaction, meanwhile, is of a more passive variety than that of Mulligan. We find Stephen acting mostly in response to Mulligan from the moment he is called up to the top of the tower during the mock Mass; this trend persists throughout the episode. Stephen’s responses to Mulligan are often not even vocalized. Just after the exchange involving the cracked mirror as symbol for Irish art, Stephen’s voice replaces the narrator’s briefly to note: “Parried again. He fears the lancet of my art as I fear that of his. The cold steel pen.”\(^{26}\) In a situation that might be described as confrontational to some extent, Stephen does not engage Mulligan directly; we see his response only in an internalized way. These contributions to the interaction between the two seem to reinforce the figurative position of Stephen as child, as he plays a role that involves more responsiveness than agency. However, it remains that Mulligan explicitly attaches the “knifeblade” connotation to Stephen, thus affording him a near-equal degree of masculinity.

Up to this point in the episode, we see interaction based on active-passive participation, one that may on the surface suggest a father-son sort of relationship. In this particular relationship, the approach to Irish nationalism based on Hellenization is associated with the active, seemingly paternal figure, while the literary-folk revivalist approach to Irish nationalism is associated with his counterpart. That the greater degree

\(^{26}\) Joyce p. 6 (1.153-154)
of conventional masculinity – expressed in the active interaction and associations of
traditional male authority – is associated with Mulligan suggests that he and his approach
to Irish nationalism belong on the more masculine (but not hypermasculine) end of the
masculinity/nationalist continuum, with Stephen and revivalist nationalism placed
towards the more effeminate end in relation to Mulligan. However, Stephen and Mulligan
each espouse approaches to Irish nationalism that are fundamentally heritage approaches
– where Stephen’s approach looks to a sentimental, Celtic conception of Ireland,
Mulligan’s approach looks outside of Ireland. The common ground that the two share in
their nationalist feeling and their own approaches allows for – as the text demonstrates –
a relationship in which the seemingly paternal becomes fraternal. Such a relationship
allows Stephen and Mulligan to acknowledge near-equal degrees of masculinity between
themselves on the basis of shared national identity and nationalist feeling.

The dynamic that emerges in Telemachus among Stephen, Mulligan, and Haines
– one in which masculinity accrues to Irishness as a valorizing influence – continues and
becomes even more explicit in the Cyclops episode.

II. Cyclops: Camaraderie, competition, and masculine nationalisms

The discussion of Irish nationalism as it is framed by the continuum of
masculinity continues in the Cyclops episode. At this point in the novel, we see the
continuum become broader than in Telemachus, with characters occupying more extreme
positions with regard to masculinity and Irish nationalism. The setting, a pub in the early
evening, is an ideal space in which the reader can observe interactions among men
unfold. The primary conflict of the episode with regard to masculinity and nationalism is
between Bloom, the novel’s meek, Jewish anti-hero, and an intensely nationalist pubgoer called only “the citizen.” However, the many pubgoers play a vital role in the episode in their own right, as they contribute to the conflict between Bloom and the citizen and demonstrate the homosocial aspects of the masculinity/nationalist continuum. The episode features two narrative voices that work in tandem with one another. The first is that of an anonymous pubgoer who observes and comments on the conflict between Bloom and the citizen. In effect, he mediates the conflict for the reader. The second is a parodic voice that emulates multiple literary styles throughout the episode; these styles often suggest the masculine or nationalist tendencies of a given character. These two voices work in tandem to provide additional insight to the episode’s discourse on masculinity and nationalism.

With the masculine/nationalist continuum established in Telemachus, the need for a British character to underline the discussion of Irish nationalism by way of contrast no longer exists. In Cyclops, the interaction that creates the masculine/nationalist continuum takes place entirely among Irish men. The trend in Telemachus for certain Irish men to act as arbiters of Irish nationalism and identity and the corresponding understanding of masculinity, however, persists. In this case, the general correspondences between understandings of masculinity and Irish nationalism persist with the additional aspect of highly masculinized figures assuming the role of arbiter of masculinity and nationalism among other Irish men. This attempt to assume the role of arbiter, as illustrated in the conflict between Bloom and the citizen, involves attempts on the part of the highly masculinized figure to deny both the Irishness and the masculinity of the men around him. Other Irish men (the pubgoers), meanwhile, rally around this arbiter against the
supposedly non-Irish/emasculated figure and further assert the conflation of Irishness with masculinity.

The general discussion of Irish nationalism as it relates to masculinity in this episode, however, is not mediated by the citizen despite his attempts to assume the role of arbiter of Irish nationalism and, by extension, masculinity. Rather, the narrator in the form of the anonymous pubgoer mediates the conflict between Bloom and the citizen. The parodic narrative voice, meanwhile, reinforces the pubgoer’s observations. The two narrative voices, particularly the parodic voice, establish where Bloom and the citizen might be placed with regard to their masculinity and their engagement with Irish nationalism early in the episode. The parodic voice introduces the primary characters in mock-epic fashion, beginning with the citizen:

The figure seated on a large boulder at the foot of a round tower was that of a broadshouldered deepchested stronglimbed frankeyed redhaired freelyfreckled shaggybearded widemouthed largenosed longheaded deepvoiced barekneed brawnyhanded hairylegged mddyfaced hero. From shoulder to shoulder he measured several ells and his rocklike mountainous knees were covered, as was likewise the rest of his body wherever visible, with a strong growth of tawny prickly hair in hue and toughness similar to the mountain gorse (*Ulex Europaeus*).  

This introduction presents an extended, overwrought portrait of the citizen that concentrates on his extreme, ostentatious masculinity expressed through physical traits, emphasizing such qualities as “broadshouldered”, “shaggybearded”, and his “toughness”. The narrative voice proceeds to illustrate his extreme nationalism in equally overwrought and superficial terms: “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

27 Joyce p. 243 (12.151-158)
tribal images of many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity.\textsuperscript{28} The parodic voice proceeds to an exhaustive list of these “heroes”; it is worth noting that the list is interspersed with examples of heroes and heroines who are not in fact Irish: “Benjamin Franklin,” “Julius Caesar,” “Napoleon Bonaparte” and “Muhammad\textsuperscript{29} are a few of the more recognizable examples. The parodic voice paints the citizen as both a hypermasculine and extremely nationalist and jingoistic figure in exhaustive but superficial terms. This suggests that the narrative voice is beginning to make certain judgments on the citizen and the place on the masculinity/nationalist scale he immediately appears to occupy.

The parodic voice introduces Bloom shortly after. While the mock-epic style of the citizen’s introduction persists here, Bloom is introduced much more succinctly: “Who comes through Michan’s land, bedight in sable armour? O’Bloom, the son of Rory: it is he. Impervious to fear is Rory’s son: he of the prudent soul.”\textsuperscript{30} The length and the overwrought nature of the citizen’s introduction are absent here, suggesting a degree of polarization between Bloom and the citizen. This polarization will occur in the context of the masculine/nationalist scale; as far as the parodic voice’s representation of Bloom goes, he lacks the citizen’s hypermasculine attributes and appears only nominally masculine in contrast with the citizen. The text also hints at further polarization between Bloom and the citizen by identifying Bloom as “he of the prudent soul”, which suggests cautiousness and even meekness in contrast with the citizen’s more bombastic traits. In terms of Irishness, the parodic voice’s use of “O’Bloom” can be read either as according

\textsuperscript{28} Joyce p. 244 (12.173-176) \\
\textsuperscript{29} Joyce p. 244 (12.187-189) \\
\textsuperscript{30} Joyce p. 245 (12.215-217)
Bloom a certain degree of Irishness or the beginning of his Irish identity's being called into question along with his approach to nationalism.

The parodic voice also serves to state the citizen and Bloom's approaches to Irish nationalism. The citizen's strong attachment to a concept of Ireland as a nation expresses itself in an approach to nationalism that promotes a strong definition of Irishness against the British other; the result is a brand of nationalism that promotes resistance (possibly violent) to British rule. Another aspect of that approach to nationalism is, in contrast to the Celtic folk and literary revival that Stephen espouses in Telemachus, a promotion of Gaelic sports revival. The parodic voice explains the immediate correspondences between this approach to Irish nationalism and a conventional understanding of masculinity:

"A most interesting discussion took place...on the revival of ancient Gaelic sports and the importance of physical culture, as understood in ancient Greece and ancient Rome and ancient Ireland, for the development of the race...as calculated to revive the best traditions of manly strength and prowess handed down to us from ancient ages."

The promotion of Gaelic sports as they were known in "ancient Ireland" suggests attachment to a conception of Ireland as a nation that relies on ideas of tradition and a vigorous masculinity in order to give it legitimacy. "Ancient Ireland" suggests attachment to an Irishness that predates the concept of nation, which works to lend a particular historical legitimacy to this brand of nationalism. This concept of ancient Irish tradition is linked to "manly strength and prowess", which serves to further valorize this particular brand of nationalism – much of the value of the Gaelic sports tradition is predicated on its associations with "ma...ness."

---

31 Joyce p. 260 (12.897-901, 910-912)
The parodic voice notes shortly after that Bloom “met with a mixed reception of applause and hisses, having espoused the negative”32; he is soon silenced by “a remarkably noteworthy rendering of...A Nation Once Again in the execution of which the veteran patriot champion may be said without fear of contradiction to have fairly excelled himself.”33 The parodic voice suggests a basic opposition on the part of Bloom to the citizen’s brand of nationalism despite the high degree of conventional masculinity (“manliness”) explicitly associated with it; that he is silenced for a song attributed to an Irish patriot34 suggests the value associated by the pubgoers of this episode to the citizen’s brand of Irish nationalism and, by extension, the implications of “manliness” that are attached to it.

The polarization between Bloom and the citizen in terms of their approaches to Irish nationalism and by extension their masculinity is further illustrated by the anonymous pubgoer’s narration. Where the parodic voice illustrates Bloom and the citizen with regard to their brands of nationalism and the corresponding degrees of nationalism separately, the narrator observes their conflict and mediates where the two fall on the masculin/nationalist scale. The narrator’s observation and unspoken mediation of the two on that scale calls additional attention to the attempts of the citizen, by virtue of his hypermasculine and highly nationalist position, to act as the arbiter of both masculinity and Irish nationalism; while the narrator calls attention to the polarization between the two and makes judgments on the nationalist and masculine

32 Joyce p. 260 (12.912-913)
33 Joyce p. 260 (12.915-919)
34 See Gifford p. 342
credentials of each, the citizen remains the polarizing figure in the conflict between himself and Bloom.

The anonymous pubgoer identifies the citizen as the polarizing figure in the conflict between himself and Bloom by making note of the citizen’s attempts to antagonize Bloom:

So of course the citizen was only waiting for the wink of the word and he starts gassing out of him about the invincibles and the old guard and the men of sixtyseven and who fears to speak of ninetyeight and Joe with him about all the fellows that were hanged, drawn and transported for the cause by drumhead courtmartial and a new Ireland and new this, that, and the other. Talking about new Ireland he ought to go and get a new dog so he ought.35

The citizen waits for the “wink of the word” – an opportunity to speak about nationalism – to begin antagonizing Bloom, signaling his eagerness to engage in conflict over questions of nationalism and Irishness. The citizen’s diatribe speaks further to his own brand of nationalism. In this case, he moves away from the Gaelic sports revivalist aspect of his nationalism and demonstrates his promotion of open, possibly militant resistance to British rule. While the pubgoer summarizes the citizen’s rant, he does make it clear that the citizen is delivering a full diatribe in praise of former agents of violent resistance against British rule. The narrator, however, refers to the citizen’s speech as “gassing” and makes a final, sardonic comment on the citizen’s desire for a “new Ireland”, suggesting that at least as far as he is concerned, the citizen is not to be taken seriously. The narrator gives us further evidence of the citizen as a polarizing and antagonizing figure as, while Bloom attempts to somewhat meekly debate with the citizen, the citizen interrupts: “Sinn Fein! says the citizen. Sinn Fein amhain! The friends we love are by our side and the foes

35 Joyce p. 250-251 (12.479-484)
we hate before us.”36 The citizen’s use of Irish here works in two ways; he further asserts his already ostentatious Irishness while, by obliquely suggesting that Bloom is among the “foes we hate,” denying Bloom’s own Irishness and nationalist credentials. In this particular respect, the citizen becomes not only an antagonist but attempts to position himself as, by virtue of his ostentatious Irishness and hypermasculinity, the arbiter of both masculinity and Irish nationalism for Bloom and presumably others. Meanwhile, the narrator’s apparent disdain for the citizen-undercuts his attempts to claim the authority to place other men on the masculinity/nationalist scale.

While the narrator demonstrates disdain for the narrator in terms of nationalism, he expresses similar disdain on the level of masculinity later in the episode:

--Afraid he’ll bite you? says the citizen, jeering.
--No, says I. But he might take my leg for a lamppost.
So he calls the old dog over.
--What’s on you, Garry? says he.
Then he starts hauling and mauling and talking to him in Irish and the old towser growling, letting on to answer, like a duet in the opera. Such growling you never heard as they let off between them. ... Growling and grousing and his eye all bloodshot from the drouth is in it and the hydrophobia dripping out of his jaws.37

Interestingly, the citizen makes insinuations of his own with regard to the narrator’s masculinity by suggesting he is afraid of the dog. The narrator responds by presenting the citizen as having a “conversation” with his dog by talking to him in Irish while the dog responds in growls. The citizen’s carrying on a conversation in Irish with his dog is significant. He is not only being given animalistic attributes by being placed on the level of a dog by the narrator, but these traits are largely contingent on his speaking in Irish.

By making note of these traits, the narrator comments on the implications of his extreme,

36 Joyce p. 251 (12.523-524)
37 Joyce p. 255-256 (12.701-711)
ostentatious masculinity and Irishness. Joseph Valente refers to this animalistic figuring of hypermasculinity (notably Irish hypermasculinity) as a kind of “simianization,” noting that “the citizen...comes to figure hypermasculinity as dehumanizing, an overflow of animal spirits.” The narrator’s disdain for the citizen further reinforces Valente’s observation; as far as the narrator is concerned, the citizen, despite (or more likely because of) his extreme separatist nationalism and hypermasculine aspects, is something less than human as well as an object of disdain. Despite the narrator’s observations, however, the other pubgoers invariably side with the citizen, suggesting that the Irish men surrounding him valorize the hypermasculine Irishness he represents.

The narrator, as a kind of mediator (for the reader) of the conflict between Bloom and the citizen, consistently undercuts the citizen’s nationalist credibility despite his place on the extremely masculine end of the scale. While the citizen expresses this place on the scale as, among other things, the authority to place other men on the scale, becoming an arbiter and judge of the nationalism and masculinity of other Irish men, the narrator’s responses to him suggest otherwise.

Bloom, meanwhile, is not necessarily exempt from the narrator’s judgment. As the polarizing influence of the citizen suggests, Bloom occupies the opposite end of the masculine/nationalist scale. Bloom consistently resists the citizen’s promotion of extreme Irish nationalism and violent separatism, attempting to communicate a universalist, peaceful vision that appears to have little to do with any attachment to a given concept of Ireland. This vision is most clearly communicated towards the end of the episode, as

---

38 Valente p. 107
Bloom briefly skirts the subject of anti-Semitism in order to establish common ground with the citizen:

--Are you talking about the new Jerusalem? says the citizen.
--I'm talking about injustice, says Bloom.
--Right, says John Wyse. Stand up to it then with force like men. 39

It is worth noting here that the citizen, along with John Wyse (an example of other men rallying around the citizen), implies an attempt to place Bloom on the low end of the masculine/nationalist scale by referring to the “new Jerusalem,” undermining Bloom’s Irishness by highlighting his Jewishness. In terms of masculinity, that John Wyse suggests Bloom “stand up to it with force like men” suggests that Bloom lacks the “manliness” required by the citizen’s nationalist position to stand against injustice. Significantly, the narrator reverses his disdain of the citizen long enough to reinforce his estimation of Bloom: “Gob, he’d adorn a sweepingbrush, so he would, if he only had a nurse’s apron on him. And then he collapses all of a sudden, twisting around all the opposite, limp as a wet rag.” 40 The narrator’s suggestion that Bloom would be better fit for domestic duties (“he’d adorn a sweepingbrush”) and the “limp wet rag” images he associates with him constitute an estimation of Bloom as emasculated. The significance lies in that Bloom is emasculated even as his Irishness comes under public scrutiny; the two are contingent on one another.

The conversation continues as Bloom explains his own position with regard to resistance against injustice, whether colonial or racial:

--But it’s no use, says he. Force, hatred, history, all that. That’s not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it’s the very opposite of that that is really life.

39 Joyce p. 273 (12.1473-1475)
40 Joyce p. 273 (12.1478-1480)
--What? says Alf.
--Love, says Bloom. I mean the opposite of hatred. I must go now, says he to John Wyse. Just round to the court a moment to see if Martin is there. If he comes just say I’ll be back in a second. Just a moment.\footnote{Joyce p. 273 (12.1481-1487)}

Bloom’s rejection of “force, hatred, history” and promotion of universal love is a vague, but decidedly internationalist and perhaps universalist approach to such issues as power and governance. His approach, being based on a universal vision and not on any attachment to Ireland as a nation or concept, appears to have little room for any particular brand of Irish nationalism, much less the citizen’s jingoistic approach.

As a result of Bloom’s nonviolent, universalist vision, the narrator expresses the same disdain for Bloom as he does for the citizen, though in this case we see emasculation of Bloom – in accordance with the links between masculinity and Irish nationalism that have appeared thus far – rather than the simianization of the citizen. Several moments indicate the narrator’s disdain; as Bloom speaks, his comments include “and Bloom trying to back him up moderation and botheration and their colonies and their civilization”\footnote{Joyce p. 266 (12.1195-1196)} and “Didn’t I tell you? As true as I’m drinking this porter if he was at his last gasp he’d try to downface you that dying was living.”\footnote{Joyce p. 270 (12.1362-1363)} The citizen is not to be taken seriously in the narrator’s estimation; however, where the citizen apparently fails in placing Bloom on the masculine/nationalist scale, the narrator succeeds with his general disdain and questions with regard to Bloom’s masculinity.

Significantly, the other pubgoers join the narrator in their estimation of Bloom – even though the narrator expresses disdain for the citizen in his own right, he and the other pubgoers are prepared to side with the citizen against Bloom. As the episode nears
its conclusion, they directly call Bloom’s masculinity into question after interrogating his Irishness, declaring that “he’s a perverted jew...from a place in Hungary.” As for Bloom’s masculinity, his apparently maternal aspects are raised as evidence of emasculation:

--O by God, says Ned, you should have seen Bloom before that son of his that died was born. I met him one day in the south city markets buying a tin of Neave’s food six weeks before the wife was delivered. ...
--Do you call that a man? says the citizen.

The narrator’s mediation of the conflict between Bloom and the citizen suggests that, although the citizen’s attempt to become an arbiter of both masculinity and Irishness is apparently invalid, the work of placing other men (in this case, Bloom) on the scale of masculinity and nationalism can be carried out among interacting men. The citizen, despite a position of extreme nationalism and hypermasculinity, is positioned in such a way as that he is not taken seriously. Despite this, his aim of both emasculating Bloom and demonstrating his lack of Irishness is accomplished by the narrator with the participation of the other pubgoers.

The interactions among men we see in both Telemachus and Cyclops demonstrate a broad scheme of Irish nationalism as it relates to masculinity. Throughout all of the major interactions in both episodes, masculinity consistently becomes associated with both recognizable Irishness and Irish nationalism as a means of legitimizing and valorizing these two traits. This association of a valorizing masculinity with Irish nationalism is in a sense an act of reclaiming dominant conceptions of masculinity, as we

44 Joyce p. 276 (12.1635)
45 Joyce p. 277 (12.1650-1654)
see when Stephen Dedalus and Buck Mulligan work to diminish the masculinity of Haines, the representative of British imperial authority. The paradigm of masculinity and Irish nationalism noted by Valente, in which conceptions of masculinity are used to undermine Irish nationalism, becomes subverted in the interactions among Irish men. As with Stephen, Mulligan, and Haines, these conceptions of masculinity are reclaimed by Irish men in order to promote and legitimize both Irishness and Irish nationalism rather than to undermine them. We see this reclamation of masculinity by Irish men in Cyclops as well, as the citizen and his fellow pubgoers work to emasculate Bloom and deny his Irishness. By creating an alternative understanding of masculinity and nationalism, these men are able to valorize and assert their own national identity by means of masculinity. This alternative understanding of masculinity demonstrates the degree to which gender operates in the general examination of nationalism throughout Ulysses.
Works Cited


