

THE PITIABLE FATUOUS FELLOWS OF DEAR DIRTY DUBLIN, OR:
CONFLICTED MASCULINITY IN JAMES JOYCE'S *DUBLINERS*

William C. Beckham

A Thesis Submitted to the
University of North Carolina Wilmington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Department of English

University of North Carolina Wilmington

2008

Approved by

Advisory Committee

Tiffany Gilbert

Barbara Waxman

Janet Ellerby
Chair

Accepted By

Dean, Graduate School

This thesis has been prepared in a style and format

consistent with the journal:

Publications of the Modern Language Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
MASCULINITY AND THE TEXT.....	1
CHILDHOOD.....	11
ADOLESCENCE.....	23
MATURITY.....	40
PUBLIC LIFE.....	63
“THE DEAD” AS CONCLUSION.....	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	86

ABSTRACT

With the wealth of scholarship regarding the stories of *Dubliners*, it is quite surprising that no critics have seen fit to determine what constitutes Joyce's often conflicted concept of masculinity. The common approach to the work holds that each story is an autonomous unit and that the work as a whole lacks a grand sense of cohesion; this approach denies a sense of unity amongst the works and serves to undermine the developmental nature of *Dubliners* itself. As the text progresses from childhood through maturity, certain characters present different masculine identities founded by not only their age and position within Dublin society, but by concepts previously introduced in the preceding narratives; the general conceit granted then becomes something of an evolutionary view of masculinity. The characters' masculine identities are then inextricably intertwined, though still certainly distinct. Joyce depicts his characters' masculine self-image as forever under siege by a litany of forces: from the self to others, from Irish society to continental influence. Close readings of each of the stories, building upon each other and culminating in "The Dead," then grants insight into the problematic nature of masculine identification. By reaffirming the work's unity, blending gender studies with post-colonial theory, and applying various other theoretical approaches to the work, a clearer image of Joyce's depiction of masculinity as a construct forever in conflict presents itself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thanks go first to my thesis committee Dr. Janet Ellerby, Dr. Tiffany Gilbert, and Dr. Barbara Waxman for their time, guidance, and numerous suggestions on how to improve the paper at hand and my own understanding of the topic as well. Their assistance with the thesis, and with my own thoughts on the matter, was a benefit which cannot be discounted.

Special thanks go to Dr. Ellerby for her enthusiasm and support for the paper topic from its conception through to its inevitable conclusion, as well as her very deft hand at steering me back on track and refining my own thoughts on the text.

I am also extremely grateful for the support of my family throughout my education. While they may have thought it seemed an endless endeavor and were perhaps frightened by it from time to time, without their support I could never have come this far.

MASCULINITY AND THE TEXT

In the thirty years since Marilyn French first noted that “*Dubliners* remains one of the stepchildren in Joyce studies, receiving less attention than its important siblings, and a fragmented attention more often than not,” her statement has remained valid (“Missing Pieces...” 443). While critical assessments of the various stories are exceedingly common, they still number considerably less than those which focus on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegan’s Wake*. *Dubliners* is frequently taken down, carved up into its fifteen seemingly disparate parts, parsed still further, and promptly returned to the shelf from which it came; rarely is it represented as or analyzed as a collected, interconnected whole. Through this treatment of the stories as individual, self-contained episodes of life amid turn of the century Dublin, various common themes and repeated concepts are unnecessarily glossed over or lost altogether. One such theme lost among the incongruent treatment of the fifteen stories of *Dubliners* is that of Joyce’s recurring and evolving concept of conflicted masculinity. Masculinity is a multifaceted construct, shaped not only through self-awareness, but through society and social interactions as well, extending from conflicts to extra-personal influence as seemingly far removed as the colonization of Ireland by the British. By reuniting the predominately male driven stories (referring both to the majority of protagonists, as well as to the tendency for males, or more accurately “the masculine,” to impel each narrative’s action or conclusion) into a unified, almost linear narrative, one is treated to Joyce’s unique perspective on the development of, and affronts to, Irish masculine identity from youth to maturity.

In order to validate the assertion that the stories interconnect to depict a linear development of a constructed masculine consciousness, it becomes necessary to first justify interpreting *Dubliners* as a unified whole instead of catering to a piecemeal dissection of the

work. The general critical consensus appears to agree with Warren Beck who holds that “for all their containment by the city itself and by Joyce’s view of a confining Irish ‘paralysis,’ the stories remarkably differ from each other as to theme, scene, and characters” (13). Thus, for Beck, to view them separately is to view them accurately. Barring their common setting and an underlying thread of paralysis, they are categorically dissonant; they lack a grand totemic unifier. Homer Brown partially agrees with the afore noted assertion, holding that “it is, after all, a collection of short stories, fragmentary lives without apparent connection with each other... [t]he immediate impression is one of discontinuity” (14-15). For Brown, the only sense of unity to be found in *Dubliners* is that of the work’s general tone and “sense of overall apathy and frustration,” which are themselves directly correlated to the book’s discontinuity and reliance on detached, passive narration (and are part and parcel to the aforementioned sense of paralysis) (53). Essentially the separatist school of criticism bases its argument on the inconsistency between the stories, most notably amongst the characters themselves, while still clinging to the (non-unifying) recurrent theme of paralysis which flows throughout each episode. While these may appear to be fair assessments of the work, as one cannot deny the disparities between the stories, Beck and Brown fail to take into account many things which point towards a more unified reading, most notably the recurrent themes which extend beyond simply the repetitive emphasis on paralysis and its, partners apathy and frustration.

Conversely, critics such as Brewster Ghiselin and Hugh Kenner see the stories of *Dubliners* as more akin to a “multi-faceted novel” than a sequence of unrelated short stories tied only tenuously together by a common theme; both point to Joyce’s own well defined vision for the work as justification for their assertions (Kenner 38). The author’s stated intent was “to write a chapter of the moral history” of Ireland, through a carefully constructed progression from

childhood to maturity, interior to exterior (Ghiselin 57). In its original form, the work only contained twelve stories (“Two Gallants,” “A Little Cloud,” and “The Dead” were omitted); the requisite order of and justification for said order Joyce explained in a letter to his brother Stanislaus: “‘The Sisters,’ ‘An Encounter,’ and another story [‘Araby’] which are stories of my childhood: ‘The Boarding House,’ ‘After the Race,’ and ‘Eveline,’ which are stories of adolescence: ‘The Clay,’ ‘Counterparts,’ and ‘A Painful Case’ which are stories of mature life; ‘Ivy Day in the Committee Room,’ ‘A Mother,’ and the last story of the book [‘Grace’] which are stories of public life in Dublin” (Ellman 208). Authorial intent however is not the sole basis for many critics’ decision to view the work as a whole. For Donald Torchiana, the “laying on of national, mythic, religious, and legendary details” adds greater credence to the claim of unity among the stories, in that they become covertly self-referential, and thus interrelated, on a secondary level (4). Ghiselin by the same token sees the reliance on symbolism and pattern, as well as a mirroring of scenes amongst the stories, as being indicative of an inherent unity in *Dubliners*. For these and other critics, the work becomes the sum of its parts. As this argument does largely hinge on Joyce’s own statements specifically about the original twelve stories and his earlier intent, it runs the risk of faltering following the inclusion of the three omitted stories. However the later addition of “Two Gallants,” “A Little Cloud,” and “The Dead” is easily assimilated into the structure by not only their placement in the text, but also by the apparent level of maturity exhibited by and the social interactions of their main characters; in the case of “The Dead,” even the physical spaces which Gabriel Conroy occupies serve to situate the story as an epilogue or conclusion for the work.

When one allows that the work embodies an integral unity, certain other facets aside from superficial commonalities emerge. Thematically, as previously noted, the reader is presented

with a depiction of the moral development of a people; from youth to adolescence, to maturity, and into public life. Each of these phases is then depicted in Joyce's original vision for the work by a specific set of three stories; in the form it was eventually published in, the groupings' numbers become three, four, four, three, one. Each story, when seen as a part of its stage-specific cluster is then necessarily and inextricably tied to its brethren via their common developmental ground; as the theme of each stage builds upon and inevitably follows each preceding chapter, they then become further intertwined. An understanding of the morality (be it altered or not) of the previous developmental stage is necessary for full comprehension of those which follow. When seen in this light, the development of the characters' morality becomes a central focus of the work, and further unifies the stories into a more linear structure. What this then amounts to, the challenges and foibles at each stage giving way to the navigations of latter stages, the development from youth to maturity, is essentially a Bildungsroman of a people as it illuminates their growing self-consciousness and evolving morality.

When one sees *Dubliners* as a unified work, focusing on the morality and psychology of a people, the question then turns to what exactly is it that impels their moral maturation? The answer to that lies in another recurring and oft discussed aspect of the work: the epiphany. For Joyce, "the epiphany was the sudden 'revelation of the whatness of a thing,' the moment in which 'the soul of the commonest object... seems to us radiant'" (Ellman 83). Or more simply, an epiphany is a moment of an instantaneous transformative realization, "a kind of spiritual 'eureka' where the characters suddenly and guiltily discover a previously unsuspected truth about their own inadequacy" (R. Brown 3). These epiphanies are then the impetus for moral development as one progresses linearly through the work; like inch marks in a doorway, they represent moral milestones of spiritual growth. Within *Dubliners* epiphanies are self-revelations

of/for the characters' of their own various shortcomings and serve as turning points for them. These epiphanies are a reaction to a perceived lack or difference that the character must acknowledge.

An analysis of masculinity within the context of *Dubliners* first requires a focus on a rather traditional interpretation of the typical attributes of the gender; one framed by, defined by, and defining of patriarchy. For this discussion patriarchy is used “in the original sense of the word, as the intimate power of men over women, a power which is historically exercised within the family by the male as breadwinner, property owner, or armed defender of women and children” (Ehrenreich 284). The dominant base of societal construction throughout history has been patriarchal at its core; the Dublin society of the early 20th century is no exception. The masculine is the dominant and dominating entity. Masculinity though is certainly not a concrete, easily definable concept; it is instead a fluid, ever-changing, protean, and often ambiguous construct constantly being reconfigured by social interactions and social institutions. The variability of the topic at hand then benefits from an approach which incorporates seemingly disparate threads of thought in an attempt to define for the purposes of this thesis to what “masculinity” refers.

“[What] form the definition of male identity takes depends more on cultural than on biological factors; moreover it changes over time,” unlike sexual bio-determinates; one is not born “masculine” or “feminine” in the way that one is born “male” or “female” (Stearns 3). How masculine gender identity changes is determined by the societies and societal expectations at play. Masculinity then is “a concept that bears only an adventitious relation to biological sex and whose various manifestations collectively constitute the cultural, social, and psychosexual expression of gender (Solomon-Godeau 71). So what then defines masculinity? “Becoming a

‘man’” or being regarded as masculine, “requires a repudiation of femininity, but also a repudiation that becomes a precondition for the heterosexualization of sexual desire” (Butler 26). An acting against or in response to what is perceived as feminine, and a marked heterosexuality (certainly a direct correlate to the repudiation of the feminine) become integral to conventional masculinity, which at this point, seems to be a large, strong, heterosexual, virile provider, yet that merely scratches the surface of the multiplicities of masculinities. Judith Butler notes: “Gender reality is performative which means, quite simply, that it is real only to the extent that it is *performed*. It seems fair to say that certain kinds of acts are usually *interpreted* as expressive of a gender core or identity, and that these acts either conform to an expected gender identity or contest that expectation in some way” (“Performance” 128, emphasis added). With that, gender identity moves away from biology, biological identifiers, and preinscribed gender roles. “Masculine” and “feminine” are no longer terms indicative of biological sex or anything concrete and measurable; instead they are enacted and acted gender. This performative nature of gender then is the replication and reinterpretation of what patriarchal society has traditionally ascribed as being a trait or action deemed as being attributable to a specific gender and necessarily denies a central defined gender core. Instead, gender identity becomes an affected persona wherein one consciously acts in accordance to or against traditional perceptions of gender roles and/or traits.

In discussing his own masculine self-image in light of his affinity for poetry, Stanley Aronowitz notes that “any inclination toward such intellectual and artistic worlds is enough to earn [a boy] the designation ‘sissy-boy’ or ‘weirdo’” (Aronowitz 311). Aronowitz’s intellectual pursuits cast him as something other than decidedly masculine, heterosexual and even heteronormative. Intellectual pursuits diverge from the traditional yin of the active masculine

performances, into the yang of the passive feminine: physicality represents the masculine; receptivity represents the feminine. Aronowitz recalls repercussions of the slights of his masculinity: “I was able to forestall these ‘insults’ with my physical clout and, therefore, I never really experienced a conflict between my artistic interests and masculine identification” (Aronowitz 311).

By dominating through physicality, the “sissy-boy” becomes more masculine than his taunters. While Aronowitz laments his segue into the aggressive male, noting his reticence to fight, his actions serve to point toward that facet of gender studies which espouses the performative nature of gender. When Aronowitz-the boy’s masculinity was questioned, he acted as he believed a masculine boy should, with violence and aggression. Returning to Butler, “there is no gender that is ‘expressed’ by actions, gestures, speech, but that the performance of gender was precisely that which produced retroactively the illusion that there was an inner gender core” (Butler 31). Aronowitz’s actions as a child then are not masculine in and of themselves, nor do they make him “a man;” instead they merely enact masculinity. If gender is a performance, the perception of one’s gender becomes subjective; it becomes a matter of appearing as such, at a specific time. Thus to “act masculine” is more accurately “to be perceived as masculine at this time.” Extending deeper into her argument, Butler holds that “gender is produced as a ritualized repetition of conventions, and that this ritual is socially compelled in part by the force of a compulsory heterosexuality” (Butler 31). As gender is a temporal performance, there is no stable identification of one’s gender; one is not determinedly masculine or feminine. Instead gender is transitory and prone to shift, thus the ability of biologically defined women to act “manly” or for biologically defined men to act “feminine.” Gender is imitative of the historical, yet nonexistent idealized heterosexually sexed exemplar; the

idealization makes that which is imitated impossible to fully realize, which produces an ever present conflict within gender identity. Aronowitz's emasculation and response to emasculation, Ehrenreich's patriarchy, and Solomon-Godeau socio-cultural determinates are all performances, replications of historical constructs which define what is and is not masculine.

One interesting facet of masculinity linked somewhat loosely psychologically and politically to Ehrenreich's definition of patriarchy is Homi Bhabha's theory regarding "*amor patrie* – the nationalist, phallic identification with the service of the nation" (Bhabha 59). This facet of masculinity is still found in the archaic, patriarchy-driven division of labor with women tied to the home. The masculine as "warrior/defender/provider" extends into the modern realm of performative gender in the preservation of nationalism. It is through the father's role of provider and familial patriarch that this nationalist inclination is fostered. Bhabha claims that it "is the absence of the Father- rather than the mother" due to his role as provider interacting within society outside of the home "that constitutes the principle of national self-identification and the service of the nation" (59). "The position must be understood as an enunciative site – rather than an identity," marking it as aligned with the performative nature of masculinity, not simply an instance of gender roles (Bhabha 59). Inherent in the nationalist identification with masculinity is the "instinct for respect – central to the civic responsibility for the service of nation-building – [that] comes from the Father's sternness, which is an effect of his 'peripheral' position in the family" (Bhabha 59). National identity, which works to maintain the status quo, is masculinized by the father's absence due to his role as familial patriarch/provider functioning within societal parameters external to the home and extends to define the "nation" and civic duty as masculine. The territory once protected was simply hearth and home, but as the territory and gender identification expands greatly, the defended mate in the home becomes the defended

“motherland.” Nationalism then, the defense, devotion, and loyalty to national interests is masculinized.

Masculinity is a social construct which differs from culture to culture, from era to era. It is a composite of the innumerable ideologies of a specific time and place: internal and external conflicts, politics, religion, economics, cultural morality and traditions. Countless other aspects contribute to the multifaceted, ever-evolving conception of what it means to “be a man.” As masculine identity is shaped from within and without, socially and psychologically, self/other interactions become integral to the construction of masculine self-identification Marilyn French notes that within the pages of *Dubliners*, “[w]omen frame men’s lives” by acting generally as caretakers of their society (“Women in Joyce’s Dublin” 267). By this, the women effectively give shape to the men, in a sense refining and situating them within their civilization, and in many ways defining them in opposition; they are a necessary other which impels the male self towards realizing masculine identity.

Two distinct schools of literary theory are necessary for a discussion of the conflicted construct of masculinity among turn of the century *Dubliners*: post-colonial theory and feminist/gender studies. The Dublin which Joyce depicts is one composed of men and women, the colonized and the colonizing; such splits bring about the clash of ideologies and serve to further engender the self/other dichotomy. Thus for this discussion “other” cannot simply be narrowed to strangers, nor friends, nor women, nor colonists, “other” must cast a broader net encompassing (but not limited to) all four. Conflicting ideologies swirling throughout society, whether made manifest or not, serve to compose and discomfit these characters’ masculine identities; it is often emasculation, brought about by interactions within society, that serves to elicit epiphanies from these paralytic Irish. Moving linearly through both the noted, broader

developmental phases and the specific chapters, a more well-rounded depiction of Joyce's take on conflicted masculinity, assailed and assaulted at every turn, presents itself.

CHILDHOOD

The first of Joyce's developmental stages, youth, is depicted in the first three stories of *Dubliners*: "The Sisters," "An Encounter," and "Araby." The three tales are told by a nameless narrator looking back on a certain defining moment in his youth. Each depicts a distinct confrontation between childishly cultivated personal values and rosy outlooks with more traditional values and the gross reality those narrators must confront. The stories are tethered to the process of constructing masculine identity of each individual youth. In effect, youthful naiveté is crumbled through the children's interactions with others embodying certain distinct traits which call into question the value of certain beliefs, certain values, and certain drives when functioning within the parameters of Dublin circa 1900.

The boy, the first person narrator in "The Sisters" presents the reader with an image of conflicted masculinity firmly situated amid youth; his internal clash centers on personal tendencies conflicting with public perception. Problematic on a number of levels is the child's relationship with the recently deceased Father Flynn. Upon learning of the child's camaraderie with the priest, the visiting Mr. Cotter notes, "I wouldn't like children of mine... to have too much to say to a man like that... it's bad for children... let a young lad run about and play with young lads of his own age" (Joyce 10). This suggestion for what a young boy should amuse himself with follows shortly after the visitor's musings on the priest as one of those "peculiar cases," having noted that there was "something queer... something uncanny about [the priest]" (Joyce 10). The insinuation is that Father Flynn appeared to Cotter as either a homosexual or a pedophile; these insinuations however are never fully vocalized as Cotter simply trails off towards the end of any conclusive statement. Arguing neither for nor against the perception of pedophilia, Suzette Henke notes that perhaps "this 'great friend' [Father Flynn] was guilty of

pederastic desire deflected into a demand for psychic appropriation... a powerful projection of his own need for psychological mastery – a desire to gain control of the boy under the aegis of pedagogical insemination and to mold this docile disciple into a spiritual replica of himself” (Henke 17). Perhaps Father Flynn had those desires, they however have been sublimated into a psychological penetration; the sexual overtones remain, the sexual assault is lost. Keeping the insinuation of pedophilia as conjecture (noting that the narrator himself never overtly alludes to any impropriety on Father Flynn’s part), the reader is still left with Cotter’s advice that a child should run about with his peers instead of biding his time being educated by an aged, discredited priest. Thus for the older, presumably “wiser” Cotter, the youth of Ireland should not be engrossing themselves in the where’s and why’s of Latin pronunciation, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Catholic dogma; they should instead be focused primarily on socialization, adventure, and physical exertion. The introspective tendencies and impersonal inclination commonly equated with the more highly educated should be discouraged and supplanted with activities which encourage physical dexterity and social interactions with one’s peers. The story sets up the opposition of intelligent social outcast vs. strong communal insider, an opposition that will be repeated and refined throughout *Dubliners*.

The narrator’s uncle echoes Cotter’s sentiments as well, noting that “I’m always saying to that Rosicrucian there: take exercise... Education is all very fine and large...” (Joyce 10-11). A Rosicrucian being “A member of an international organization, especially the Ancient Mystic Order Rosae Crucis and the Rosicrucian Order, devoted to the study of ancient mystical, philosophical, and religious doctrines and concerned with the application of these doctrines to modern life,” the uncle is then both chiding the boy and demonstrating something of his own level of education in referencing the Medieval order (“Rosicrucian”). Again though, the uncle,

Cotter's peer, sees the boy's education as having a secondary importance to his physical constitution. These two others then, the uncle and Cotter, are calling into question the self-defining values to which the boy has heretofore subscribed by discouraging them and encouraging their perceived antithesis. As Vincent Cheng notes, these two adult men are urging the narrator "towards a life of cultural normalcy defined both by the prescribed cultural male expectations" and in opposition to "the socially undesirable danger of queerness and otherness: the Rosicrucian sect" (Cheng 80). The boy identifies himself as a male, and therefore attempts to perform masculinity. He experiences a crisis of faith when he realizes his actions are perceived as more feminine. This though is not the whole of the boy's internal conflict.

The following day, after the boy has read the death notice hanging from the priest's door, he finds it strange that he felt "annoyed at discovering in [him]self a sensation of freedom as if [he] had been freed from something" by the death of his mentor (Joyce 12). This is a revealing development, as it shows that the boy had already been feeling constrained by his relationship with the priest; the evidence points towards this conflict being based more so on the expectations of the priest himself and not on the child's dedication to learning. But what exactly is it that the boy is freed from by the death of his mentor? Most likely he is freed from the priest's "great wish" for him to follow in his footsteps and enter into the priesthood (Joyce 10). This is a bit of a return to Henke's claim that the pedagogue was crafting a "spiritual replica" in the boy. The boy has doubts that he is of the mettle to undertake the priesthood: "The duties of the priest towards the Eucharist and towards the secrecy of the confessional seemed so grave to me that I wondered how anybody had ever found in himself the courage to undertake them" (Joyce 13). Father Flynn, when not correcting the boy when he makes "no answer or only a very foolish and halting one" to the questions put to him, instead merely smiling and nodding his head, is not

acknowledging a superiority; he is acknowledging a sense of complicity (Joyce 13). “He responded to the boy’s bewilderment as though it is sound and sensible;” as the priest has no answers for the child, and appears to agree with him, it seems that Father Flynn too sees the religious ephemera as difficult to comprehend and himself as ill-suited for the duties of the priesthood (Sultan 87). “Only with his pupil did the pensive old man let down his guard, and that but partially and without aim except his own relief, who must still be priest, most of all to his one remaining and unofficial acolyte” (Beck 70). The failed, discredited priest atones by preparing the boy to assume his lost mantle; he finds his spiritual atonement through his prepared spiritual replica. The boy finds freedom in the moment where he “had not the courage” to enter the priest’s house; his mentor deceased, his mentor’s great wish died off as well (Joyce 12). He is free from that which he saw as too courageous and too grave for anyone to take upon themselves. Of course the fact that even though the boy has been reluctant to fully follow his mentor’s path, he has still readily received the priest’s lessons should not be ignored, nor should his perceived lack of courage. What the priest realized late, that he was ill-suited for his profession, the boy learns early.

The drive towards the life of the intellectual aesthete is made further problematic and thus more questionable as the boy listens to his aunt and the priest’s sisters discuss the recently deceased. Their conversation is peppered with the same trailing off of seemingly disparaging comments regarding the priest as Cotter’s was earlier in the story. Nonetheless, through their scattered and vague discussion a portrait of the priest as “resigned” (15), incapable of providing for his sisters who were forced then to care for him (16), “too scrupulous” (17), “nervous” (17), “disappointed” with his lot in life (17), prone to “mope by himself” (17), and as acting as an isolationist (17). Even more succinctly, they remark “his life was, you might say, crossed;”

simply put, it was one riddled with frustration (17). As though this were not bad enough, the boy is then witness to the story of the time that a clerk and two priests find Father Flynn “sitting up by himself in the dark of his confession-box, wide-awake and laughing-like softly to himself... then, of course, when they saw that, that made them think that there was something gone wrong with him” (Joyce 18). The boy, already conflicted in his own opinion of the priesthood, can likely receive no more damning condemnation than that meted upon the corpse of his mentor: the pedagogue who saw himself as unable to fulfill the duties of the priesthood. Holding with the aforementioned critics, attesting that Father Flynn is a man of lost faith, his downfall and introversion are understandable; his removal from the church, although misinterpreted, becomes acceptable. Via misinterpretation, Father Flynn is seen not as a man lacking the courage to fulfill his responsibility as a priest but as a mentally troubled and wholly inept man.

While the story itself ends on an ellipsis, there should be no question that the boy’s sense of masculine self-identity has been thrown into a flux. His mentor, who he has modeled himself after in his general life’s pursuit, his education, his drive, and in his own concern over courageousness has been shown to be perceived as a mentally unbalanced loner. His choice then becomes to either adhere to this set course (from which he has been set “free”), or to take what has presented itself as the only opposite course; he can become a traditional provider, a functional member of society, physically fit, and equipped to prosper, as his uncle desires for him. His burgeoning masculine identity is then rendered extremely problematic. Due to his education from Father Flynn, the boy sees the station of Cotter, the “tiresome old red-nosed imbecile” and the women who discuss “new-fangled carriages... with the *rheumatic* wheels,” as undesirable (Joyce 11, 17; emphasis added). They, the laity, offer the alternative to a future in priestly vestments, which the boy sees as too lofty and objectionable for his liking. The paths

open to him then are to turn to what he sees as the apparently imbecilic laity, or the priesthood for which he sees himself unfit. By ending with an ellipsis the story leaves the boy's eventual path towards masculine self-identity open ended. He could follow his deceased mentor Father Flynn, he could tend towards identification with Cotter and his uncle, or the boy could follow a third, unrepresented path.

The boy of "An Encounter" offers a counterpoint to the narrator of "The Sisters." By contrast, the first-person narrator of *Dubliners*' second story appears more outgoing, better capable of socializing, and considerably more adventurous; in lieu of cloistering himself away from his peers, the boy is often found embroiled in "mimic warfare" with them, reenacting scenes of the "Wild West" culled from works like "*The Apache Chief*" (Joyce 20-21). This perceived "rubbish" which he seems so fond of serves to awaken in him a need for adventures, ones which would remove him from the security of his life in his home and school, and thrust him out into an unknown and potentially dangerous world. With the mock battles, the boy is influenced by peer pressure (an affliction nonexistent for the former narrator), as he is "afraid to seem studious or lacking in robustness," what he yearns for is that enigmatic danger that finds itself in the unknown (Joyce 20). The child's studious nature is preempted by his desire for adventure, as he and a friend forego "the weariness of school-life one day" for a secretive journey to the Pigeon House (Joyce 21). Truancy puts the boy in contact with the apparent danger that will be an affront to his own thus far developed masculine sensibilities when he encounters a "queer old josser" who presents a different and somewhat frightening performance of masculinity (Joyce 26).

The josser ("one who is or is made to appear foolish or simpleminded" ["josser"]) appears to be innocuous enough as he settles in beside the two truants; his grayed moustache, his

shabby clothes, his slowed strolling all serve to paint him as simply an unthreatening, aged man. His inoffensive chit chat with the boys, about the weather and the changes since he was a youth, appears to be simply trite conversation topics an older man would discuss with two young boys; unthreatening, innocuous, a little boring. The turning point however is when the josses begins “to talk of school and of books,” rattling off a list of authors, all of which the narrator falsely claims to have read (Joyce 25). His ensuing agitation with Mahony, his fellow truant, who asks why boys shouldn’t read Lord Lytton, demonstrates that he is afraid “that the man would think [he] was as stupid as” Mahony (Joyce 25). The narrator wants to impress the josses, an act which serves to distance him from his accomplice, the stupid boy with the three totties. The man certainly seems admirable “for he seems liberal, sensitive, and well-read;” in fact, he appears not just admirable, but almost respectable (Cheng 86). This appearance changes when the man turns to the round and round, seemingly rehearsed and pervertedly euphoric reverie of young girls, noting their “nice soft hair... how soft their hands were and how all girls were not so good as they seemed to be if one only knew... nice young girl... nice white hands and her beautiful soft hair” (Joyce 26). Whether it is the boys’ presence or the man’s lustful musings, he suddenly feels the need to excuse himself, “taking himself off to a corner of the field to masturbate” (Torchiana 44).

Upon his return to the narrator’s side, the old josses launches into another zealous diatribe, this time shifting from his prior theme of liberalism and instead centering on corporal punishment for young boys; or more specifically the desire of boys to get and his desire to give sound “whippings.” Recanting his prior statements about his adoration of young girls (or perhaps adding to them) the man notes that should he find “a boy talking to girls or having a girl for a sweetheart he would whip him and whip him... he would give him such a whipping as no

boy ever got in the world” (Joyce 27). As the man continues to explain his desire to “whip” boys, “his voice... grew almost affectionate and seemed to plead with [the narrator] that [the boy] should understand him” (Joyce 27). The man feels safe in telling the narrator this; he apparently feels that the child can identify with his perversions. The boy having previously noted that he lacked any “sweethearts” remains and is witness to the man’s diatribe, even following the man’s public masturbatory interlude.

As the boy sits uncomfortably listening, oppositions are made clear and we see the narrator’s conflicted sense of a masculine self; his models are the imbecile Mahony or the erudite pervert. At first this queer old jossler appears to him to be admirable stranger; the man seems to know about love and seems a man whom the boy should impress. In so doing, the boy necessarily aligns himself and his own personal values with another who then reveals himself to be both a pervert and a pedophile. The boy’s desire for adventure, for encounters with what serves to pass as new or strange, brings him to this point; his daring and his willingness to shirk societal expectations (attending school) bring him to this new field where he meets this strange man who is studious (well read), shirks societal expectations (a pedophile), dares (masturbating in public), and is adventurous (attempting to woo a young boy). The boy’s values, his masculine identifiers are here, perverted by pedophilia. His most telling moment of conflicted masculinity concludes the story; in reference to Mahony trotting towards him, the narrator notes “And I was penitent; for in my heart I had always despised him a little” (Joyce 28). He is remorseful for his hatred and prior deprecation of his cohort; and now he must turn to this imbecilic boy for protection from a dangerous situation he has gotten himself into with a person with whom he initially identified. “The young boy is driven at the end of the story... in fear and disillusion, to suppress his own spirit of unruliness and to seek instead the safe normalcy of his

less sensitive, more conventional, more ‘normal,’ masculist [sic] buddies;” suddenly idiocy, cat chasing, and having a litany of totties appears to be better markings of masculinity than what the narrator deemed so prior to his encounter with the old man (Cheng 88).

Concluding the work’s opening trilogy is “Araby,” a story that functions as a logical culmination of the evolutionary ark of the three. The first person narrator of “Araby,” like those of the previously discussed stories, is a nameless boy firmly situated in Joyce’s “youth” stage of development; like his predecessors, the boy is defined by his already developed outlook and a turn in fortune leads to what serves as both his epiphany and his questioning of his own seemingly established masculinity. Here though, the conflicted masculinity is not so much the question of social perceptions or the dangers inherent in adventure, instead Joyce turns his jaundiced eye towards that which can best be described as young love.

The young narrator, like his forebear in “An Encounter,” is a sociable child, although prone to introspection and studiousness; he has friends his own age, but is often found alone reading the handful of books left behind by the former tenant of his home. These tomes, “*The Abbot*, by Walter Scott, *The Devout Communicant* and *The Memoirs of Vidocq*” serve to engender in the boy a perspective on love steeped in the Romantic and chivalrous traditions of days gone by (Joyce 29). *The Memoirs of Vidocq* recounts the tale of a double agent, “who moved nimbly from the underworld to that of the literary salon and back;” the book “unfolds the doubtful triumph of the flesh in the disguise of the ideal detective;” Vidocq being both the criminal and the police officer at different times (Torchiana 53-54). *The Devout Communicant; or, Pious Meditations and Aspirations, for Three Days Before and Three Days After Receiving the Holy Eucharist* regards what the subtitle states- prayers and hopes for that specific week around communion. The author, Reverend Pacificus Franciscan also acted as a double agent a la

Vidocq; he reportedly “received one of the church’s greatest foes, Edward Gibbon into the faith” (Torchiana 54). *The Abbot* by Sir Walter Scott continues the double agent theme, depicting a spy’s convoluted wanderings, ending with the renunciation of Catholicism for reformatory faith, and a protagonist who “Ultimately married one of the older persuasion” (Torchiana 54). As such, the narrator “partakes in the female idolization and deification that is part of both the Romance tradition of courtly love and the Christian essentializing of women around the desired figure of the Virgin” (Cheng 90). The boy’s rapturous adoration of his idealized love coupled with his ecclesiastical rapture over her never-said name seem to reflect the youth’s Romantic notions of chivalry. The boy observes and adores Mangan’s sister from afar; whether from the windows of his home as she sets off to school or summons her brother, or as he tails her en route to school, or even from the shadows where he watches and decides that she “was waiting for” him, as “her dress swung as she moved her body and the soft rope of her hair tossed from side to side” (Joyce 30). He is depicted as traditionally romantic and chivalrous, but most importantly chaste. While the young girl clearly elicits a desire in the boy, as his “body was like a harp and her words and gestures were like fingers running upon the wires,” he forces himself to forgo sexualizing his love (Joyce 31). Instead, “like a monk struggling for dignity and self-control, he finds ritual solace in a litany of ejaculations repeated like a mantra evocative of his beloved” (Henke 20). In lieu of cheapening his adoration of Mangan’s sister to mere lust, the boy instead chooses to press “the palms of [his] hands together until they trembled” and repeatedly murmurs “*O love! O love!*” (Joyce 31). The boy sublimates his lust into a euphoric mantra evocative of religious zeal.

Having deified his “beloved,” the narrator also inadvertently glorifies her values as well, most notably, the Araby bazaar. She is forced to deny herself that pleasure (conveniently

enough) due to an impending retreat with her convent; further justifying the boy's monastic euphoria with regards to Mangan's sister, she too is capable of forgoing vice for virtue. She is the virginal entity he has crafted to be adored. The narrator then, seeing himself as her chivalrous knight, takes it upon himself to do for his lady as she would wish; he swears to her, "If I go... I will bring you something" (Joyce 32). He is to bring her a token of his love from the faraway bazaar of Araby; she can't, therefore he must. Traveling to Araby then becomes a pilgrimage for the child; he must overcome the obstacles that face him to show his beloved his love. The bazaar itself becomes something akin to a temple or church. However upon his arrival the boy is greeted by a "weary-looking man" who is hardly impressed with the majesty the child expects to find there; inside he is greeted by two men "counting their money on a salver," echoing of the money changers in the temple episode of The Gospel of John (Joyce 34). The boy's holiest temple, the end of his quest is defiled by simple capitalism. When he reaches an open stall, the boy finds three intruders in Dublin, two gentlemen and one woman, flirting in English accents; worse than finding the money changers, the boy has found a trio of interlopers flirting. This serves to further cheapen and defile his temple; this is not the courtly love of yore. Instead this is lust on display in the hall of his pilgrimage. Everything he deified by proxy has been reduced to being trivial, ugly, and banal.

In the end the boy notes, "I saw myself as a creature driven and derided by vanity; and my eyes burned with anguish and anger" (Joyce 35). Everything the boy exalted, chivalry, courtly love, and the deification of his Madonna, has been rent asunder due to his trip to the bazaar; all he has been presented with amounts to flirting over trivial trinkets. The narrator's recognition that his temple is nothing more than crass normalcy (the bazaar certainly is not bizarre), completely bereft of romanticism then serves to reverse other prior assumptions which

he held. His realization that it has been simple vanity which impelled his trip to the bazaar then debases his own deifications; his lady in waiting becomes simply a “brown figure,” a non-descript girl, just “Mangan’s sister” (Joyce 30). The crassness he encounters forces him to reconsider his preconceived notions of love in his culture, effectively causing his conception of masculinity as defined by adherence to romantic notions and knighthood to die. His romantic notions dashed, he is left to reconceive the society that he inhabits, now devoid of chivalry and courtly love. He is perhaps the wiser for leaving behind boyish romantic illusions, yet his belief in a highly romantic masculine identity has been shattered.

ADOLESCENCE

What is most interesting about “Eveline,” the collection’s fourth story, the first in third person with a named protagonist and the first to deal with Joyce’s “adolescent” phase, is that in order to ascertain the version of masculinity depicted within its pages, one must do so through the perspective of Eveline herself. The two versions of masculinity that present themselves to the reader are that of Eveline’s father, Mr. Hill, and of her suitor, Frank. The two males are presented as though they are polar opposites within the pages of the story; Mr. Hill seems to be an oppressive, increasingly threatening and alcoholic tyrant, while Frank appears to be a “kind, manly, open-hearted” sailor (Joyce 38). One offers hope and change; the other offers thankless toil and stagnation. Even the homes they offer to Eveline are at odds; Mr. Hill offers his dusty Dublin home where all “was the odour of dusty cretonne” and Frank, the “good air” of Buenos Ayres (Joyce 36). They seem to be at odds with one another, one a black hat, the other a white hat, and yet they are quite possibly more alike than they are different. Mr. Hill’s depiction within the story is overwhelmingly that of a broken, abusive drunk who is unconcerned with the quality of his children’s lives, but it is the brief asides and reflections that paint him in a different light. When Eveline was a child, “[t]hey seemed to have been rather happy then...[h]er father was not so bad then” (Joyce 36). Mr. Hill was once playful: hunting out his children as they played in a then-vacant lot, “putting on her mother’s bonnet to make the children laugh” (Joyce 39). Even in the present, Eveline’s father can be a pleasant man: “he would miss her... he could be very nice... he had read her out a ghost story and made toast for her” (Joyce 39). The man, aside from his threats of violence, is certainly not all bad. In his past he was as playful, fun, and caring as Frank appears to be with regards to Eveline mid-courting. Mr. Hill then becomes the logical extension of Frank, post-marriage.

Cheng notes that Eveline “is faced with reinscribing for herself the same exact fate as her mother’s, within what are arguably a woman’s two worst archetypal fears: to become one’s mother; and to be the madwoman in the attic” should she choose to stay in her father’s house (103). It is this realization which impels her rush to the North Wall to meet Frank. Those two fears, becoming one’s mother and/or going mad are the only possibilities Eveline can see. After her mother’s death, she has become the woman of the house under her father’s roof, just as she swore to her mother she would. Her adherence to this course of action causes her to be the brunt of her father’s threats of violence, which Eveline is certain “had given her the palpitations” (Joyce 38). Palpitations are a symptom of panic or anxiety disorders. In her father’s house, she has already become her mother; to become the madwoman in the attic, she need only remain there. Yet conversely, to escape the confines of her home, Eveline would have to sacrifice the security of her home, marry Frank, depart for a foreign country, and become a wife/likely mother, effectively sending her down a similar route as her mother: “that life of commonplace sacrifices closing in on final craziness” (Joyce 40). This then explains the moment when standing on the wharf, Eveline senses that “All the seas of the world tumbled about her heart... [Frank] was drawing her into them: he would drown her,” and her devolution into simply a “passive... helpless animal” (Joyce 41). It appears that Eveline has suffered what we today would call an anxiety attack (one not brought about by her father) and has become frozen into a conscious-obliterating panic.

In the end, it is not as Cheng claims that Eveline is unable “to choose action over paralysis” and therefore “condemns herself to the prison of her dust-filled house... the hard life and crazed fate of her own mother;” instead it is simply that she has no choice (103). Should she enter into that life of “commonplace sacrifices” that is marriage (first sacrifice: the security of

her home, her job, and the known world of Ireland), she would become her mother, Frank would likely become her father; should she stay, her father would remain her father, she would remain her mother. She is sadly stuck between an Irish rock and an Argentinean rock; they may look different, but at their cores, they are both the same to Eveline. Yes, it certainly is “a story with devastating feminist resonances;” however it is just as much a story with devastating masculinist resonances (Cheng 103). The whitest hats may inevitably blacken. It is not that *all* men are damned to be oppressive and broken; it is instead that all men *may* be so damned.

The conflict in “After the Races” is set forth in its opening paragraph:

The cars came scudding in towards Dublin, running evenly like pellets in the groove of the Naas Road. At the crest of the hill at Inchicore sightseers had gathered in clumps to watch the cars careering homeward and through this channel of poverty and inaction the Continent sped its wealth and industry. Now and again the clumps of people raised the cheer of the *gratefully oppressed*. Their sympathy, however, was for the blue cars--the cars of their friends, the French. (Joyce 42 – emphasis added)

The Continent, most notably England, France, and Germany, oppressors all, make a show of their industry, their wealth to those colonized on-lookers through the flash and bang of the road race; those spectators, thankful for the demonstration, cheer this show. The industry and wealth which they cheer however is predicated on the oppression of those self-same spectators; the oppressed work to foster that wealth, they are the backbone of that industry, hence their grateful oppression. They cheer on their friends and compatriots the French, as they are the competition of the British, the oppressors of Ireland proper; yet the “continentals” exploit the Irish as well.

The story’s main character, Jimmy Doyle functions much as a male counterpart to Eveline. While their overt differences far outweigh their similarities, Jimmy too is victim to that same sense of inheritance that Eveline embodies; Henke notes that the boy “is portrayed as an

inverted replica of the naïve Eveline” (24). Jimmy has been provided for in ways that his precursor could hardly even dream of; at “about twenty-six years of age” (seven years Eveline’s senior), Jimmy is the son of “a merchant prince,” has been “educated in a big Catholic college” in England, has studied law at Dublin University, and has even gone to Cambridge “for a term... to see a little life” (Joyce 43). His life is one of opportunities, travel, change, seemingly the absolute antithesis of Eveline’s sequestered, inopportune life. They are, however, united in that aforementioned inheritance. For Eveline it is the onus of keeping her promise to her dying mother and thereby becoming her mother; for Jimmy it is burden of succeeding his living father and thereby assuming a greater sense of power/masculinity than the man who provides for him. Mr. Doyle provides the “capital” for crafting the continental Jimmy, the “cultured” gentleman. It is Jimmy’s “sojourn at Cambridge [which] put him in contact with the fast set that will outstrip the provincial Irishman” (Fodaski Black 20).

Since Jimmy’s onus is that of following in his father’s footsteps, and Mr. Doyle appears to be a well-established man in the world, one who appears to command some respect from his peers, it becomes necessary to first ascertain the ways in which the elder’s own sense of masculinity is conflicted. First of note is the fact that he “had begun his life as an advanced [Irish] Nationalist, [but] had modified his views early on” (Joyce 43). His first action which is problematic for his sense of masculinity is to supplant his rebellious nature, his nationalist tendency and cater instead to his people’s oppressors; too this exemplifies a shirking of Bhabha’s *amor patriae*, the masculine identification with nationalism. To shirk said nationalist tendencies then is to deny a basic component of traditional masculine identity. Mr Doyle effectively puts himself in the submissive position, readily accepting dominance by others. Instead of answering to his people, his peers, his equals, Mr. Doyle becomes a “shoneen,” or “English collaborator,”

and thus takes to answering to the king (Cheng 106). In so doing, he goes from being a “butcher in Kingstown” to a “merchant prince” in Dublin (Joyce 43). This transition holds certain importance as it embodies a shift not just in values, but with regards to culture as well: Mr. Doyle willingly adopts and is co-opted by colonial power; he becomes the gratefully oppressed. This amounts to a superseding of the traditions which assure his masculine identity for the ways of the other who sees him as less than masculine. Of course, the wordplay of his two roles can not be ignored; Mr. Doyle went from being a butcher in (the) *King’s-town*, to be a merchant *prince*, as though he himself had been adopted by the King instead of adopting the King’s ways himself. He has taken a new father and with it, his new father’s values, values which he in turn instills in his own son Jimmy, who then replicates them in turn.

Jimmy has inherited his father’s newfound shoneen values and has had them further ingrained in his identity via his education in Cambridge; this “continentalism” further demonstrates how “shoneen values get inculcated in subaltern groups through processes of social formation and education” (Cheng 106). His formative years spent outside of Ireland, his acquaintances made inter-continently, Jimmy has been indoctrinated with values comparable to his father, but detrimental to his own society; in so doing, Jimmy comes to embody the values of his own oppressors and to even become reverent towards them. Just as the spectators raised the “cheer of the gratefully oppressed” when greeted with the display of wealth and industry in the story’s opening paragraph, so too did Jimmy grow to become reverential to his oppressors, and thus complicit in his own homeland’s oppression.

The three instances which serve to best exemplify Jimmy’s conflicted masculinity as a counterpart to his conflicted Irish identity are his investment in Seguin’s car dealership, his rankling of the Englishman Routh, and his being fleeced at cards. In each case it is a situation

where Jimmy's sense of Irish identity is compromised by his inherited shoneen values. With the dealership venture, Jimmy was well aware that his contribution amounted to "a great sum;" it is noted that he had inherited a natural propensity for money management, and he "knew well with what difficulty [his investment] had been got together" (Joyce 44). However, even with his understanding of the secondary value of his contribution, he allows himself to be deluded as "Segouin had managed to give the impression that it was by favour of friendship the mite of Irish money was to be included in the capital of the concern;" Segouin has skillfully manipulated appearances (Joyce 45). Again the boy embodies that grateful oppression, enthusiastically participating in his own downfall. While Segouin needs Jimmy's investment in order to establish his business, he belittles it not simply by claiming it has only been accepted as a "favour of friendship" but also by referring to it as a mere "mite of Irish money." The value of the investment is demeaned twofold: the great sum becomes a trifling amount and is sullied by coming from the subaltern, the Irish. Segouin is insulting and ridiculing not only Jimmy's monetary sense, but his lineage as well; Jimmy, thankful for the opportunity denies his Irish self and puts himself in an exploitable position, eager for the meager table scraps of Segouin's exploitative "friendship."

During their night out on the town, Jimmy, "under generous influences, felt the buried zeal of his father wake to life within him: he aroused the torpid Routh at last" (Joyce 46). Not only has Jimmy inherited his father's shoneen values, he has also become heir to his father's long suppressed nationalism. He actively confronts a representative of his oppressor; his inhibitions lessened by what will continue to do the same throughout much of rest of the *Dubliners*, alcohol. Jimmy enters their unrecorded dispute, arguing to the point that "there was even danger of personal spite" (Joyce 46). The dispute however is defused by the friend to the

British, the friend to the Irish, Segouin of the French, with an unspecific toast to general “humanity.” Segouin tosses to the combatants the table scraps of unity- “humanity”- and the rancor is assuaged. Too, he masks the differences in the power dynamics and wealth of the participants by equalizing them under the singular banner; this feigned equality aids in his later fleecing of Jimmy at cards. Jimmy, not wanting to offend this father-figure cools his nationalist zeal, and returns to talking loudly and gaily with the party of his peers, his oppressors; just as his father before him would have done. Jimmy has adopted the shoneen values which Mr. Doyle instilled in him, but he has not fully acquiesced to his own form of selling out. Ill will and resentment towards his oppressor remain as exemplified by his rousing of Routh, perhaps encouraged by his own guilt over compromising his Irish defined masculine identity. All it takes to soothe his anger however is a passing word from his assumed father figure; the one with the power, Segouin, uses “universalism” to mask covert European nationalism.

The circumventing of the personal spite and the self-imposed return to “civility” leads to the group retiring to Farley’s, the American’s, yacht for “supper, music, cards” (Joyce 47). Aboard the boat, a situation arises which points towards a questionable masculinity, as two of the men dance together, “Farley acting as cavalier and Riviere as lady” (Joyce 47). This dance has the American playing the role of the masculine, while the Frenchman takes on the feminine performance, except here it is merely for “merriment” (Joyce 47). The attendees and the players see it as mere farce, noting that “it was Bohemian” or a shirking of traditional standards. Promptly though, the status quo is resumed as five of the six men sit down to a round of cards; Villona, the Hungarian is smart enough to walk away as the “other men played game after game, flinging themselves boldly into the adventure” (Joyce 48). Jimmy, drunk on excitement and libations to the point of incomprehension, is unable to follow the games, not knowing who is

winning, only that “he was losing” (Joyce 48). Unable to understand his cards, incapable of calculating his I.O.U.’s, he is forced to rely on the other players, and Jimmy blames himself while he is being fleeced for his stake. The boy allows himself to be exploited by those who wield power over him; he is made vulnerable by his shoneen hypocrisy inherited from his father. Regardless, the flash and bang of his “friends,” much like the flash and bang of the earlier race, serves to placate his sense of exploitation: “Jimmy was excited too; he would lose of course” (Joyce 48). Grateful to simply be there, to be a part of this Continental set, Jimmy willingly succumbs to imperialism; in the end the Englishman, Routh, comes out the winner, the Frenchmen Sequin and Riviere profiting, and Farley and Jimmy, the American and the Irishman, “were the heaviest losers” (Joyce 48). Jimmy’s feelings over his humiliating showing, his demeaned status at the table are summed up in the story’s concluding paragraph:

He knew that he would regret in the morning but at present he was glad of the rest, glad of the dark stupor that would cover up his folly. He leaned his elbows on the table and rested his head between his hands, counting the beats of his temples. The cabin door opened and he saw the Hungarian standing in a shaft of grey light:

-"Daybreak, gentlemen!" (Joyce 48)

Jimmy deludes himself, thinking that only come morning will regret and remorse over his submission wash over him; in the intervening time, he can hide his fatuousness behind his drunken and misguided state. Unfortunately for Jimmy, morning has come and along with it the illuminating light of regret; the boy’s opportunity for epiphany has arrived, although it is problematized. Jimmy’s romanticizing of the continentals, revealed to him as debased, may still overshadow that buried nationalist zeal which he momentarily displayed. The boy has

prostituted himself to that cosmopolitan allure of his oppressors; in so doing, Jimmy has compromised his own integrity and obliterated his own would be masculinity.

Moving from the geo-political climate's effects on masculinity, Joyce returns to the themes of debased chivalry and gallantry begun in "Araby" with the next story, "Two Gallants." Here he takes a more direct look at the exploitation of the conquered and focuses more on the explicitly masculine and feminine, as opposed to the somewhat indirect treatment featured in "After the Races." The story is also the first in *Dubliners* where a protagonist has any recorded dialogue. The narrative of "Two Gallants" follows the meanderings of Lenehan, an unemployed thirty year old gambler and leech, caught somewhere between youth and maturity (an aged adolescent), living in "poverty of purse and spirit," eking by on what he can wheedle from his friends and acquaintances, as he walks and talks with his friend and mentor Corley (Joyce 51). While the narrative focuses primarily on Lenehan and his interactions with and without his friend, Corley himself plays possibly a more integral role in depicting a conflicted sense of masculinity.

As the story opens, the two gallants are walking down the hill of Rutland Square, and due to Corley's discourtesy, Lenehan is depicted walking "on the verge of the path and was at times obliged to step onto the road" (Joyce 49). Lenehan's walking alongside of Corley, on "the verge of the path" demonstrates an almost agreement of perspective with his friend and his friend's sentiments; however his digressions into the road seem to point towards a moving forward, a progression away from the notions which affirm Corley's station in life. Lenehan is at a crossroad in his life. He is stuck as an adolescent transitioning between youth and maturity and is conflicted as to the justifiability of a life led along Corley's example, which is quite quickly demonstrated as the callous exploitation of others for sexual conquest and monetary gain.

To call Corley's egotism, machismo, misogyny, and militaristic bent a "philosophy" may be a bit of a stretch, as he is referred to as having "not a subtle mind," but it also seems to be the most fitting descriptor (Joyce 52). He is a man of "burly body" with the frame and gait of his father "an inspector of police," and a "large, globular and oily" head that swayed from side to side when he walked; Corley is clearly not an appealing nor attractive man, whether physically or psychologically, as he largely speaks in monologues and disparagingly of the women he has conquered (Joyce 51). Yet, for all intents and purposes:

"Corley fulfills the role of knight in many ways: he is the experienced jouster, the Byronic gay Lothario *in extemis*; he is in the egotistic reporting of his forensic victories, the Florentine (not only romantically, but in a Machiavellian sense too, since he is dogmatic teacher of his 'disciple'); like former knights pricking on the plain, he seeks 'adventure;' his stiff and formal gait with the necessity of moving his body from the hips, suggests, if not armor, at least ritual; and he is 'class,' not to be got on the inside of, confident of victory and worthy of the admiration and emulation of his squire" (Boyle 101).

Lofty words for such a base character certainly, but they serve to illustrate the dishonoring of the idealized "gallant." For the age then, this globular, oily exploiter is the embodiment of the debased and debauched chivalry that that young narrator of "Araby" previously aspired to, the highly idealized chivalry that can not exist in 1900's Dublin. Corley's shift from traditional "wooer" to "user" comes as a necessary extension of the awareness of the commodification of the Dublin love and marriage market:

- First I used to go with girls, you know, said Corley, unbosoming; girls off the South Circular. I used to take them out, man, on the tram somewhere and pay the tram or take them to a band or a play at the theatre or buy them chocolate and sweets or something that way. I used to spend money on them right enough, he added, in a convincing tone, as if he was conscious of being disbelieved.

But Lenehan could well believe it; he nodded gravely.

- I know that game, he said, and it's a mug's game.

- And damn the thing I ever got of it, said Corley.

- Ditto here, said Lenehan.

- Only off of one of them, said Corley (Joyce 52).

For Corley and to some extent Lenehan, the dating, the wooing, and therefore the relationship in question became little more than a business transaction where he felt cheated; he spent his money, and seldom received what it was he thought he was buying. This is due to Corley's objectification of the women in question, seeing them only as a means to sexual gratification. In his oily mind, the "fine tarts" off the South Circular were exploiting him, taking but never giving, leading to a false (and pre-emptive) sense of victimization.

Corley's decision, like the Doyles', is to adopt something akin to shoneen values; instead of being the victim, the exploited, he will exploit. In short, Corley adopts feminine values (sans chastity, of course), effeminizing himself. His fine tart, the slavey from a house on Baggot Street, "brings her lover cigarettes and fine cigars, eagerly provides him with Sunday sex, and, at the end of the evening, pays a sovereign to retain his favor" (Henke 25). Corley has turned his perceived exploitation around. He has deceived the woman; as he notes to Lenehan "I told her I was out of a job... I told her I was in Pim's... But she thinks I'm a bit of class" (Joyce 51). It's not that he is "out of a job;" he simply does not have one, and certainly he does not have much in the way of class. The woman sees him as a gentleman, a chivalrous gallant, down on his luck, and likely to provide for her once he gets back on his feet; the gold coin, the cigars, and all the rest are a means by which she can hold on to her knight and her hopes at marriage and upward social mobility.

Lenehan, Corley's "disciple," is a conflicted character in light of the gallant. Lenehan clearly exploits his friends, a la Seguin and Jimmy, hitting them up for money and alcohol; but it is the implied exploitations that are of utmost importance. Lenehan's friends have no concept as to "how he achieved the hard task of living, but his name was vaguely associated with racing tissues" (Joyce 50). A seemingly innocuous note, Lenehan was unemployed and made his living through gambling on horses, but when coupled with Henke's note of the gallants' insinuations of all women, who they imply "resemble race-horses, whom males bet on to win or lose," a more nefarious picture is painted (Henke 25). It's not that he is literally betting on horses; he is betting on those who he likens to horses, which is made obvious by his interest in the slavey's payment to Corley for retention of his favors. The squire though is not simply relying on the knight for his money, but is also learning how to be such a "knight," as is implied by Joyce's dubbing of Lenehan as Corley's "disciple." He too profits via exploitation and is being tutored in how to exploit women for sex and money. Lenehan then, as implied in the opening scene of the tale, is "on the path" with Corley, but as he is from time to time forced into "the road," he also departs from Corley's "philosophy."

In this light then, Lenehan's epiphany bears discussion within the realm of conflicted masculinity. His poverty of purse and spirit brings him to his epiphanous moment, wherein he realizes that he "was tired of knocking about, of pulling the devil by the tail, of shifts and intrigues... Would he never get a good job?" (Joyce 57). His shirking of general responsibility, his unemployment, and his providing for himself through chicanery has proven empty and unfulfilling; the exploitation of others leaves him desiring something more. Lenehan essentially questions his refusal to "be a man" in Ireland, to be an adult, functioning within the societal parameters of his community, an act which necessitates his forgoing the exploitation of others.

“He had walked the streets long enough with friends and with girls. He knew what those friends *were worth*: he knew the girls too” (Joyce 58 – emphasis added). His friends, those girls on and off the Circular, are reduced to a base value (commercialization and commoditization), a value that is beneath that which Lenehan himself aspires for; continuing to exploit them will never net what Lenehan suddenly realizes he wants. He knows he can never rise out of the station he is firmly situated in through his gifting lifestyle. “Would he never have a home of his own? He though how pleasant it would be to have a warm fire to sit bay and a good dinner to sit down to” (Joyce 57-58). Lenehan knows he will have to break company, break from his current cycle of exploitation of all acquaintances if he is to ever hope for such a thing. Then he realizes that he “might yet be able to settle down in some snug corner and live happily if he could only come across some good simple-minded girl with a little of the ready” (Joyce 58). Lenehan has realized that happiness will continue to elude him should he persist “down the path” with Corley, should he remain an immature exploiter. His unhappiness essentially boils down to his rejection of sullied traditional masculine gallantry. To take “the road” and get a job, a home, and a wife is to take on the traditional masculine roles of provider, protector, and husband. Lenehan is certainly not an affable character, although in light of his epiphany, there seems to be hope for his redemption.

Closing out Joyce’s take on “adolescence” is “The Boarding House;” a story which when paired with “Eveline,” serves to bookend the section with depictions of the Madonna/whore dichotomy. Eveline the virginal nineteen year-old girl incapable of shirking her self-imposed paralysis is paired with the seemingly conniving nineteen year-old Polly Mooney who aided by her mother’s shrewd ways, is propelled into a marriage of convenience. Also returning for expansion is the exploitation through sex of the previous tale, “Two Gallants,” which, similar to

the inversion of “Eveline,” is treated from a perspective wherein the apparent victim of prior exploitation is here the exploiter. The manipulator of before has rather overtly become Mrs. Mooney, whom “the resident young men spoke of ... as *The Madam*” (Joyce 62). Her exploitation is not simply through arranging sex; it is more so her pretense of adhering to ideals of sexual purity, all the while maneuvering her daughter and Doran into sexual compromise as a means of entrapment. The madam exploits the religious, social, and civil mores which surround and enshroud said act. Mrs. Mooney, a butcher’s daughter and a butcher’s wife, was a “determined woman,” “a big imposing woman,” and most notably she “governed her house cunningly and firmly” (Joyce 62-63). This being the case, the woman is quite aware of the relationship between her exploitative/exploited daughter Polly and the exploited Bob Doran. While a shrewd business woman, the Madam also “dealt with moral problems as a cleaver deals with meat,” she of course being the cleaver (Joyce 64). As the wife and daughter of butchers, Mrs. Mooney certainly has an awareness of the importance of the presentation of her wares, to entice and allure potential customers through displaying one’s commodities. For the butchers, those goods were various meats; for the Madam, it is her daughter who she displayed like a piece of meat.

The reader is introduced to Polly as “a perverse little madonna,” “the Madam’s daughter, [who] would also sing... *I’m a... naughty girl. You needn’t sham: You know I am*” (Joyce 62). The girl is sexualized; the sing-song claim of wayward morality or vulgarity (of which Bob Doran later notes), coupled with the other-acknowledgement of awareness of said naughtiness, and lastly the implication of the anti-madonna status all serve to present the girl as quite aware of her feminine wiles and as sexually aware. She is a commodity within the commercialized sexual marketplace, a good to be bought or sold. The Madam seeking to secure an economic advantage

for Polly (and, of course, herself as well), encourages this and further commodifies her own daughter. Mrs. Mooney, acutely aware of what transpires under her roof, and under the guise of a protector of feminine purity encourages and enables Polly; her “intention was to give [Polly] the run of the young men,” to flirt and woo and hopefully secure herself a husband (Joyce 63). Enter Bob Doran.

Doran “was a serious young man, not rakish or loud-mouthed,” who “had been employed for thirteen years in a great Catholic wine-merchant’s office” (Joyce 65). His age of “thirty-four or thirty-five” sets him as something of a counterpoint to Lenehan of “Two Gallants.” Doran is Lenehan’s honorable, stable antithesis. He is gainfully employed, set upon a certain path, and does not earn a living by exploiting acquaintances (Joyce 64). Doran functions as a counterpoint to Lenehan by realizing his own encroaching maturity; whereas Lenehan rallies against the impending maturity with his young man’s costume, Doran accepts it and moves towards it. “As a young man he had sown his wild oats, of course; he had boasted of his free-thinking and denied the existence of God to his companions in the public house... but that was all passed and done with... nearly” (Joyce 66). It can certainly be inferred that Doran is only pretending to accept the responsibilities of maturity, what with his attention to regular religious duties and a regular life for “nine-tenths of the year” (Joyce 66). That other one-tenth of the year is presumably the time frame wherein he finds himself entrapped by the machinations of the Madam, when he allows his socially imposed sanctions of maturity to ease and his status as adolescent to reign. His first internal conflict occurs when he cannot establish his status as adolescent or mature adult; his second conflict regards how he might act in relation to that each. Should he shirk societal mores as an adolescent or succumb to societal expectations due to his adolescent folly and act as a mature adult?

“The sin was there,” Doran and Polly had pre-marital sexual relations; she was a fallen woman in the general eyes of her society. “[H]is sense of honor told him that reparations must be made” (Joyce 67). The Madam had bet on this turn of events, and all was coming out in her favor; “she was sure she would win... she had the weight of social opinion on her side” (Joyce 64). “The intimidated Doran is far too weak and pusillanimous to challenge” that aforementioned weight, asserts Henke (27). Yet that seems to be a bit of a miscalculation on Henke’s part. Certainly there is a necessarily implied timidity to the cornered Doran and yes, that reluctance to challenge the social mores of his time could be considered weak; yet it seems to discount the character as a whole. Doran is presented as a largely honorable man, whose transgression has led to his entrapment by a nefarious Madam and her well positioned though silly, vulgar, daresay insipid daughter; but it is his own sense of duty as regards societal conventions (eluding the impending threat of physical violence), filtered through and informed by his station in society which prevents him from attempting an escape. Not wholly unlike Eveline, his sense of duty and honor, forces him to attempt reparations. He “longed to ascend through the roof and fly away to another country where he would never again hear of his trouble, and yet a force pushed him downstairs... the implacable faces of his employer and of the Madam” (Joyce 68). While he wants to escape, Dublin and all of its morality settle upon him, religious and societal expectations in the guise of the wine merchant, the pretense of sexual purity in Mrs. Mooney. Should he run and not marry Polly, Mrs. Mooney would slanderously tie him to a fallen “innocent” girl in a house that “was beginning to get a certain fame;” his reputation would be destroyed, his employer the great *Catholic* wine-merchant would certainly oust him from his station on account of such a transgression (Joyce 66). Escaping would mean social ostracism and a loss of respectability; staying means self-sacrifice at the altar of warped

ideal of sexual purity of women. Ergo, Doran's social identity and self-image along with it would be destroyed; not to mention he would be forced to compromise his own cultivated sense of honor. Too there is the problematic appearance of his wedding the girl: she is vulgar and has a disreputable father. His friends would laugh at her improper grammar; "sometimes she said *I seen* and *If I had've known*," her parentage puts her beneath Doran in the social schema of Dublin (Joyce 66). Doran is timid and cowardly perhaps, but certainly trapped by his own cage. His sense of duty is the trump card Mrs. Mooney treasures; his own societal expectations are her ace. Regardless of what his every impulse tells him to do, Bob Doran effectively acts in the way in which societal mores deem a Dublin man should act; his conflict is that of adolescence versus maturity. Acting in a socially accepted and expected manner, setting himself in the throes of traditional performative masculine identifiers, Doran chooses maturity. Once Mrs. Mooney plays her card, she gains a respectable son-in-law who will presumably become something like a cash cow for her; at the very, least he takes her daughter off of her hands. Polly gets a husband and leaves her mother's house; but as readers of *Ulysses* later learn, she apparently becomes her mother. In the "Cyclops" episode "Doran will be a henpecked, irascible, and alcoholic spouse, portrayed on 16 June 1904 indulging in one of his periodical binges of drinking and whoring to escape connubial dreariness" (Henke 29). Thus the story of entrapment is given an even more bitter closure.

MATURITY

Introducing Joyce's depiction of befuddled masculine identity in maturity is a pair of stories entitled "A Little Cloud" and "Counterparts." While the two stories appear on the surface to be quite different, the stations depicted of Little Chandler and Farrington are notably similar. The two men are at the very least near the same age, are the bread-winners in their family, and renege on (to varying degrees) their obligations and expectations. Also of note is that both stories follow the same structure; the protagonist is introduced at his job, post-work he ensconces himself in a public house, and post-bar hopping, he returns to his home. And yet, for all their similarities Little Chandler and Farrington could not be more different, most notably in their performances of masculinity. Where Farrington functions as being exemplary of the hyper-masculine "man of action," Chandler counters as the hyper-effeminate thinker; they truly are "counterparts."

Stymied Little Thomas Chandler of "A Little Cloud" finds his first counterpart in his friend, the continent-travelling shoneen Ignatius Gallaher. Gallaher left Dublin eight years prior to their meeting and "had got on" and become something of "a brilliant figure in the London Press;" in so doing, Gallaher has rejected many of the Irish and Catholic values of Chandler and his ilk, opting instead for a life as an arrogant, morally lax raconteur (Joyce 70-71). Of course the tales Gallaher regales his friend with are over the top, so much so that it appears that the man has only returned to Ireland as a means of bolstering his own inflated ego. Where Chandler aspires to create art which rivals the heights of the Romantic poets, his apparently less loftily-minded although notably talented friend has been willing to apply his writing skills to the less esteemed realm of mass media; where Chandler thinks himself squandered because of inactivity, his counterpart has been willing to dare to squander and thereby has found some semblance of

success through the written word. Little Chandler has only fantasized about his lofty poems and odes; all that he has crafted is the fictional laudatory reviews of the theoretical poems he is theoretically capable of producing. Gallaher the successful one by contrast, wears his continental allegiance around his neck; his orange tie is exemplary of his dedication to England (or at the very least, the protestant Northern Irish, a theme to be regarded more closely with “Counterparts”). The intercontinental roué takes the opportunity of meeting with his old friend to belittle the little man and his lot in life while touting the licentiousness and corruption of a world Chandler can never know. Gallaher depicts a world morally at odds with the oppressively pious homeland that is Dublin and Ireland-proper; he also renders his own pride-soaked cosmopolitanism moot, describing his newfound stomping grounds, the capitals of the world and their immorality, with a simple wave and assertion that they are all merely “six of one and half-a-dozen of the other” (Joyce 77). Yet Little Chandler cannot see that, nor can he see past his friend’s exaggerated worldliness, his daring, and his opportunity; magnified and reflected back upon himself is his own provincialism, paralysis, missed opportunity, and finally his own failure to turn the written word into profit. He embodies Irish nationalist values, Gallaher the new shoneen mores; where Chandler has responsibilities, his friend has none.

Chandler is depicted as a somewhat effeminate and prudish character, a depiction which is further magnified when posed alongside his seemingly hyper-sexual, misogynistic friend.

He was called Little Chandler because, though he was but slightly under the average stature, he gave one the idea of being a little man. His hands were white and small, his frame was fragile, his voice was quiet and his manners were refined. He took the greatest care of his fair silken hair and moustache and used perfume discreetly on his handkerchief. The half-moons of his nails were perfect and when he smiled you caught a glimpse of a row of childish white teeth. (Joyce 70)

There is no hint that the meticulous little man has any conventionally “manly” tendencies; his stature, his apparent vanity, his fragility, his kemptness, his “refined air,” all seem to set him apart from stereotypically physical/masculine pursuits. He is presented as almost stunted in his physical development by his “childish white teeth” and diminutive stature. His punctilious tendencies- his silken hair care, perfect nails, and discreetly perfumed handkerchief- are all more in line with conventionally feminine inclinations than masculine proclivities. Yet even with his careful and meticulous tendencies, Little Chandler is demonstrated as being somewhat dreamy or lost in his own thoughts such as when “he pursued his reverie so ardently that he passed his street and had to turn back” and later on in the story when also entranced by his “reverie,” he neglects to procure a parcel of coffee for his wife (Joyce 74). In the first instance wherein Little Chandler’s absent-mindedness is noted, his mind is focused on his aspiration to become a critically acclaimed poet of the downhearted and disenchanting, one that could translate the Irish experience to verse so well that the “English critics, perhaps, would recognize him as one of the Celtic school by reason of the melancholy tone of his poems; besides that, he would put in allusions” (Joyce 74). His characterization, inclinations, and aspirations, all serve to paint Little T. Malone Chandler as an effete intellectual, cowed by traditionally patriarchal responsibilities for which he is ill-equipped. The question that arises though is what is it that suppresses his development and prevents him from producing the poems he yearns to create?

The first hint at why Little Chandler has failed to succeed as a poet is his discussion with Gallaher regarding their former group of friends:

- I met some of the old gang to-day, said Ignatius Gallaher. O'Hara seems to be in a bad way. What's he doing?
- Nothing, said Little Chandler. He's gone to the dogs.

- But Hogan has a good sit, hasn't he?
- Yes; he's in the Land Commission.
- I met him one night in London and he seemed to be very flush.... Poor O'Hara! Boose, I suppose?
- Other things, too, said Little Chandler shortly. (Joyce 75)

Of the noted foursome, the duo of Gallaher and Hogan have adopted shoneen values and achieved some measure of success; the Land Commission is a program created and sponsored by the British government. As Chandler notes, “There was no doubt about it: if you wanted to succeed, you had to go away” (Joyce 73). Whether that “going away” is physical or social, success seems to elude those who “stay” or refuse to dally with shoneen values. Little Chandler and O’Hara then, in their retained Irish loyalties, have not realized that success. “Boose” and “other things” have led O’Hara “to the dogs,” meaning he has lost his finer attributes and has wound up possibly homeless, likely destitute, and incapable of prosperity. Intemperate consumption of alcohol, as was shown through Jimmy in “After the Race” and shall be demonstrated later, has for Joyce a detrimental effect on the construction of masculinity; often drunkenness hinders one’s capacity for actualizing an ideal masculinity. O’Hara has fallen prey to a prototypical Irish stereotype of compromised masculinity, that of alcoholism. Little Chandler however is something of a teetotaler; alcoholism is not his downfall; instead his is more attributable to his allegiance to a simplified version of traditional Irish masculinity.

Where Gallaher has bought into and is enacting his own version of shoneen values of success, and with them a disparate masculine image, Little Chandler has adhered to a traditionally Irish, adult, masculine image of success. Gallaher’s masculinity is a gaudy one replete with exploitation, conquest, dominance, and independence as means to self betterment; his is a supposed sense of supremacy based largely on a financial superiority, ergo his

disparaging treatment of Little Chandler. Gallaher depicts the world of his accomplishments as immoral and one of excess, necessarily implying that success in that realm is depraved and debased; Chandler asserts that “there was something vulgar in his friend” and his friend’s crudity “did not please him” (Joyce 76). Gallaher’s version of masculine success is largely incongruous with the traditional Irish image of successful masculinity to which Little Chandler had subscribed to early on. The masculinity to which the Irishman ascribed was steeped in patriarchal Irish traditions and within that, Catholic dogma. In its simplest form, that traditional Irish masculinity to which Little Chandler adheres is that of responsible provider, of husband and father. In this situation though, Little Chandler is only superficially enacting these traditional masculine roles, for which he appears ill-equipped to compensate for his diminutive stature and less masculine tendencies. The conflicted masculinity then is Little Chandler’s own desires running at odds and stunted by Irish society’s concept of what defines a “man.” He is forced to perform roles he does not want, roles which trap him and thus leave him full of resentment and envy.

Little Chandler’s exacting, punctilious nature not only belies effeminate tendencies, it also points towards a heightened sense of the importance of appearance. His meticulous concern for how both his mien and his grander sense of self are perceived is demonstrated not only through his attention to detail in regards his personal hygiene and manners, but also through his interactions with others. His reticence to read poetry to his wife is chalked up to mere “shyness,” however further evidence points towards Little Chandler’s reluctance as predicated upon how such an action would be perceived by others, in this case, his wife (Joyce 71). The reading of poetry would certainly veer from the conventionally masculine, as it is more of an intellectual act than a physical one. When he enters Corless’s to meet with Gallaher, as he glances around the

bar, he frowns as though “to make his errand appear *serious*” (Joyce 74 - emphasis added). Feeling out of place, as though the people were “observing him curiously,” Little Chandler strives to give his patronage of the establishment an air of importance, as though it were not a pleasure for him to be there meeting a friend; instead it was a duty of importance and gravity which led him to enter into such an establishment (Joyce74). Sobriety has apparently always been a part of Little Chandler’s life, one foregone only in the presence of others: “I drink very little as a rule... An odd half-one or so when I meet any of the old crowd” (Joyce 75). Drinking in this instance is a performance which Little Chandler enacts only in social situations, the implication being that it is expected for a man to drink while out with friends. That it is only done when with “the old crowd” suggests that it is a heteronormative act, an identifier amongst and between them which the man takes part in as a means of demonstrating a shared similarity with other men.

The most overt presentation of a conflict of appearance of masculinity for the little man regards his purchase of a blouse for his wife Annie:

It had cost him ten and elevenpence; but what an agony of nervousness it had cost him! How he had suffered that day, waiting at the shop door until the shop was empty, standing at the counter and trying to appear at his ease while the girl piled ladies' blouses before him, paying at the desk and forgetting to take up the odd penny of his change, being called back by the cashier, and finally, striving to hide his blushes as he left the shop by examining the parcel to see if it was securely tied. (Joyce 82)

Little Chandler is embarrassed about purchasing an article of women’s clothing; fearing that said purchase will be perceived as for his own personal use, and mark him as a cross-dresser.

Purchasing an article of women’s clothing, even for his wife, is not a masculine act for Little

Chandler. His performance makes him appear to be less masculine, as he is enacting a feminine role in this instance; his concern for appearing, for performing as masculine then is intensified.

Little Chandler's anxiety over the performance of masculine actions can be carried over to his home life as well. The depicted interactions with Annie reveal a troubled relationship, one which serves to paint Little Chandler as an ineffectual husband. His inability to recall the one meager favor his wife has asked of him leads to tense dealings between the two. The scenes depict a hostile household, one in which Little Chandler resents his wife (and son), and one in which Annie is solicitous of her child and unconcerned with her husband. The politics of the hearth have allowed something of an "Oedipal ascendancy" wherein Annie as Queen of the house turns all her "female affection and solicitude to the boy-baby who has symbolically displaced his impotent father," crowning the child *her* "little man... Mamma's little lamb of the world" (Henke 31, Joyce 85 – emphasis added). The "Little man" Little Chandler has been displaced from his role as "man of the house" by Little Chandler. Little Chandler only fallaciously performs the roles of husband and father, and is quite ineffective at performing both. Joyce makes Chandler's total disenchantment with domestic bliss and his concern over appearance quite clear when the little man compares Annie to the furniture "he had bought for his house on the hire system" (Joyce 83). Both are "prim and pretty," but still "cold" and "mean" (Joyce 83). Where the hired furniture appears to make the house a home, Annie and their child appear to make Little Chandler a husband and a father; but most importantly they make him appear traditionally masculine.

Back at the bar Chandler had decried his friend Gallaher as "his inferior in birth and education. He was sure that he could do something better than his friend had ever done, or could ever do, something higher than mere tawdry journalism" (Joyce 80). Calling his friend vulgar

and feeling debased, he had lashed out with an attempt to “assert his masculinity” (Joyce 80). “Some day you will [get married],” he intoned as his means of defending his masculinity against the roué. That he has taken on the traditional role of husband and father is Little Chandler’s most persuasive means of asserting his own masculinity; they are his clearest masculine identifiers. But as his interactions with his wife and child demonstrate, he is hardly much of either; he fails in the roles. By his “appearing” masculine by “appearing” to be a father and husband, he attempts to assert his masculinity, but instead does so impotently. Little Chandler’s masculine performances fail to bolster his masculine self image.

Little Chandler’s disillusionment with his life and his awareness of his own feigned masculinity is made evident as the story closes and the “tears of remorse started to his eyes” (Joyce 85). He only appears masculine through sham performances; his masculine self image is one of a carefully constructed fantasy; he is the great poet, lauded by critics for his “Irishness” only in a delicately engineered daydream. Little Chandler insulates himself from the harsh reality he has created with these fantasies; that manufactured reality reciprocates by squelching the possibility of realizing his fantasies, thus his tears of remorse. When he attempts to read poetry while caring for his son, the child’s crying wrenches him from “the rhythm of the verse... the melancholy of his soul” and evokes the realization that “It was useless. He couldn’t read. He couldn’t do anything... He was a prisoner for life” in a cage he had built for himself (Joyce 84). There will be no poems for the husband/father. Little Gallaher’s fantasies and intellectual pursuits are stunted by his assumption of societal expectations of what it takes to “be a man.” What’s worse, while he can only imagine himself to be the great poet, he also can only play at being a husband and father; the masculine identifiers he aspires to are equally as elusive as his great poem.

As though Little Chandler had not been made little enough through “A Little Cloud,” Joyce has one final stab at him with the inclusion of the poem he reads while holding his son. Lord Byron’s “On the Death of a Young Lady” is “a piece of juvenilia that reeks with artificial diction... [and] Chandler had no notion of what a bad poem” it was (Beck 175-176). Notably, the poem is seen as so inferior to the rest of Byron’s verse that even the poem’s author saw fit to ask for an indulgence from his audience for its publication. Yet Little Chandler aspires to reproduce the melancholy in his own verse of a fourteen year-old boy who would grow to be a renowned rake, an infamous roué, and eventually write the epic poem *Don Juan*.

Following Little Chandler, the reader is presented with his antithesis, the brutal Farrington, a product of the conflict of masculine identities that came about with the transition from predominately insular agrarian communities to a more continental, urban society of Dublin-proper, i.e. - colonialized Ireland. Farrington is essentially a throwback to that un-industrialized way of life, cast adrift in the modern world; he functions as a counterpoint to Little Chandler’s diminutive intellectual who assumes identifiers to define masculinity. Farrington adheres to a more traditional construction of masculinity which emphasizes the display of strength and power. The character is also instrumental in illustrating Joyce’s professed intention in writing *Dubliners*: to tell the truth as he saw it about his homeland and to stand against the gross misrepresentation inherent in sentimentalized Irish nationalism, which he felt distorted conditions and led people into despair over the conditions of their lives. “I am nauseated by their lying drivel about pure men and pure women and spiritual love forever: blatant lying in the face of truth” he noted (*Letters of James Joyce* 191-192). One would be hard pressed to find a less sympathetic character than Farrington.

A single sentence which is found towards the end of the story calls for early mention as it is essentially the spectral cloud that lingers over all the preceding actions and with that, Farrington's masculinity.

His wife was a little sharp-faced woman who bullied her husband when he was sober and was bullied by him when he was drunk. (Joyce 97)

The reciprocal abuse in his domestic sphere is then mitigated by alcohol consumption. Farrington dominates his wife when he is intoxicated; in sobriety, she dominates him. Patriarchal gender roles of hearth and home then hinge upon his inebriation; who serves as "the man of the house" and who is the subordinate are necessarily tied to the man's drinking. Certainly this does not justify his brutality; it does however in some way serve to explain his drinking.

Farrington is depicted as little more than a drunken Irishman, coming up short at every turn, be it socializing or at his job. He is debased, exploited, and damned to failure by reliance on alcohol. He is bullied when sober, he is the bully when drunk; his wife dominates and thus feminizes him when he is not intoxicated. His ability to assert his masculinity is hindered by sobriety and enabled by drunkenness; his masculine identity then is predicated on his inebriation. To assess his conflicted masculinity, it is necessary to examine his sobriety or lack thereof. Alcohol becomes a part of his enacted masculinity, and with that, a kind of masculine currency for Farrington.

Also of important note is the story's title "Counterparts," a word with varied definitions, two of which serve to illuminate Farrington's struggle towards masculinity. According to *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary* the first, more traditional definition being "one having the same

function or characteristics as another” nods to Farrington as a man of a certain ilk; in this case he functions as emblematic of a certain set of fathers and husbands, in a colonized Ireland.

“Counterpart” is also defined as “one of two corresponding copies of a legal instrument.” This definition points towards Farrington’s job as a transcriptionist in the law offices of Crosbie & Alleyne. This second, more specialized definition is of equal importance with regard to masculinity as the first. Farrington’s job is to copy, to take what has been written before and reproduce it unaltered; this is not simply his job, but it is also his comportment. Yet Farrington, in his job and in his life, is incapable of properly reproducing that to which he aspires. He attempts to replicate what came before, perpetuating prior values and merely copying the past; in his case, the traditional image of masculinity is drunkenly mis-reproduced.

Throughout the story, Farrington is presented in three distinct arenas: his office, the public houses, and his home. In each setting, his masculinity is challenged, albeit in a different way, respective to the social sphere inhabited and the masculine values each promotes. In his job, Farrington is an underling and thus supposed to be submissive to Mr. Alleyne, “a little man,” “pink and hairless,” with “gold-rimmed glasses” and a “piercing North of Ireland accent” (Joyce 86-87). Mr Alleyne is clean, kempt, orderly, markedly upper-class (the glasses), and decidedly shoneen (North Ireland being aligned with the British). Perhaps too eloquent to be directly attributed to Farrington, but succinct nonetheless, “he perceives his employer Mr. Alleyne as a castrating phallographic figure, an Anglo-Irish boss whose breed has raped Mother Ireland and continues to hold her sons hostage to a capitalistic production and alienated, feminized labor” (Henke 32). By contrast, Farrington “was tall and of great bulk,” with a “dark wine-coloured... hanging face,” mustachioed, “his eyes bulged forward slightly and the whites of them were dirty” (Joyce 86). He is impoverished enough by the middle of the month that he is forced to sell

his watch in order to go out drinking; he is hulking, unkempt, dirty, ruddy, and degenerating due to alcohol consumption. In the agrarian Ireland of the past, Farrington would be the dominant entity in his relationship with Mr. Alleyne (akin to the traditional dominance granted a husband under patriarchy), brute strength being on his side. However the social hierarchy of the office, a microcosm of the business world and British by association, runs counter to such a model of power distribution and serves to feminize the underling. As counterparts, Mr. Alleyne and Farrington depict the old and the new, the shoneen and the traditionalist. They have two distinct systems of value based upon the social hierarchies they bring with them. The office with its strict structure runs counter to world of the public houses. In the office, power is rigidly enforced; there is a clear delineation predicated on perceived intellectual capacity, coupled with order and based on the concrete and the written word. In the public houses, the hierarchy is much more fluid, bordering on chaotic. In Farrington's social realm, the public houses, dominance is established by the man with the best story or the strongest forearm. Preserving and respecting the old values of agrarian Ireland, physical strength and the recitation of stories serve as the principal currencies of this hierarchy. Nowhere is the delineation between old and new values made clearer throughout the pages of *Dubliners* than in the distinction made in "Counterparts."

Farrington and Mr. Alleyne's two interactions bear discussion. In their first interaction, Farrington is on the receiving end of Mr. Alleyne's barrage of rebukes and insults; Farrington's every reply is punctuated with a "sir," but underscored with "a spasm of rage" and a wondering at the fragility of Alleyne's "polished skull" (Joyce 87). Farrington's "sirs" function as feigned respect towards his superior in this specific setting; the underlying rage and ponderings of violence however, speak to his own brutal nature and his insulted masculinity. As he is bullied

at home, so too is he bullied at work, his masculinity assailed by his wife, his masculinity assaulted by the lesser man. In both situations, Farrington's perception of masculinity is steeped in tradition based on patriarchal values and agrarian identifiers of strength. The end result of this interaction for Farrington however is one of "a sharp sensation of thirst... he must have a good night's drinking" (Joyce 87). As in his home, he is capable of asserting his dominance and with it his idea of masculinity only when intoxicated, and this challenge to his manliness is a justification for drinking. A rush to the corner bar for a "glass of plain porter" downed in a mere gulp, and Farrington returns to his office where his ineptitude at menial office labor, exacerbated or caused by drink, evokes more thoughts of violence. Again he is confronted by Alleyne, this time with a "tirade of abuse... so bitter and violent" that Farrington can hardly restrain himself from lashing out violently (Joyce 91). The change here is that Alleyne is acting out his masculinity and dominance over the physically stronger Farrington in order to impress Miss Delacour, who sits to the side watching; Alleyne is attempting to demonstrate to her that in this environment, he is the dominant male wielding all the power and is capable of berating an underling who physically dwarfs him. Farrington, having procured his liquid masculinity, let's slip with a turn of phrase and infers his superior is "a fool." The presence of Miss Delacour is arguably a factor in this assertion of supremacy as well; where Alleyne has paraded his masculinity before her, so too must Farrington. His retort, while directed at Alleyne, is said while Farrington is looking at the woman, implying that it is for her that he makes it. The folly of his enactment of masculinity is to make the office "a hornet's nest" in order to impress a woman and redeem his self-esteem and emasculated masculinity.

Following his abject apology to his boss, Farrington makes his way through a series of public houses, the sphere of society which still respects the values of the pre-colonized, agrarian

Ireland. Again, contrary to the Anglicized business realm, the world of the bars is where the Irish working class of Dublin holds onto a version of masculinity that still reflects its traditional standards. Where the business world appreciates rigid structure and insistence on the written word as proof, Farrington's public houses maintain a fluid hierarchy reliant on the oral tradition and prize physical strength above all else. The cheeky, physically-able Farrington, impotent and stymied in the office, is here rendered virile. Certainly it helps that the environment lends itself to drinking, but the fluid nature of the realm's social hierarchy and respect within it can be quite fickle even for those who, like Farrington, exemplify traditional masculine values.

Farrington is first stood drinks for his recounting of his altercation with Alleyne, the story mildly elaborated: "So I just looked at him – coolly, you know, and looked at her. Then I looked at him again – taking my time, you know. *I don't think that's a fair question to put to me*, says I" (Joyce 93). Mild elaborations for mild adulations while on a continued quest towards inebriation. Boasts are made of similar stories, yet Farrington's version of events is regarded as superior and more drinks are stood to him; the currency of his tale buys him the retrieval of his masculinity. Farrington's confrontation of the man Henke referred to as a "phallocratic-Anglo-Irish-rapist" is rewarded and appreciated; he is subservient in the office but dominant in the public house. Yet all is not well in the sphere of the colonized, and Farrington's restored masculine identity is again emasculated. Once again his defeat is at the hands of the colonizers and this time his emasculation occurs in the only place Farrington feels assured of his masculine dominance.

From the moment he appears on the bar circuit, Weathers the English "acrobat and knockabout *artiste*," begins exploiting the Irishmen who welcome him (Joyce 94). He asks to be stood whiskey paired with a German mineral water "Apollinaris" in the reciprocal give and take

of standing drinks; he returns the favor with “just one little tincture at his expense” (Joyce 94). His protest that standing drinks for one another is “too Irish” is affirmed; as the representative colonizer, he exploits that reciprocation to his own benefit, returning the favor with meager repayment (Joyce 94). It is through Weathers’ introduction to the group, that the others note that Farrington could not take advantage of Weathers’ offer to meet the performing girls at the Tivoli on account of his being married; his drinking buddies chide him for this. His stature among his fellow drinkers is lowered on account of his being the butt of the joke, and he is quite aware of this slip in his standing in the social hierarchy of the bar. When he notices the woman in the big hat, he gazes “admiringly” at her; he’s fascinated by her and they lock eyes; he believes that there does exist some unspoken connection between the two of them and is chaffed when she bumps his chair and says “*O, pardon!* in a London accent” but does not turn to meet his gaze as she leaves Mulligan’s (Joyce 95). Chided by the amusement he has provided his friends on account of an exploitative Englishman, and embarrassed by the tacit rebuke of the Englishwoman, Farrington is prepared for his final humiliation: his loss to Weathers. “[T]he national honour” is on the line as the two arm wrestle, and Farrington loses twice (Joyce 95). The English have debased the Ireland proxy Farrington in the one realm where he has normally been guaranteed dominance and unquestioned masculinity.

Joyce sums up the perceived indignities Farrington has faced as he returns home:

A very sullen-faced man stood at the corner of O’Connell Bridge... He was full of smouldering anger and revengefulness. He felt humiliated and discontented; he did not even feel drunk; and he had only twopence in his pocket. He cursed everything. He had done for himself in the office, pawned his watch, spent all his money; and he had not even got drunk. He began to feel thirsty again and he longed to be back again in the hot reeking public-house. He had lost his reputation as a strong man, having been defeated twice by a mere

boy. His heart swelled with fury and, when he thought of the woman in the big hat who had brushed against him and said *Pardon!* his fury nearly choked him. (Joyce 96)

His masculinity vanquished and not even drunk, he faces further humiliation from his wife when he returns home semi-sober. He finds his wife away at church and his son Tom acting in her stead as cook and housekeeper. Unfortunately for Tom, he must serve as his father's subordinate as well. "The climactic scene offers a classic example of aggression-frustration displacement" as all the accumulated rage and fury in Farrington are vented upon his son (Henke 33). He takes on Alleyne's role, mimicking and belittling his son, his underling. For being bested by Weathers, a "mere boy," he beats a mere boy. For the perceived snub by a woman, he drubs the female surrogate. That these indignities came from the British add to their sting. When Farrington savagely beats his son, he is attempting to reaffirm his supremacy, his dominance, his masculinity; his son is simply the only surrogate available. And the cycle of violence will likely continue; Farrington the human copier is copying his own earlier domination. He is reproducing the colonizers' abuse and social domination, not the traditionally inscribed performance of masculinity of father as protector. Corrupting the power he wields from patriarchy, he abuses his son as a means of bolstering his vanquished ego and masculinity. Following the example of the colonizer, Farrington attacks the weak. His destroyed masculinity is displayed as a desperate, debased, and corrupt masculinity that will resort to violence in an attempt to grasp at redemption.

The penultimate story regarding maturity, "Clay" focuses almost exclusively on the character of Maria, a seemingly "contented spinster," and is largely devoid of any facets of a conflicted masculinity (Henke 33). The notable dearth of prominent male characters and masculine traits would appear to render an analysis of the story as futile; this however is not the case. In something of a clandestine manner, Joyce presents the reader with an alternative to the

atavistic Farrington in the character of Joe; it is an admittedly hazy image, and certainly is secondary to the depiction of Maria. Joe, like Farrington is a husband/father figure, apt to drink, and even has an instance of replying to his manager with “a smart answer” (Joyce 104). Since his sass apparently has not rendered the office a “hornet’s nest,” one can only assume that he, for whatever reason, is in good standing with his supervisor. “Joe was a good fellow,” however he “was so different when he took any drink” (Joyce 100). Alcohol has an adverse effect on Joe as well. While Joyce neglects to describe the changes in Joe when he drinks, he is presented throughout the story as drinking.

Another cursory character that appears in the story is that of the “colonel-looking gentleman” who makes room for Maria on the Drumcondra tram; it is this gentleman that causes Maria to note “how easy it was to know a gentleman even when he has a drop taken” (Joyce 103). This older gentleman contrasts with the young men on the tram, as they seem to take no notice of Maria and make no move to offer her a seat. The man appears to be honorable, giving Maria a seat, chatting innocuously with her; he seems to be something of a throwback to gallantry, the young men (the new gallants) unconcerned with the spinster on the tram. When Maria later discovers that her plum cake has gone missing, and recalls “how confused the gentleman with the grayish moustache had made her,” the implication is that he had pinched the plum cake (Joyce 103). The man has merely enacted the role of the courtly gallant, when in fact he is a drunkard using chivalry to pilfer a bite to eat.

While the reader is not allowed access to the character of Joe in such a way as was allowed with Farrington, certain conclusions can be drawn from his depiction. Much is made of the past and more importantly Joe’s severe estrangement from his brother Alphy; the conditions of their rift are again left unnoted. As the story concludes, Joe is noticeably moved by Maria’s

song; he “said that there was no time like the long ago and no music for him like poor old Balfe... and his eyes filled up so much with tears that he could not find what he was looking for” (Joyce 106). This longing for the past implies a loss; that it is a song by Balfe, an Irish composer and writer of *The Bohemian Girl* (tying back to “Eveline”) is doubly important (“Balfe”). First the rhyming of the name Balfe with Alphy implies a tie, tenuous or not; it is a song of remembrance and loss, mingled with hope. Alphy is the one “loss” in Joe’s life about which the reader is made acutely aware. Secondly Balfe cements the song in Irish tradition. When Joe notes that there was “no time like the long ago,” he is noting that there has been a shift away from the traditions of the past; he has departed from and rues the loss of what he recalls as a better time. This shift has moved him to tears and his emotions are given voice because of his inebriation. While traditionally men “were schooled to fear” displays of emotion, swayed by nostalgia and alcohol, Joe gives way to his emotions (Stearns 29). The masculine performance of stoicism is breached by his inebriation.

Unlike Maria, the sad woman who regrets her unmarried state, “A Painful Case” presents a discontented, aging, isolated bachelor in the figure of James Duffy. In many ways Duffy appears to be not simply Maria’s counterpart, but also what could pass as a possible outcome for the boy narrator of “The Sisters” should he continue down the path laid out for him by Father Flynn. Duffy is an isolated man; he “had neither companions nor friends, church nor creed,” forgoing all those for the ordered and esoteric life of the “saturnine” academic/philosopher (Joyce 108-109). There is order in his simple existence: no pictures on his walls, no frivolities, no deviations from his routine; his life is presented as rigidly self-enforced regulations, to the point that the only “dissipations of his life” are based on his liking for Mozart and his attending

concerts or operas featuring the composer's music (Joyce 109). His "life rolled out evenly – an adventureless tale" (Joyce 109).

Duffy is also an egotist, deeming himself to be superior to the common Irishman; as a member of the Irish Socialist party, he found the workmen "were too timorous; the interest they took in the question of wages was inordinate... they were hard-featured realists and that they resented an exactitude which was the product of a leisure not within their reach" (Joyce 112). Duffy's assessment sets him even further apart from the concrete and ordinary, and further into the esoteric, in that he decries these men as "realists" for their concern over wages, a justifiable concern for men working as providers concerned with immediate needs. By finding fault with working men Duffy justifies his isolation and monkish existence. He is superior, theoretically. But it is not in his enactments of masculinity that he is dominant, for Duffy "lived at a little distance from his body" (Joyce 108). This is not to say that his gender is defined by his physical body, informed perhaps though certainly not defined. His body and therefore his sex are simply ballast in his pursuit of arcane enlightenment; sexual desire is only another unnecessary impediment to his intellectual life. In stepping back from his body, removing himself from it, Duffy not only de-sexes himself, he also de-genders himself through, figuratively speaking, a sort of psychological castration. He is neither masculine nor feminine, more a self-made eunuch through his repression, ironically enabled in his intellectual pursuits by the fact that his "maleness" allows him the self-reliance not afforded to characters such as Maria.

Courtesy of a dissipation of his life, the eunuch meets Emily Sinico who is a "sensitive, passionate, and defiant figure who might well be expected to question the puritanical practices of 'dear dirty Dublin,'" and who in turn becomes his pupil, confessor, and nurturer (Henke 35). She is the one person who can penetrate the theoretical armor in which Duffy has encased

himself. She too has been de-sexed in her life; her daughter of marrying age is commonly “out giving music lessons” and her husband “had dismissed his wife so sincerely from his gallery of pleasures that he did not suspect anyone else would take an interest in her” (Joyce 110). Her roles as wife and mother have been rendered negligible, and all female erotic pleasures have been denied her. She has been turned away from the sexual in the concrete, making her an ideal counterpart to the man who has been de-sexed in the insubstantial; this makes their relationship ever more problematic. Each has certain preconceptions at the outset of their relationship which are counter to the other’s expectations.

Duffy sees the relationship as something akin to a tutor/tutee rapport, Sinico being the rapt and apt pupil; he “lent her books, provided her with ideas, shared his intellectual life with her” (Joyce 110). In his narcissism, he attempts to shape her into a mirror image of himself and sees her as such; Duffy projects the thoughts he propounds on her in order to see them reflected back upon himself tenfold. He remains detached, reminding himself, “We cannot give ourselves... we are our own” (Joyce 111). Sinico sees the relationship as something different, more of a nurturing bond; applying herself to it “with *almost* maternal solicitude... she became his confessor” (Joyce 110- emphasis added). Like the Uncle in “The Sisters,” she is attempting to remove her *almost* child from the realm of the abstract and bring him into the physical world, to save the Rosicrucian. Duffy as her almost child is here meant in the Freudian, Oedipal sense; “almost” being as important a word as “child.” Sinico clearly becomes enamored with her Duffy who she nurtures, positioning herself in a maternal yet obsequious position to the man. She “in return for his theories... gave out some fact of her own life,” attempting to bring Duffy into the concrete, returning the favor of his theories with facts and attempting to awaken Duffy’s sensual nature (Joyce 110). In so doing, she tries to rein her quasi-paramour’s tendency to the theoretical

into the real; it is a give and take as each attempts to influence the other with his/her own preoccupations. She encourages him to write down his thoughts and theories, thereby making them concrete; he responds that they are too arcane and enigmatic to be interpreted by those who would confront them, most notably “an obtuse middle class” (Joyce 111). Duffy’s profundities cannot be appreciated by Sinico’s middle class; his ideas, like he, must remain intangible. It is nonetheless a symbiotic relationship. She takes in the knowledge he bequeaths her and acts in a feminine capacity as nurturer; for Duffy the “union exalted him, worn away the rough edges of his character, emotionalised his *mental* life” (Joyce 111 – emphasis added). Each focuses on what the other actually lacks: he remains trapped in the mental, while she concerns herself with the physical.

Their relationship ends when she makes her sensual nature, her physical attraction clear to Duffy. “The end of these discourses was that one night during which she had shown every sign of unusual excitement” to his theories, “Mrs. Sinico caught up his hand passionately and pressed it to her cheek. Mr. Duffy was very much surprised” (Joyce 111). His ethereal ponderings have given rise to her corporeal, erotic reaction, and it shocks him. He, the man who functions apart from his body, is wrenched back into an acute awareness of his body; Mrs. Sinico is not simply a distorted mirror image that likes Mozart and hypothetical discussion, she is a passionate woman. She is enraptured by his mystical, ethereal thoughts and crosses the invisible line. For Sinico, the relationship moves beyond the tacit parameters; not so for Duffy. What had been holy has been sullied by the carnal; their meeting place becomes a “ruined confessional” (Joyce 112). His thoughts are summed up by his scribbled line, “Love between man and man is impossible because there must not be sexual intercourse and friendship between man and woman is impossible because there must be sexual intercourse” (Joyce 112).

Following the dissolution of their relationship, Duffy “returned to his even way of life” and “the orderliness of his mind” (Joyce 112). He re-isolates himself and continues to live outside of his erotic desire in that carefully constructed and manicured world of his mind. New music and new philosophy feed his mind; his consumption is mental and encourages isolation via his adherence to Nietzschean philosophy. Sinico conversely stays in the physical, turning to alcohol as tangible consumption, as a sedative/numbing tool. Even her death is a reminder of her own physicality; it is brought about by “shock and sudden failure of the heart’s action” (Joyce 114). Her death is due to heart failure; however it is induced by physical action (locomotion) and corporeal being (locomotive). That it is a death by such a phallic symbol cannot be ignored. Rejected by all, Mrs. Sinico wants to kill the body and to bring her passionate desires to an end. When Duffy learns of her death from an article in the newspaper, the “vulgarity” of it affronts him: “Not merely had she degraded herself; she had degraded him” by his having shared himself, his thoughts, with her, by his seeing his own reflection in her (Joyce 115). “The lurid nature of her accident ostensibly justifies [for Duffy] a role-reversal that makes him into a judgmental patriarch condemning her violation of a presumed code of honor, a transgression to be sutured by masculine law” (Henke 36-37). But the reversal does not truly make Duffy into a “judgmental patriarch.” He is just a patriarch (as he was already overly judgmental), but his masculinity is bolstered. Duffy notes that thinking over their relationship evokes “alternately the two images in which he now conceived her, he realised that she was dead, that she had ceased to exist, that she had become a memory” (Joyce 116). Her corporeal form gone, she exists only for him in his mind, the same way he wanted her to exist for him in their relationship. His metaphysical aloofness has been rendered moot; he has inadvertently reinscribed his own physical manifestation, the sexualized male in the relationship, by proxy of Mrs. Sinico’s sexualized

female. His admission of her as a physical entity admits his own physicality. She was not simply a reflection of himself, she was a lonely woman; Mrs. Sinico, who was the “one human being [who] had seemed to love him” (Joyce 117). He has remade himself into a man in that momentary realization of Mrs. Sinico’s physical and sensual being. He understands he was always a man who had the opportunity to find love, who rejected it for his own moral code and his pursuit of the ethereal. Re-corporealized and re-sexed, Mr. Duffy has attained a superficial masculine identity. Comfortably isolated up to that moment, at last “[he] felt that he was alone” (Joyce 117). The life he preferred, the scholastic aesthete above all others, has been rendered problematic by his sudden awareness of his own sensual nature. Due solely to his own rejection of and refusal to acknowledge his own desire “[no] one wanted him; he was an outcast from life’s feast” (Joyce 117). Where Mr. Duffy, the man, goes following his epiphany is left open to interpretation.

PUBLIC LIFE

An analysis of conflicted masculinity in Joyce's first tale of public life, "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" becomes problematic, because as Warren Beck notes, the story has a certain "uniqueness in its complete independence of the characters' subjective life... never extending into the dimension of unvoiced thought or feeling" (237-238). Their enactments of masculinity are solely performative and based on social interaction. While elements of the previous stories find further elucidation within the pages of the political tale, certain other aspects need to be factored in, most notably an explicit description of a historical figure and a look towards Joyce's regards of said figure. "Ivy Day" in the title refers to October 6, a day of remembrance for the Irish freedom fighter and Home Rule advocate Charles Stewart Parnell. A member of Parliament, Parnell rallied the Irish to stand united in opposition to British rule, to become independent and self-governed, and to forego "kowtowing to a foreign king" (Joyce 122). The "unyielding man" enthralled his countrymen to the point where he was dubbed "Ireland's 'uncrowned king'" (Ellman 32). Parnell however was undone by what "was always spoken of by his adherents as his betrayal" (Ellman 32). His colleague in Parliament, William O'Shea, named him as his wife's illicit lover in his petition for divorce. Quickly, Parnell's support waned, first within the Catholic church, then with those with whom he had long aligned himself in Parliament, and most notably throughout Ireland; his followers turned their backs, and the "uncrowned king" was dethroned and dead within a year. Although vilified in the end, he was still beloved by many and his contributions to Irish independence were recognized through the introduction of Ivy Day.

Assessing just where Joyce's own sympathies and loyalties (not to mention exaltations) can illuminate the depictions of masculinity in the story. Joyce himself, was enamored with and

supportive of Parnell's efforts. His regard for Parnell was fostered by his father and began at a very young age. At age nine, Joyce penned "a poem denouncing [Parnell's 'lieutenant' Tim] Healy under the title 'Et Tu, Healy,'" of which only seven lines remain; but quite clearly Joyce likens Parnell to Caesar, as Joe Hynes likens him to Christ in his own poem at the conclusion of the story (Ellman 33). Too, this all comes after Healy himself likened the man to Moses (Ellman 32). Joyce's admiration was not short lived, as his biographer notes: "Most young men fancy themselves as Hamlet; Joyce, as later hints make clear, fancied himself a Parnell" (Ellman 32). For Joyce himself, Parnell, the man came to function as a paragon.

Seven characters make an appearance in the titular committee room on that sixth of October; four of them are canvassers for Richard "Tricky Dick" Tierney, one is the caretaker of the room, one is a quasi-priest with no "chapel or church or institution," and the last is Joe Hynes, a supporter of Tierney's competitor Colgan (Joyce 126). The character of Hynes frames the story and serves to function as not just the political counterpoint to the five men, but for the sake of this discussion, their masculine counterpoint as well. The four canvassers are portrayed, each in his own way, as being unsupportive of their candidate of choice; each has his own ulterior motive or justification for soliciting votes for Tierney. As "the representative of the... moderate Nationalists, the Irish Parliamentary Party," Tierney is in line to take a role that has descended from Parnell; the party's perspective has shifted however (Tierney's nomination being indicative of such) in the wake of the uncrowned king's deposing: "the Nationalist zeal once focused under his leadership has been replaced in Irish citizens by a prostituted, shoneen politics that would sell its services to anyone willing to pay for them, regardless of political affiliation or ideology" (Cheng 124). Once Parnell's and now Tierney's party, directly associated with the Irish independence movement has, in that shift, acquired the support of the traditionally unionist

party, the Conservatives, a move that has truly perverted the autonomy the party has long fought for.

The caretaker of the committee room, Old Jack is a man depicted, like so many preceding characters, as perpetuating the past. Speaking of his truculent drunkard son, Old Jack notes that were he not an old man he would “take the stick to his back and beat him” as he once did; yet Old Jack reaps the violence he heaped upon his son for drinking whenever the youth “takes th’upper hand” once he notices his father has “a sup taken;” the unruly son now abuses Old Jack when his father has been drinking (Joyce 120). “Lines of antagonism have been drawn between obstreperous sons and arrogant fathers, powerless progeny and hypocritical authority figures,” representing once again the conflict between powerless Ireland and authoritative England (Henke 38). It is the violence of the oppressor once again reproduced by the oppressed; whoever has the transitory power wields it over the other. What is more, Old Jack implicitly allows a perpetuation of the behavior which brought about the cycle of violence between father and son in someone else’s son by allowing Henchy to tip the delivery boy from the Black Eagle with a bottle of stout. Old Jack notes nonchalantly, “That’s the way it begins,” implying the continuation of drunkenness, or in a moment of cynical prescience, suggesting that the boy will wind up where the canvassers have, selling out Ireland for a pittance and some stout (Joyce 129). Old Jack, instead of attempting to break from a negative cycle, chooses to passively encourage it.

O’Connor, “engaged by Mr. Tierney’s agent to canvass one part of the ward... spent a great part of the day sitting by the fire” with Old Jack (Joyce 119). Not only has he opted against soliciting votes, O’Connor takes to lighting his cigarettes with the pasteboard cards he is supposed to be distributing, demonstrating his lack of concern for the politician’s campaign. He is simply a man attempting to earn money; he is willing to sell his allegiance to whoever is

willing to pay for it. His concern over money parallels his unconcern over the political climate. In response to Hynes, who notes that Tierney is likely to argue for an address of welcome to King Edward, O'Connor replies: "By God! Perhaps you're right Joe... Anyway, I wish he'd turn up with the spondulics" (Joyce 122). His only concern is the "spondulics" or money he is due, not the transparent hypocrisy of the politician he is supporting nor Tierney's compromises of the Nationalist Party ideals with shoneen values.

O'Connor's fellow canvasser Lyons is concerned less with the money and more with the perk of the job, the twelve bottles of stout sent to the committee room in the evening. His first line of dialogue is "Where did the boose come from?" which is followed by O'Connor's laughing retort "O, of course, Lyons spots the drink first!" (Joyce 130). Lyons is the character who points out the double-standard of the Nationalist party's vilification of Parnell when viewed alongside its impending welcoming of King Edward: Parnell was demonized for his part in an extramarital affair while Edward is being lionized for his being "an ordinary knockabout like [the canvassers]... fond of his glass of grog... a bit of a rake" (Joyce 132).

The fourth hire is Crofton, the only canvasser for Tierney who is characterized as having actual political leanings, though his leanings actually do not favor the politician he ostensibly supports. Crofton "had been a canvasser for Wilkins, the Conservative, but when the [overtly unionist] Conservatives had withdrawn their man and, choosing the lesser of two evils, given their support to the Nationalist candidate, he had been engaged to work for Tierney" (Joyce 130-131). As a unionist and a flagrant shoneen, Crofton judges the other canvassers as beneath him for their commitment to Ireland (Joyce 130-131). Surprisingly enough considering his company, the man chooses not to say anything disparaging about their employer (opting to remain largely mute). Instead his one-liner is saved for the ultimate in hypocrisy, noting of Parnell, "Our side of

the house respects him because he was a gentleman” (Joyce 132). Crofton’s party, and likely Crofton himself, stood adamantly opposed to Parnell.

The fifth and final canvasser Henchy, the apparent wrangler of the group, is easily the most hypocritical of the lot. He, like O’Connor and Lyons, is primarily concerned with the money he is due and the stout he is provided; he holds the responsibility for the procuring of those benefits, lobbying Tierney for the canvassers’ due. As the fiercest critic of the man he refers to as “Tricky Dick,” the “mean little shoeboy of hell,” and “[mean] little tinker” who learned his treachery and how to exploit his peers from his father, Henchy he is also Tierney’s staunchest ally in the room (Joyce 123). Henchy is Father Keon’s sycophant, effusive with his gushing praise of his candidate to potential voters, and adamant in his support of welcoming the King and the ensuing “influx of money” into Ireland (Joyce 131). Henchy treats the Committee Room as Farrington treated the public house, with “the gift of gab...assiduously talk[ing] his way to a petty dominance” (Beck 254). Through double talk and sheer volume, Henchy commands the room and his peers.

The only character in the story who steadfastly adheres to Parnell’s beliefs without compromising himself is Joe Hynes, a staunch anti-shoneen, pro-Ireland man who declares that the “working-man is not going to drag the honour of Dublin in the mud to please a German monarch” (Joyce 121). Hynes illuminates the corruption, perversion, hypocrisy, and decrepitness of the party of his hero Parnell, and demonstrates the possibility for hope for the deluded canvassers. On his first entrance to the room, Hynes asks, “What are you doing in the dark?” to which Old Jack produces two candles, thrusting the room into the light; “[a] denuded room came into view... the walls of the room were bare except for a copy of an election address” (Joyce 120-121). The room is barren, empty, and squalid; because of Hynes, the canvassers are

forced into an awareness of their physical surroundings. Hyne's recitation at the story's end illuminates them once again, throwing light upon their moral decay. Hynes is as hard up as the canvassers, more so perhaps as Henchy implies that he merely stopped by the Committee Room to "sponge" off of their meager provisions of coal and the dozen bottles of stout (a claim rendered questionable by Hynes' immobility when his own stout is eventually uncorked in the story's end); Hynes' own candidate is a working-man, apparently incapable of paying his canvassers. When Hyne's is absent and a disparaging comment is made about him, it is quickly discounted with a claim of his decency and respectability; even Henchy concedes the man's finer mettle (shortly after thinking him to be a spy of Colgan's). Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is the hypocritical Henchy who lauds Hynes' resolute loyalty to Parnell's politics: "There's one of them, anyhow... that didn't renege him. By God, I'll say for you, Joe! No, by God, *you stuck to him like a man!*" (Joyce 133- emphasis added). The implication here is that those who did not remain loyal were not "men." Or perhaps, they were not "man enough" to remain true to their allegiance, despite the deprivations they have had to weather.

Following the recitation of Hynes' poem (tying to oral tradition in its presentation and focus on nostalgia), the humbled hypocrites are silent. A burst of applause ensues which "continued for a little time" before more silence and the canvassers return to the beers they paid for with their Irish identity (Joyce 135). O'Connor is genuinely moved, "taking out his cigarette papers and pouch the better to hide his emotion" (Joyce 135). The shoneen, exploiter of Ireland for the personal gain of a pittance and beer, sees his hypocrisy for what it is. He has compromised his better sense and submitted to the values of his oppressor; he has betrayed Ireland and his integrity. These men have sold out their Ireland in the siege on their masculinity. They only seek to provide for themselves rather than defend their party and Irish independence.

They forgo Bhabha's assertion of the nationalist tendency within masculine self-identity and emasculate themselves for the sake of profit

O'Connor at least has the decency to show he sees his own complicit guilt in the exploitation of Ireland; Mrs. Kearney, nee Davlin, the titular character of "A Mother" apparently does not. While her actions seem to pale in comparison, they are still an example of the exploitation of "Nationalist fervor and idealism for private profit and personal gain," akin to the proposed plotting and angling of Tierney in "Ivy Day and the Committee Room" (Cheng 127). "A Mother" provides a microcosmic look at the negative effects of adopting shoneen values. Mrs. Kearney is another interesting case: her adoption of shoneen values couples with her own adoption of a masculine identity.

The first notion of Mrs. Kearney's role as exploiter of Ireland comes with the second mention of her daughter Kathleen and the potential for profit by way of Kathleen's talent: "When the Irish Revival began to be appreciable Mrs. Kearney determined to take advantage of her daughter's name" (Joyce 137). Prior to this point, Mrs. Kearney has been painted as a seemingly harmless "stage mom." Narcissistically bent on reinscribing herself on Kathleen, she pushes her daughter into a "good convent where she learned French and music" just like she herself had (Joyce 137). Kathleen follows the path of her mother, reenacting her life; like the perpetuated circle of violence heretofore noted, Kathleen's pursuits are rooted in the past and in her mother. The later push that Mrs. Kearney gives Kathleen into the arts also reflects the various pushes into physicality of prior stories. Mrs. Kearney's exploitation of her daughter is a shoneen tempered act as it is an exploitation of Irish heritage and the Irish Revival Movement; the girl's reputation in Dublin and her traditionally Irish "name," makes her ripe for exploitation amid the commercialization of Nationalist fervor. This commercialization is itself demonstrated

succinctly when Joyce notes that Mrs. Kearney brought, presumably hired, “an Irish teacher,” to nurture and/or craft Kathleen’s Irish identity (137). The implication here is that Irish identity can be bought and sold. Kathleen then comes to embody nationalist Ireland as a commodity; she is “a believer in the language movement,” she associates with Nationalist friends, she is versed in Irish arts, and she is under the thumb of a profiteering matriarch.

Mrs. Kearney is portrayed as a business tactician when approached by Mr. Holohan for Kathleen’s participation in the concert series of the Eire Abu Society. She takes over his role as pre-organizer, crafting the performance order, and writing the contract for her daughter’s performances. All her actions tend towards that which is considered traditionally masculine. The contract itself is entered into while she is steadily plying Holohan, “a novice in such delicate matters as the wording of bills,” with as much wine or brandy (what is in the decanter is not abundantly clear) as she can, addling his mind, and muddying his judgment (Joyce 138). Holohan is essentially lulled into a misguided contract with an ambitious and opportunistic woman. Mrs. Kearney shifts between traditional masculine and feminine roles in this moment, lulling Holohan through her role as host/keeper of the house and at the same time crafting a business agreement while exploiting his weaknesses, his drinking and poor business sense. Her shoneen tendencies are revealed as she exploits her daughter’s Irish persona for a mere eight guineas to an Irish Renaissance society. She co-opts “Irishness” and resells it.

The outcome of her sale culminates in a sour note: “Miss Kathleen Kearney’s musical career was ended in Dublin after” her mother’s various scenes behind the scenes at the concert series (Joyce 147). The series is not as profitable as was expected and is cut short, yet Mrs. Kearney still wants the agreed upon payment. Her daughter’s profitability, not to mention a shade of her self-worth, is rendered null courtesy of Mrs. Kearney’s greed. Mrs. Kearney is a

fairly well-to-do woman, but she sells Irish tradition for a mere pittance. Of course, as Mrs. Kearney herself notes time and again, no one would “have dared to have treated her like that if she had been a man” (Joyce 148). She certainly has a point.

Although the men of the story are no less exempt from scrutiny or from exploitation. Holohan in his submission to Mrs. Kearney defaults and takes on a traditionally feminized role to her. His retaliations towards her (“I thought you were a lady” [Joyce 149]) is his means of recovering his ceded masculinity. Holohan has superiority on his side simply because he is male. He is as guilty of profiteering as Mrs. Kearney. He perverts nationalist loyalty by his importing “Madam Glynn *from London*” (Joyce 143- emphasis added). Mr. Kearney in his submissive, “yes dear” role appears to be led about by the collar by his domineering wife; his tacit presence never lends any aid to his wife’s cause, aside from hailing a cab. It seems he sees the futility of his wife’s campaign, yet is unmoved to intervene. Mrs. Kearney “respected her husband in the same way as she respected the General Post Office, as something large, secure and fixed; and though she knew the small number of his talents she appreciated his abstract value as a male” (Joyce 141). He to her is an institution on account of his gender; his value is most notably in his male-ness. As Mr. Kearney never pleads his wife’s case, or the committee’s, or his daughter’s, he is portrayed as simply detached from the events. The man becomes an ineffective husband and father. His wife’s ambitions lead to mortification, which he makes no move to attempt to prevent. His daughter is ostracized from the Irish arts society and he does nothing to avoid it. Mr. Kearney, in his inaction becomes a disempowered father, a man who cannot or will not be “manly.”

The following story “Grace” was originally intended to conclude *Dubliners*. The penultimate story of the collection, like “Counterparts,” has a title which points to seemingly

disparate though thoroughly interrelated aspects of the story. Overtly, the title appears as a gesture towards the story's final scene, wherein Mr. Kernan is depicted ensconced in a crowded church, surrounded by his four friends, presumably seeking grace through an absolution of his sins. The story's first act depicts Kernan's "fall" and supposed sin. The second act focuses primarily on his peers' attempts to lure him into back to the church, shaming him into going on a retreat because of what has transpired. Viewing the story as such is certainly logical, as the brunt of the narrative's action centers on Kernan's fall from grace and his later presumed return to such a state through his recommitting to Catholicism. It is this reading of the story which many critics tend to adhere to, the supportive evidence being mainly Stanislaus Joyce's observation "that the story is based on Dante's *Commedia*" (Niemayer 196). Niemayer's reading of the story wholly commits to God's grace, yet ignores Kernan's own, a necessary component of the story.

Also ignored in a "Grace' as parody of *Commedia*" reading is the fiscal allusion of the title. Grace in this context means "an allowance of time after a debt or bill has become payable granted to the debtor before suit can be brought against him or her or a penalty applied" ("Grace"). "Joyce calculates the cost of an equation between the spiritual grace promised by religion and the period of grace offered to debtors" in the story (Osteen 76). Kernan is an indebted man. He "was aware that there was a small account for groceries unsettled between him and Mr. Fogarty" (Joyce 166). His wife recalls "many small, but opportune loans" the couple had taken from Mr. Power (Joyce 155). Caught in an economic downturn, he is unable to provide for his family and is forced to rely on loans and borrowed funds from his friends and acquaintances. Father Purdon's sermon in the end discusses pecuniary matters melded with religion, a clear-cut example of the dual meaning of grace. Too there are the matters of favors owed, from Power's swooping in and returning Kernan home safely, to the unnamed youth in the

cycling-suit who kept him from “seven days without the option of a fine” (Joyce 160). His convalescence, taking up the middle portion of the story, then acts as his grace period from his debtors and “the redeemer” and becomes the focus for analysis.

While nearly every other definition of grace fits with the story, “elegance or beauty of form, manner, motion, or action,” or “a pleasing or attractive quality or endowment” appear to be the most fitting with regards to a discussion of masculinity. Kernan’s fall should certainly be viewed as his fall from grace, but it needs to be tempered by the man’s own religious beliefs. “Kernan came of Protestant stock and, though he had been converted to the Catholic faith at the time of his marriage, he had not been in the pale of the Church for twenty years. He was fond, moreover, of giving side-thrusts at Catholicism” (Joyce 157). For Kernan, church-going is unnecessary and at times laughable and worthy of denigration. His wife seconds his sentiments, as “[religion] for her was a habit and she suspected a man of her husband’s age would not change greatly before death” (Joyce 157). The grace offered by the church, namely the Catholic Church, then seems unlikely to phase the lapsed-reluctantly-converted-Catholic, even to his wife. Hence his grace through Catholicism then comes to be merely performative and strictly for appearances’ sake, indicative of Butler’s performative masculinity; it is an enactment. Going to the retreat, for Kernan, then becomes a chance not to seek redemption, but to display his own sense of “grace.”

Kernan is a man concerned with his appearance:

Mr. Kernan was a commercial traveller of the old school which believed in the dignity of its calling. He had never been seen in the city without a silk hat of some decency and a pair of gaiters. By *grace* of these two articles of clothing, he said, a man could always pass muster. He carried on the tradition of his Napoleon, the great Blackwhite, whose memory he evoked at times by legend and mimicry. Modern business methods

had spared him only so far as to allow him a little office in Crowe Street, on the window blind of which was written the name of his firm with the address--London,E. C. (Joyce 153-154, emphasis added)

The use of grace in this paragraph holds that by dint of his silk hat and gaiters, he is capable of appearing respectable, regardless of certain other facets of his self. He appears to be a capable business man; that he is in debt is rendered unapparent. Note too, nowhere else in *Dubliners* does Joyce make as explicit a mention of “modern business methods” altering the careers of the characters; similar to the atavistic Farrington shoehorned into an office job, the “commercial traveler of the old school” “was spared only so far” as to relinquish that traveling and open up a “little office” which in turn was running up debt and only questionably profitable. His passing muster then is to appear respectable, a business man turning a profit in the modern marketplace. His “grace” is affected, intended to hide shortcomings.

The other characters of “Grace” are equally concerned with their appearances. “But that she did not wish to seem bloody-minded, [Mrs. Kernan] would have told the gentlemen that Mr. Kernan’s tongue would not suffer by being shortened” (Joyce 157-158). She holds her tongue for fear of the perceptions of the men. Mr. Power presents himself as a “debonair young man” who does not appear to be a seedy character, one who would never gadabout with Kernan on a drunken binge; and yet “[his] inexplicable debts were a byword in his circle” (Joyce 154). He presents himself as a concerned man, and perhaps he is; however, he is affronted by the manners and accents of the Kernan children; their appearance is somehow questionable to him. As well, Power “did not relish the use of his Christian name” by a man of lower stature, such as Mr. M’Coy, a man who once had a reputation as a quality tenor; however, his “line of life had not been the shortest distance between two points and for short periods he had been driven to live by his wits” (Joyce 158). Yet through his procession of jobs he fell into respectability as “secretary

to the City Coroner,” a position which enables him to present unfounded assumptions which others agree to, since it would seem that he might have knowledge over what ails Kernan (Joyce 158). Mr. Cunningham somehow lucked into a reputation of respectability through sympathy, as he had “married an unpresentable woman who was an incurable drunkard. He had set up house for her six times; and each time she had pawned the furniture on him” (Joyce 157). Sympathetic certainly, yet he also cultured an image as “a thoroughly sensible man, influential and intelligent” through “long association with cases in the police courts... tempered by brief immersions in the waters of general philosophy” (Joyce 157). He comes to be well-respected as he presents himself as having sound knowledge of the wheres and what-fors of inebriates and others entangled in the justice system and beyond, most notably in religion. Lastly is Mr. Fogarty, a former barkeep turned grocer, whose description is granted the second use of “grace.”

Mr. Fogarty was a modest grocer. He had failed in business in a licensed house in the city because his financial condition had constrained him to tie himself to second-class distillers and brewers. He had opened a small shop on Glasnevin Road where, he flattered himself, his manners would ingratiate him with the housewives of the district. He bore himself with a certain *grace*, complimented little children and spoke with a neat enunciation. He was not without culture. (Joyce 166, emphasis added)

Like Kernan before him, his career of choice has been removed from him. Like Kernan before him, Fogarty affects grace through “his manners,” by complimenting children and speaking “with a neat enunciation.” His graces present him as respectable, thus he is perceived as such.

Kernan’s fall from grace is then not so much a fall from God’s grace (a few days spent getting “peloothed”) as it is a fall from his own graces. The fall down the stairs that precedes the story sullies the graces of Kernan’s profession: “His hat had rolled a few yards away and his clothes were smeared with the filth and ooze of the floor on which he was lain” (Joyce 150).

When his hat, an icon that grants him grace, is next mentioned, it is a “dinged silk hat,” signifying the dent in his appearance post-fall; his appearance is filthy and dinged, just as his reputation. While he is sitting in the pew at church, his hat “which had been mended by his wife, rested upon his knee” (Joyce 173). His hat, his signifier of grace has been mended; his attendance to the service, graced with the presence of a veritable who’s who of respectable Dublin merchants, serves to mend his reputation. Attending the retreat puts him back in Dublin’s graces. He is there not to be redeemed by God; he is there to be redeemed by his peers, to be seen not as an unconcerned, over-the-top inebriate, but as a repentant sinner, a good man who erred. It is again an insincere performance, one intended to demonstrate his adherence to the traditional masculine image of the Dubliners. His conflicted masculinity is one in which a man is forced to choose between personal preferences and societal expectations. In order to appear to be a remorseful man, repentant of his abominable conduct against expectant Dublin decency, he must appear to repent as the rest of his peers would so do: in a church. The “helplessness” of his personal pursuits is a weakness, rectifiable through public reconciliation: “he was keenly conscious of his citizenship, wished to live with his city on terms mutually honourable and resented any affront put upon him” (Joyce 154, 160). To return to respectability, and his own masculine identity within and with respect to society, he has to conform to societal expectations of masculinity.

“THE DEAD” AS CONCLUSION

Concluding *Dubliners* is the much longer narrative, “The Dead.” A number of the various foibles and fumbles of masculinity previously discussed are again revisited, and certain prior characters are recast and reinterpreted within the story’s pages. “The Dead” occupies an interesting place in the collection, not just as the work’s final tale of masculinity in conflict, but also in its lack of defined narrative parameters. Where each of the preceding narratives fits neatly within its noted particular developmental/social phase, “The Dead” does not; Joyce himself never explicitly noted where, in the series of transitions, it was meant to function; the title tends to suggest that this is the final phase. Viewing the collection as a bildungsroman, and following the necessary developmental chain of evolution, the story is then the logical follow-up to Joyce’s take on “Public Life,” which itself was the logical follow-up to “Maturity.” As each phase is seen as the logical precursor to the following phase, elements of the former appear in the latter; “The Dead” is no exception. In many ways it is largely a return to the “Maturity” narratives, as it focuses once again on a single character’s role; the third person omniscient narrator of “A Mother” and “Grace” has been once again limited to a single character’s inner workings. The audience is only treated to the inner thoughts and perceptions of Gabriel Conroy, a focus which is narrowed considerably as the tale goes on. Too, as with the central characters of Farrington and Little Chandler, Gabriel’s navigations of the public sphere impinge upon his domestic life; the two are inextricably bound.

The story and the development of Gabriel are “structured on a series of challenges by individual women” to the character and his sense of his masculine identity (Eggers 379). The first overt affront to his masculinity comes from Lily, his aunts’ housemaid and a mirror for the slavey of “Two Gallants.” In making small talk with the young woman, Gabriel notes, “I

suppose we'll be going to your wedding one of these fine days with your young man," which is met by Lily "with great bitterness" and a prompt retort that "The men that is now is only all palaver and what they can get out of you" (Joyce 178). Lily's retort humbles him. As she lashes out at all males, Gabriel himself is caught up in the accusation. Too, Lily's outburst can be argued to have transgressed certain class notions Gabriel represents. His immediate reaction is that he "coloured as if he had made a mistake and, without looking at her... flicked actively with his muffler at his patent-leather shoes" (Joyce 178). He is embarrassed to be compared to the Corley's of Ireland; in response, he chooses to focus on his appearance like the men in "Grace." He is "discomposed by the girl's bitter and sudden retort. It had cast a gloom over him which he tried to dispel by arranging his cuffs and the bows of his tie" (Joyce 179). He has not approached Lily "with an eye to flirtation or even seduction," and his composure is thus greatly affected by the implied accusation (Anspaugh 5). Gabriel has been saddled with guilt for exploitative males throughout Ireland. By catering to his appearance, he seeks to distance himself, to appear respectable. He also gives Lily a coin, under the guise of being a Christmas gift as a means of demonstrating his non-exploitative nature and reaffirming his superiority of class. It is not the case that Gabriel is "reducing a human relationship to commerce," as has been argued; it is at best a gift, at worst an affirmation of class superiority (Bauerle 115).

In his discomfort following Lily's outburst Gabriel proceeds to go over the speech he has prepared for the dinner table that evening, and he is "undecided about the lines from Robert Browning for he [fears] they [will] be above the heads of his hearers" (Joyce 179). Up until that point, Gabriel has deemed the lines to be appropriate to the tone of his speech, fitting to his theme. The egotism dripping from his concern over the lines as somehow above his audience is paired with that same concern over his appearance. Thinking of the speech, Gabriel decides that

he “would only make himself *ridiculous* by quoting poetry to them which they could not understand. They would think that he was airing his superior education. He would fail with them just as he had with the girl in the pantry” (Joyce 179). Again, the schism between intellectualism and physicality as masculine identifiers appears. It is here in response to Lily’s outburst that Gabriel recalls this, and seeks not to become further emasculated. Gabriel’s reluctance to quote Browning then is not simply due to his sense of superiority, although admittedly it does play a part in the matter; it is also due largely to the fact that he would prefer not to embarrass himself. He is concerned with appearances again, here in regards to how his words are to be perceived by others; he does not want to appear to be putting on airs of his superior education, nor so scholastic that he comes across as less masculine. It is a two-fold development of character: certainly he is egotistical in regards to his education, yet he does not want to be perceived as such.

When Gabriel joins his aunts and wife, the domesticated duo enter into a teasing discussion where certain other facets of Gabriel’s character are brought to light. The scene has at least once been noted as being indicative of a troubled marriage, one in which Gabriel dominates and demeans Gretta (Bauerle 117). Their banter should not be seen as “a series of slights” meant to demean Gretta, instead it should be viewed more so as an expression of the state of the comfort within their marriage (Bauerle 117). While the conversation begins with Gabriel demonstrating overt concern for his wife’s well-being (a cold she caught the prior year), it quickly shifts to gentle chiding on his part, referencing Gretta’s headstrong nature – “she’d walk home in the snow if she were left” (Joyce 180). Gretta replies by elaborating on Gabriel’s doting nature, noting that “he’s really a bother, what with green shades for Tom’s eyes at night and making him do the dumb-bells, and forcing Eva to eat the stirabout” (Joyce 180). Gabriel’s

concern for his children is here jokingly reproached; it does point towards his encouraging his son (and not his daughter) to follow a fitness regime, just as the uncle from “The Sisters” does, implying the masculine tie to physicality. His solicitude extends to encouraging his wife to wear goloshes, as he holds “everyone wears them on the continent” (Joyce 181). Overly solicitous perhaps, but his justification for Gretta wearing the goloshes suggests his rejection of certain facets of traditional Irish identity. He relies on the popularity of an item “on the continent” as reason enough to justify her use of them; while outwardly shoneen on a basic level, this seems to be a secondary justification. His concern for his wife’s well being is the primary. While Baurle sees traded barbs as indicative of a conflict within their marriage, that Gabriel’s “admiring and happy eyes had been wandering from [Gretta’s] dress to her face and hair” as they tease each other seems to deny any sort of implied animosity between the husband and wife (Joyce 180).

The next commonly noted assault on Gabriel’s masculinity comes from his co-worker Molly Ivors, “a frank-mannered talkative” nationalist, who does not simply attack Gabriel as a man, but as an Irishman as well (Joyce 187). Ivors teases Gabriel over his writing book reviews under the not-very-effective pseudonym “G.C.” for *The Daily Express*, a unionist publication. She wheedles him with “O, innocent Amy!... aren’t you ashamed of yourself?... I didn’t think you were a West Briton” (Joyce 188). While it would appear that she is teasing him similarly as Gretta does earlier (and in a way, she certainly is), Gabriel is unsure of how to take her jibes and is perplexed and put-off by them. When Ivors calls him an “innocent Amy,” not only is she actually likening him to a female, she is implying Gabriel is ignorant, unlearned, or has simply not thought out what his writing for “that rag” means. The “West Briton” jibe is another means of accusing him of adopting shoneen values and rejecting nationalist values, thus rejecting Bhabha’s *amor patriae*; a basic tenet of patriarchal masculinity. Her jests cause Gabriel to

question himself, they throw him off; he wants to answer her charge, but his own justification that “literature was above politics” seems to him to be too “grandiose a phrase” (Joyce 188). Gabriel does lose his temper following a series of wheedling digs from Ivors as to why he should vacation in Ireland instead of on the continent; “O, to tell you the truth...I’m sick of my own country, sick of it!” he declares (Joyce 189). The blunt statement is made in reaction to his awareness that their discussion is garnering an audience, and is likely directed as much towards the nationalist Molly as it is to Ireland. Gabriel lashes out here once again as a means to save face, to maintain appearances in front of the other partygoers. He feels debased and degraded by his co-worker; he tries to hide his agitation and replies to her imploring looks with a smile, yet he is clearly affected by her jabs. “Of course the girl or woman, or whatever she was, was an enthusiast but there was a time for all those things. Perhaps he ought not to have answered her like that. But she had no right to call him a West Briton before people, even in joke. She had tried to make him ridiculous before people” (Joyce 190). His façade and self-image have been wounded; his masculine superiority granted him by patriarchal values has been questioned not simply by Ivors, but his own doubts as well.

The effect of this interaction on Gabriel’s comportment is that he is left with a shortened temper and a greater concern for his appearance at the party. He replies “coldly” and “moodily” to his wife’s questions; eliciting her sarcastic response, “There’s a nice husband for you” (Joyce 191). Then Gabriel turns to plotting revenge on Molly Ivors for embarrassing him by injecting an invective into his speech, decrying the lack of “*qualities of hospitality, of humor, of humanity, which the new and very serious and hypereducated generation*” embodied by Ivors and other nationalists forgoing traditional constructs of national identity (Joyce 192). Gabriel’s insecurity, brought about by Ivors’ earlier jibes, is revealed. He believes that Molly hopes his speech will

be a failure; he transfers his own doubts to her. Adding the accusation to the speech “gave him courage,” a masculine attribute, and with it he reaffirms his masculine “superiority” (Joyce 192). Gabriel though is not without a heart, not without a sense of guilt over Ivors’ early departure; he wonders whether it is his fault that she chooses to leave so abruptly. His salve for this sense of guilt is to reapply himself to appearing as the “man of the house,” leaping at the opportunity to carve the Christmas goose as he “felt quite at ease... for he was an expert carver and liked nothing better than to find himself at the head of a well-laden table” (Joyce 197). His sense of prosperity and dominance empowers and reaffirms the masculine by way of taking on this patriarchal role. His speech, somewhat humble and somewhat disingenuous, goes swimmingly; similarly to Farrington and his telling of his insubordination, Gabriel reasserts himself as an orator and the dominant male at the party.

“The third and telling blow to Gabriel’s male ego is dealt by his wife Gretta” following the party’s conclusion and the couple’s retreat to the hotel (Anspaugh 6). Gabriel, embroiled in what appears as an equally brutal and lofty passion for his wife is crushed when he hears of Michael Furey, the seventeen year old boy who Gretta was once “great with” (Joyce 220). His mind has been racing with intimate and sensual thoughts of his wife. With the “kindling again of so many memories” of their private life, a hyper-masculine sexual desire to “cry to her from his soul, to crush her body against his, to overmaster her” has awoken in him (Joyce 215, 217). Though hyper-masculine to a degree, his passion is tempered; he is not savage or brutal in his desire; he wants Gretta to “come to him of her own accord. To take her as she was would be brutal” (Joyce 217). He is no Farrington. He misreads her detachment, hopefully thinking “[p]erhaps her thoughts had been running with his” (Joyce 217). The questions he puts to Gretta about Michael Furey are put to her “ironically,” as a means of shifting her focus to himself, as a

means to “be master her strange mood” (Joyce 219, 217). “Gabriel felt humiliated by the failure of his irony and by the evocation of this figure from the dead, a boy in the gasworks” (Joyce 219). He sees that his wife had been comparing him not simply to a dead boy, but to an apparently uneducated, working class country boy; that boy has overtaken her emotions, something Gabriel himself can not do. He is emasculated by the comparison and Furey’s momentary dominance; for Gabriel, the *boy* from Galway, who worked in the gasworks, is in that moment more masculine than he. Furey is the master of Gretta’s mood and emotions; he is the dominant entity. Gabriel, no longer Gretta’s first love, sees “himself as a ludicrous figure, acting as a pennyboy for his aunts, a nervous well-meaning sentimentalist, orating to vulgarians and idealizing his own clowning lusts, the pitiable fatuous fellow” (Joyce 220). That Furey was willing to die for Gretta, trivializes Gabriel’s love for his wife; while his riot of emotion, his passion and desire for her, is founded on remembrances of deeply meaningful moments the two have shared, he comes to think that he “had never felt like that himself towards any woman but he knew that such a feeling must be love” (Joyce 223).

Michael Furey in his innocent death at seventeen, in his assertion that “he did not want to live” has become a martyr (Joyce 221). By dying just shy of confirmed adolescence he is saved from the corruption that was to come. There will be no commercialization of love and romance, no corruption through education, no perversion of gallantry, no exploitation of others, no loveless marriage, no embittering missed opportunities, no disillusionment, no need for superiority or dominance. Furey will never become Jimmy Doyle, Lenehan or Corley, Bob Doran, Little Chandler, Farrington, Mr. Duffy, the men in the Committee Room, Mr. Kernan, or even the pitiable, fatuous Gabriel Conroy. His masculinity still in its’ embryonic stage will never be assailed or assaulted; he will never be less than that martyr on the altar of innocence.

Furey, in his death, becomes an unsullied ideal, one in which love and masculinity are as pure as the snow that “was general all over Ireland” (Joyce 223). Furey is the impossible masculine ideal that overshadows the identifications of the many conflicted characters of *Dubliners*.

What Michael Furey embodies though is not simply the purity of masculine identity that is lost to the various other characters of *Dubliners* through the trials and tribulations of their lives, but also the impossibility of maintaining such an ideal. Furey has been saved from the inevitable challenges that would assail him; he is uncorrupted, incorruptible, and frozen in time by his early death. He is a lost boy, trapped in a lost time; he is a remembrance, trapped in a tradition. What Joyce has depicted within the pages of the collection then is not a roadmap towards an ideal masculinity; instead *Dubliners* is a depiction of the complicated and problematic nature of what adherence to such an impossible, traditional concept entails. Furey as the exemplar of ideal masculinity is free from the ever-changing Irish society that the other characters inhabit; he can never be challenged or assailed by changes in expected or accepted performance and interpretation. There will be no need for any necessary deviation or evolution away from that expected tradition which the living must face.

Within the pages of *Dubliners*, no character is depicted as sympathetically as Gabriel Conroy, the self-proclaimed “pitiable fatuous fellow” of the “The Dead” and direct contrast to the deceased Michael Furey. Gabriel’s performance of masculinity is certainly flawed by traditional standards, but it must be since he exists within an ever-changing society. The social strata and expectations of Dublin are in flux: new values arise, new definitions are created, and masculine performance itself changes with the society. During his dinner speech, Gabriel pays lip service to the past and the traditions which inform his present and notes that “[a] new generation is growing up in our midst, a generation actuated by new ideas and new principles,”

changing and altering those traditions (Joyce 203). As the living change and alter society, they necessarily move away from tradition. That era informing tradition “might, without exaggeration be called spacious days: and if they are gone beyond recall let us hope, at least that in gatherings such as this we shall still speak of them with pride and affections, still cherish in our hearts the memory of those dead and gone... the world will not willingly let die,” the world has changed, yet one should still remember and revere the past as tradition (Joyce 203). Gabriel goes on to assert:

But yet... there are always in gatherings such as this sadder thoughts that will recur to our minds: thoughts of the past, of youth, of changes, of absent faces that we miss... Our path through life is strewn with many such sad memories: and were we to brood upon them always we could not find the heart to go on bravely with our work among the living. We have all of us living duties and living affections which claim, and rightly claim, our strenuous endeavours. (Joyce 203-204)

To brood upon those dead and gone traditions and remembrances denies the living their right to live and redefine their own traditions. To move beyond those archaic definitions of masculinity steeped in patriarchal tradition and ill-suited for turn-of-the-century Dublin, to adapt to that new changing society, the characters must, as Gabriel says “not linger on the past” (Joyce 204). Pay it lip service, remember it fondly for the foregone tradition that it is, but move beyond it. As the society changes, so does its interpretation of those traditions. Do not dwell on the dead and gone for they are dead and gone; exist and function in the world as it is. Those fellows of dear dirty Dublin that refuse to adapt their own identifications and performances to these changes, and instead insist on impossible ideals of the lost traditions are left pitiable and fatuous, and successful masculine performance will forever elude them as it always must, for it exists in a forgotten, dead time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anspaugh, Kelly. "“Three Mortal Hour[i]s’: Female Gothic in Joyce’s ‘The Dead’”. Studies in Short Fiction, 31.1 (1994). 11 Oct 2007 <<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9503010333&site=ehost-live>>.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. "My Masculinity." Constructing Masculinity. Eds. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Steve Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995. 307-321.
- "Balfe." Victorian Opera Northwest. Donizetti Society, 2005. 11 Oct. 2008. <<http://www.victorianoperanorthwest.org.uk/Balfe.htm>>
- Bauerle, Ruth. "Date Rape, Mate Rape: Liturgical Interpretation of the Dead." New Alliances in Joyce Studies. Ed. B.K. Scott. Newark: University of Delaware, 1988.
- Beck, Warren. Joyce’s Dubliners: Substance, Vision, and Art. Durham: Duke University, 1969.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Are You a Man or a Mouse." Constructing Masculinity. Eds. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Steve Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995. 57-68.
- "boycott." The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 16 Oct. 2008. <[Dictionary.com](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/boycott) <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/boycott>>.
- Brown, Homer Obed. James Joyce’s Early Fiction: The Biography of a Form. Cleveland: Archon Books, 1975.
- Brown, Richard. James Joyce. New York: St. Martin’s, 1992.
- Butler, Judith. "Melancholy Gender/Refused Identification." Constructing Masculinity. Eds. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Steve Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995. 21-36.
- . "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution." The Twentieth Century Performance Reader. Ed. Michael Huxley. New York: Routledge, 2002. 120-125.
- Cheung, Vincent j. Joyce, Race, and Empire. New York: Cambridge University, 1995.
- "counterpart." Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law. Merriam-Webster, Inc. 10 Oct. 2008. <[Dictionary.com](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/counterpart) <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/counterpart>>.
- Eggers, Tilly. "What is a Woman... A Symbol Of?" *James Joyce Quarterly* 18 (1981): 379-95.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. "The Decline of Patriarchy." Constructing Masculinity. Eds. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Steve Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995. 284-290.
- Ellman, Richard. James Joyce. New York: Oxford University, 1982.

- , ed. Letters of James Joyce, Vol. II. New York: Viking, 1996.
- French, Marilyn. "Missing Pieces in Joyce's Dubliners." Twentieth Century Literature 24.4 (Winter, 1978): 443-472.
- . "Women In Joyce's Dublin." James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1988. 267-272.
- Ghiselin, Brewster. "The Unity of Dubliners." Twentieth Century Interpretations of Dubliners. Ed. Peter K. Garrett. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 57-85.
- "grace." Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Random House, Inc. 20 Oct. 2008. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/grace>>.
- Henke, Suzette. James Joyce and the Politics of Desire. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- "josses." Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Random House, Inc. 10 Sep. 2008. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/josses>>.
- Joyce, James. Dubliners. New York: Penguin, 1987.
- Kenner, Hugh. "Dubliners." Twentieth Century Interpretations of Dubliners. Ed. Peter K. Garrett. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 38-56.
- Niemeyer, Carl. "'Grace' and Joyce's Method of Parody." College English 27.3 (1965): 196-201.
- Osteen, Mark. "Serving Two Masters: Economics and Figures of Power in Joyce's 'Grace.'" Twentieth Century Literature 37.1 (1991): 76-92.
- "rosicrucian." The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 08 Sep. 2008. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/rosicrucian>>.
- Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. "Male Trouble." Constructing Masculinity. Eds. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Steve Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995. 69-76.
- Stearns, Peter N. Be A Man! Males In Modern Society. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1979.
- Torchiana, Donald T. Backgrounds for Joyce's Dubliners. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1986.