

"Now, just wash and brush up your memoirias:"

nation building, the historical record and cultural memory

in Finnegans Wake 3.3

Len Platt

History/cultural memory

Joyce scholars have always been interested in situating Joyce in historical context, but only since the late 1980s has the "Joyce and History" formulation become central. In part, this turn toward "history" has been philosophical. Less concerned with Joyce as a historical subject, the American academy in the 1980s and early 1990s produced a Joyce engaged with the subject of history – that is with history as historiography. Such critics as Robert Spoo and James Fairhall, then, constructed a Joyce preoccupied with history as ideological formation, particularly in relation to the orthodoxies of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century historiography (Fairhall 1993; Spoo 1994). Spoo recognized that something he referred to as "genuine historical experience" operated at some undeniable level (Spoo 1994, 158), but his Joyce was "principally concerned to contest a set of dominant articulations of history . . . Lecky, Collingwood, Croce et al.: these, and not (say) Gladstone, Joseph Chamberlain, the Balfours, even Carson, were the more or less minatory figures in Joyce's historical imagination" (Gibson and Platt 2006, 4-5).

Elsewhere there were attempts to construct new versions of a politicized Joyce from more local historical materials. These responded not just to the historiographical turn in Joyce studies but also to a long and dramatic period of both structuralist and

deconstructive energy. In specific relation to Wake studies, Margot Norris traced a tradition going back to Eugene Jolas and the 1920s which, she claimed, had inaugurated "the vexing problematising of the 'political' in avant-garde art and theory" (Norris 1996, 178). In Wake criticism of the 1970s and the 1980s, language became "the field and paradigm for the play of power operative in the nonmaterialist social realm conceptualised as the symbolic order. Finnegans Wake thus came to be read politically with relatively little reference to 'history' conceptualised as a moment of temporality" (ibid.). In short, while we could agree that the Wake was "revolutionary," there was no real focus on the realities against which it revolted. In response to this "linguistic self absorption" and the associated bloodless constructions of the Joyce identity (ibid., 178), Joyceans in the late 1980s began to work from very precise historical materials to produce a Joyce much more animated in relation to Irish, English and, indeed, wider European politics and culture (see Cheng 1995; Nolan 1995; Platt 1998 and 2007; Gibson 2002). Inevitably, these involved new versions of Joyce's politics.

Whether this "Joyce and History" phase of Joyce studies is still developing or now overdeveloped is a matter for debate. It is clear, however, that the current interest in Joyce and the historiographical version of cultural memory has evolved out of historical approaches to Joyce.¹ Its specific appeal seems to rest, first, in the challenge to what is usually presented as the orthodoxy of institutional history – although precisely what institutional history is and whether all published history must be tarred with the same brush is not made clear. At least this is the

case in Pierre Nora's Les Lieux de mémoire, an account so influential that here it stands in more generally for theoretical intersections across memory and history. Thus in cultural memory theory, history, both as the lived past and historiographical practice, is positioned not in the official past of parliamentary archives, nor, necessarily, as in previous orthodoxies, at the radical margins, but rather becomes emphatically subjectivized, relativist and a matter of the strategized imagination. The "central goal" of Nora's Les Lieux de mémoire, then, is to "reinterpret history" in symbolic terms, "to define France as a reality that is entirely symbolic, and thus reject any definition that would reduce it to phenomena of another order" (Nora 1996, xxiv). This idea of cultural memory is attractive in part because it claims inclusivity. The "symbolic order" it arranges has a phenomenological basis that displaces the "intellectual experience of the historian" with "lived historical experience" (Nora 2001, viii). Here history is restored to a freshly convened and highly democratized constituency. In Nora's articulation that constituency is usually imagined as the "nation," a France which is diminishing in confidence and authority: "reshaped by European integration and internal 'regionalisation,' redefined by the fading of the national-revolutionary equation of 1789, and, finally, tested by an influx of immigrants not easily adaptable to the traditional 'norms' of Frenchness" (Nora 1996, xxiii). At the same time, however, Nora finds a France "revitalised" by "the explosion of memory" (Nora 2001, x). France's "attachment to its national roots has been transformed. That attachment is no longer based on history; it now includes a deep consciousness of its

threatened countryside, lost traditions, wrecked ways of life – its very 'identity'" (Nora 1996, xxiii).

Nora argues the case for a new historiography invigorated by cultural memory, but he does not understand memory and history to be synonymous in the modern world. On the contrary, memory, for Nora, is "life," while history is no more than a "representation of the past." In a dramatization of this difficult and much underdeveloped idea, he constructs a historical fable of his own in which history (or historiography) becomes a "conquering force" of modernity that has "uprooted" memory. Nora visualizes a moment of splitting, as if "an ancient bond of identity had been broken." Where once "nation, history and memory" had apparently been identical, in late modernity they separated: "the nation ceased to be a cause and became a given; history became a social science, and memory became a purely private phenomenon" (Nora 1996, 2-6).

This romanticized national and nationalist dimension to Nora's theoretical position is a further reason why cultural memory theory has engaged the interest of Joyceans. On the one hand cultural memory appeals to our long-established sense of Joyce the radical individualist who, like his own early heroes and the Stephen Dedalus identity, stands heroically against convention and the authorized version. On the other hand cultural memory theory's capacity to handle multiple versions of history has, to some Joyceans, seemed suggestive of new ways through which the difficult question of Joyce and nationalism can be refocused, reproduced with more "nuance" than may have previously been the case (see, for example, Fogarty 2006). The theoretical basis may, as is often recognized, remain obscure and problematic but, for all that, cultural memory theory appears a

potentially heady mix.² In the case of application to Joyce studies it suggests ways for anarchic self-assertion to combine with some notion of the Irish artist who, for all his self-proclaimed independence, goes forth to forge the "uncreated conscience" of his "race" (P 288).

This essay joins in the debate on cultural memory and Joyce studies, although the focus is not, as it has tended to be so far in this area, on early Joyce. On the contrary, the concern here is with part three of the Wake – in particular, with the idea of the historical record in 3.3, an episode very much involved with setting the facts straight, historical authentication and, indeed, with attempts, all failing, to exercise memory in the service of some (never articulated) collective good. The account focuses on particular sections of the Wake but the broad aim of this piece does extend beyond the immediate reading of 3.2 and, especially, 3.3. The primary intention is to use this reading not only to throw some light on how these notoriously complex episodes of the Wake work, but also to consider what it might mean to approach Joyce's last great work through some of the ideas that characterize Nora's historiographical version of cultural memory theory.

Remembering the new nation

Finnegans Wake 3.3 brings together a number of elements that were much later to become central in Nora's articulation. In the first place 3.3 is crucially concerned with relations between remembering, nation building and national identity. As I have argued elsewhere, this episode takes place at a very particular juncture (Platt 2007, 60-8). It follows on from the rise of a Shaun/Jaun/Yawn identity closely associated with a Celticized form of republicanism

- in yet another incarnation, as Chuff, Shaun is the "chief celtech chappy" (FW 237.20). His status as a postman places Shaun at the very heart of the Irish Rebellion and post-war Irish radicalism (see FW 409.6 and "phost of a nation"). The postal system was emblematic of colonial administration, hence the painting green of red boxes by the republican government in the 1920s; Shaun proudly admits to painting "our town a wearing greenridinghued" (FW 411.24). O'Connell Street General Post Office was, of course, the literal and symbolic center of the 1916 uprising. After the rebellion, Michael Collins famously made a point of establishing agents in the Post Office - Royal Mail wagons were used by the IRA for lines of communication and for moving arms, and there are contemporary photographs of black and tans searching them. In this context it is significant that Shaun's "permit" to be a postman comes "from on high out of the book of breedings" and is "hairydittary" (FW 409.10; FW 410.1-2). He appears at the beginning of Book 3 sporting emblems of republicanism: "a starspangled zephyr . . . with his motto through dear life embrothred over it in peas, rice, and yeggyolk" (FW 404.27-30), green, orange and white being the colours of the new Irish state. The "Lettreachaun" (FW 419.17) who is called by "Sireland" (FW 428.7), Shaun is the modern Cuchulain figure foreseen by Yeats (see FW 455.33) and he is, of course, utterly devoted to country - "Oh Kosmos! Ah Ireland!" (FW 456.7) - but a particular kind of country where the priority is to use the "punch" of the "Gaa" to "Gaelicise," with "impulsory irelitz" (FW 421.27), in order to create the "[t]he eirest race, the ourest nation, the airest place that erstellunged" (FW 514.36-515.01).

It is in this context that 3.3 images the emergent nation, the new republic of De Valera's Gaeltacht, which is why the early stages of 3.3 contain so many allusions to the history and process of Irish independence: to senators (the four old men, of course, have status as "senators four" - FW 474.21); to the "Mansianhase" (FW 491.18) or Mansion House where the first Dail assembled in 1919 to proclaim Irish independence; to "dogumen number one" (FW 482.20) (the Anglo-Irish Treaty); to "partition" (FW 475.25) and Irish territoriality (see, for examples, "leinconnmuns" [FW 521.28] and "Normand, Desmond, Osmund and Kenneth. Making mejical history all over the show" - FW 514.2-3) and so on.³ At the same time 3.3 reproduces the kind of crisis in nation that Pierre Nora sees as critical to the modern formation of cultural memory. The transformation in Shaun from a "walking saint" fit to join the pantheon of Irish heroes to a babified giant reproduces the ambiguities of powerful nationalist insurgence combined with deep insecurities about the national identity (FW 427.24-28). Positioned at the junction of the four provinces, at Uisneach, a physical and figurative center of Irish self-determination, "Yawn" is nevertheless helpless. Gigantic but enfeebled, the new alpha male who in 3.2 staked his claim on Issy ("the mainsay of our erigenal house" [FW 431.34-35]) and the other dancing girls who collectively represent Ireland is both hugely expanded and yet entirely reduced and seemingly spent.

Part of the problem with "rememorizing" the new state, the essential engagement of 3.3, has to do with incorporating the sheer number of important, and often competing and quite contradictory, "pasts." These pasts are explored in part through what we might

think of as language pasts, involving speaking, "writing" and the ambiguity of "raiding," for example (FW 482.31-32).⁴ One of the first questions asked of Yawn concerns language and the fact that, as might befit a republican, "yav hace not one pronouncable teerm that blows in all the vallums of tartallaght to signify majestate" (FW 478.11-12). Some of these pasts are mythical and concern "folklore" (FW 480.6), as the reference to Tallaght indicates. Tallaght is the supposed mass burial site of the Parthalonians, said to have reached Ireland in 2,200 B.C. led by Parthalon after he had killed his parents in an attempt to seize his brother's throne, a narrative which has several points of contact with Yawn's own tale. According to some traditions, the Parthalonians were responsible for "reshaping" the Irish landscape; indeed their nickname was apparently "Shapers of the Land."⁵ In the first few pages in particular of 3.3 there are also many references to Gaelic pasts, to Uisneach, Beltaine and to ancient divisions of rule and territory (see, for example, the "ells upon ells" of Yawn's full extent "one half of him in Conn's half but the whole of him nevertheless in Owenmore's five quarters" (FW 475.5-7). Again Yawn is quizzed on the Viking past when "From Daneland sailed the oxeyed man" (FW 480.10-11), "Magnus Spadebeard" who "[l]aidbare his breastpaps to give suck, to suckle me" (FW 480.12-4). In the word "Frankly" Yawn hears an interest in the Frankish past which produces an immediate response in French: "How? C'est mal prononsable, tartagliano, perfrances" (FW 478.19-20). Of particular interest and significance to both 3.3 and this essay is the impact of a colonial past, which produces a very specific set of historiographical difficulties. Thus the concern with legitimacy in 3.3 and the fascination with the

historical record, which, while it may frequently involve imagined pre-colonial pasts, also both appropriates and collides with the orthodoxies of institutional histories of empire.

In 3.3 the authorized version of history and its processes are invoked not so much by, say, Brehon law, as by a large concentration of references to British parliamentary and other legal processes – significantly one of the four old men “Dr Shunadure Tarpey’” is additionally entitled “his Recordership” (FW 475.27-28). Yawn is required to “honour and obey the queen” (FW 488.1-2) and the conduct of his “trial” becomes framed and legitimized in an Anglicized constitutional discourse. When he responds to the accusation that he is intervening inappropriately and is probably unstable, Yawn speaks in kind – “It’s you not me’s in erupting, hecklar!” (FW 494.8) – suggesting a Westminster frame of reference confirmed when parliamentary balloting is implied in the “Yerds and nudes” who say “ayes and noes” (FW 493.26). At one point there is a demand for a “Recount!” (FW 496.17); at another an invitation to “Declaim” (FW 497.3). Parliamentary history surfaces in HCE’s parenthetical address to “Voter, voter, early voter, he was never too oft for old Sarum” (FW 551.36-552.01); parliamentary statute is invoked in the information that Queen Molly’s pants are “five itches above the kneecap, as required by statues. V.I.C. 5.6.” (FW 495.30-31).⁶ Elsewhere important parliamentary figures are referred to. The “overseer of the house” alludes to the Egyptian Book of the Dead but also to the speaker of the House of Commons (FW 493.30). On the same page the woolsack, seat of the Lord Chancellor, one time presiding officer in the House of Lords, as well as Viking history, features when “Ota, weewahrwificle of Torquells, bumps her dumpsydiddle

down in her woolsark" (FW 493.19-20). Elsewhere still parliamentary buildings are incorporated, as in the reference to the roof of Westminster Hall "where no English spider webbeth or bredeth to this day" (see FW 481.5) – the Hall is part of the Palace of Westminster and was used primarily for judicial purposes (see MacHugh 1991, 481). It once housed the Court of the King's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas and the Court of Chancery.

Most suggestively of all, the associations between legality, the historical record and colonial government are firmly related to the structural principles of the chapter – the formal arrangement of interrogation and response – by the reference that positions Yawn's trial in terms of the Star Chamber – "Those four claymen clomb together to hold their sworn starchamber quiry on him. For he was ever their quarrel" (FW 475.18-19). Here the "devilera" represented by the four Evangelists who are also "Shanators" (see FW 475) becomes associated with a judiciary that, especially under the reigns of James I and Charles II, became a byword for injustice and persecution. With a very deep irony indeed, Joyce's version of the new republic gets spliced to a vilified institution that, for many, represented the extension of the royal prerogative into virtual absolutism.

3.3 is framed by all these contexts, which are not just historical, but historiographical, concerned with the process of constructing, and verifying, versions of the past. Following on from Yawn's rise, 3.3 is almost exclusively devoted to the extended questioning of a Yawn in swaddling who appears to be the subject not of a trial in the usual sense, but certainly of a judicial process which invokes memory, in vain, to establish historical accuracy,

authenticity and the right of succession – these being issues that are expressed in many different ways in 3.3, as in the formulation, for example, which constructs Yawn as both an honored St. Patrick figure and the precise inverse, a fraudulent “Mr Trickpat” who is “imitation Roma,” “the voice of jokeup” whose answers appear to be taken “from the writings of Saint Synodius, that first liar” (FW 487.22-23; FW 487.36-488.01). Matthew, the Ulsterman, strikes the historiographical note with his injunction to “Name yur historical grouns” (FW 477.35), but this is just the beginning of a whole series of strategies designed to fix the present in “climes of old times gone by of the days not worth remembering” (FW 474.23), and to test Yawn’s authenticity. With “Shanator Gregory” “seeking spoor through the deep timefield” (FW 475.24), there is a strong sense of historical archaeology contextualized in the problematics of the new state, for “the old order changeth,” although since the old order “lasts like the first” (FW 486.10) continuity is as characteristic as change. In “trailing the wavy line of his partition” (FW 475.25), Shanator Lyons may be marking out the territories of the new, but this can only be performed on the basis of an imagination that is historical. Thus the insistent concern with origins and parentage, as in the question that asks whether Yawn is “derevatov of it yourself in any way? The true tree I mean?” (FW 505.26-27), or that which asks whether “any orangepeelers or greengoaters appears periodically up your sylvan family tree?” (FW 522.16-17). Social status is all-important to the alleged value of the “fact,” which is why Yawn’s insistence that his “ruridecanal caste is a cut above you peregrines” (FW 484.28-29), as is eye-witness (or “eyewitless” [FW 515.30]) authority. Yawn is asked, for example, whether he was

present when Tim Finnegan fell off "that erection . . . Were you there, eh Hehr?" (FW 506.07-11). Similarly, as a "witness" of an "epic struggle," he is asked to "reconstruct for us, as briefly as you can, inexactly the same as a mind's eye view, how these funeral games, which have been poring over us through homer's kerryer pigeons, massacred as the holiname rally round took place" (FW 515.22-25). Establishing the correct sequence of events is equally important as in ": "Date as? Your time of immersion? We are still in drought of . . . ? - FW 513.3-4. The suggestion of the deluge, incidentally, reflects a widespread practice in the Wake where the flood is often connected with attempts at historical dating. Here Joyce echoes historiographical tradition, which is presumably the meaning of the note in one of the Wake notebooks: "floods reveal/history" (Deane 2001, V1.B.6 002(b)). Emily Lawless's Ireland, a known notebook source for Finnegans Wake, begins with a quote that reflects this tradition: "'It seems certain,' says the Abbé Geoghegan, 'that Ireland continued uninhabited from the Creation to the Deluge'" (Lawless 1912, 2). An earlier account of the deluge, also known to Joyce, Peter Parley's Tales About Ireland, stated more or less precisely that Ireland "was first inhabited about 322 years after the flood" by "Partholanus, the son of Scaree" (Parley 1843, 13).

Most of 3.3 consists of Yawn's subjection to often fierce questioning on all these scores. In the following section, for example, he is quizzed in relation to the chronology of burial practices: "Tell me now this. You told my larned friend rather previously a moment since about this mound or barrow. Now I suggest to you that ere there was this plaguebarrow, as you seem to call it,

there was a burialbattell, the boat of millions of years . . . What! Henu! Spake ab laut!" (FW 479.21-32). With the Haveth Childers Everywhere section (FW 532.6-554.9), however, the historiographical dimensions of 3.3 shift and, to some extent, are displaced. Certainly the perplexing issue of the new republic's antecedents and authority remains, with the attempt being made, "after the Irishers," to convert the resurrected HCE "into a selt" (FW 537.7). This is no easy matter. His "old antenaughties" ("antinatti" being Italian for "ancestors") tend to be Germanicized ("Sigismond Stolterforth"), Anglicized/Jewish/criminal ("Rabbin Robroost") or lascivious ("Leecher Ruddy" [FW 537.7-10]). Indeed, quite apart from the awkward matter of his well-known associations with the full range of human crimes and vices, HCE's primary racial connections are not with valorized Celticism, but with invader culture – with the Vikings, Anglo-Saxons, Protestants, seen in statements like "I contango can take off my dudud dirtynine articles of quoting here in Pynix Park" (FW 534.11-12) – and with cricket and empire, as when "with a slog to square leg I sent my boundary to Botany Bay" (FW 543.3-4). Thus his entry into 3.3 as "the first of Shitric Shilkanbeard . . . known throughout the world wherever my good Allenglisches Anglalachsen is spoken by Sall and Will" (FW 532.8-11). Indeed his appearance in 3.3 is a comic version of the real challenge faced by a new Church and State founded so fundamentally on notions of Catholic piety and purity and Celtic blood – how to square that version of national identity with a modernity represented in the Wake by the city builder who famously "devaleurised . . . base fellows for the curtailment of their lower man" (FW 543.2-3). Where "Haveth Childers Everywhere" differs from

the early section of 3.3, however, is in the formal change that replaces the question and answer structure with an HCE monologue. This continues to narrate histories, but, with the removal, for the most part, of the mamalujo intervention, the psychology of an HCE on the run moves to the fore.

In broad terms the above reading indicates that cultural memory theory is highly suggestive in terms of reading 3.3. The connections between historical record and nation building in 3.3 certainly take on considerable significance when read against Nora's agenda in Les Lieux de mémoire and elsewhere. Like Nora (and Vico), Joyce sees national definition, whether shaped by the state or its citizens, in terms of a selective appropriation of tradition.⁷ This is one reason why the four old men in 3.3, although invoking chronology obsessively, never get to anything like certitude – there is, as HCE in particular demonstrates so splendidly, always a mismatch between one historical version and another. For the four old men, Yawn's confusing tale – “Are we speachin d'anglas landadge or are you sprakin sea Djoytsch” (FW 485.12-13) – is, at more than one stage, a “cock and biddy story” (FW 519.08). Indeed, while the questioners insist on the importance of what actually happened, the text itself, in which “there are sordidly tales within tales” (FW 522.05), is much more ably involved in what Nora calls the “perpetual reuse and misuse” of history (Nora 1996, xxiv); much more compelled by the attempt to get the facts straight than any facts themselves, which prove to be exceedingly slippery. Finnegans Wake in general, and this episode in particular, is concerned with history's “influence on successive presents” rather than its reconstruction as a past (ibid.). It certainly subscribes to Nora's

sense that memory is an active constituent in historical process, forming, as "history in the second degree," the "overall structure of the past within the present" (ibid.), or "History as her is harped," or made Irish (FW 486.6).

But if Joyce can be usefully positioned alongside Nora in these historiographical terms, especially in terms of the connections between memory and the nation, there are also some important distinctions to be made. Whereas Nora sanctifies the "entwinement" of contemporaneity with the imagined past, celebrating it as a "transformation of historic memory which has been invaded, subverted and flooded by group memories," Joyce in 3.3 and, indeed, throughout the Wake, subjects cultural memory to extended mockery (Nora 2001, xii). Here the intersections between past and present, what Samuel Ferguson called "entrelacement," are more than appropriative and strategic (in Thompson 1996, 22-3).⁸ They become hugely exaggerated and rendered grotesque, as if Joyce is both outdoing and ridiculing. Memory here seems not just subjective, variable and localized but truly bizarre in its operation and appetite, just as likely to fix on the big ideas, like the matter of "the ouragan of spaces" (FW 504.14), as it is to focus on the seemingly trivial: "Do you know my cousin, Mr Jaspar Dougal?" (FW 479.10). Of course, as throughout the Wake, the exercise of cultural memory in the service of the emergent nation has an Irish frame of reference, but this is subject to wild slippage, with Yawn, for example, retreating into a stage Chinaman identity at one point - "Me no angly mo, me speakee Yellman's lingas" (FW 485.29). This a strategy that produces a strong response in his questioners: "Thot's never the postal cleric, checking chinchin chat with nipponnippers!

Halt there sob story to your lambdad's tale! Are you roman cawthrick 432?" (FW 485.36-486.01). Again, Nora's even treatment of kitsch, just as important in cultural memory theory as, say, state ceremony, is displaced by something much more satirical in 3.3, as in this rendition of John's reminiscences of his "grandmother's place, Tear-nan-Ogre, my little grey home in the west, in or about Mayo when the long dog gave tongue and they coursing the marches and they straining at the leash" (FW 479.01-4). The extension of the historical into the experiential, a source of strength in Nora's account, becomes more complex, more problematic and very much more comic in the Wake.

There are many ways of understanding the differences being outlined here but they cannot be taken simply as matters of different theoretical positioning. Among other things, they return us to the question of Joyce's politics and a more intimate connection to events that were not actually historical for Joyce at all, but part of his real, lived experience. Thus 3.3, for all its historiographical engagement, refers over and over to the particular emergence of the Irish republic. In this sense the satirical comedy and hard ironies of 3.3 derive substantially, not, of course, from any antipathy to the idea of Irish independence, but specifically from De Valera's defence of "traditional and Catholic familial and social values," a defence that was emphatically racialized, inextricable from what many historians have seen as "a rising Celtic fundamentalism" (Hutchinson 1987, 317). Gaelicizing the new state was, at the very least, a "preoccupation." Highly sensitive to notions that it had sold out, the Free State was to later develop an "obsession with enforcing public modes of 'Irishness'" (Foster 1988,

518).⁹ It is with this kind of contemporaneity that the questions and answers of 3.3 most obviously engage – a contemporaneity which, as Nora would surely want to point out, fundamentally shapes its representation of the business of history making in 3.3 and in the Wake more generally.

Works Cited

- Cheng, Vincent J. 1995. Joyce, Race and Empire. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Deane, Vincent. 2001. The "Finnegans Wake" Notebooks at Buffalo. Turnout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Fairhall, James. 1993. James Joyce and the Question of History. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fogarty, Anne. 2006. "Parnellism and the Politics of Memory," in Joyce, Ireland, Britain, edited by Gibson and Platt, 104-21. Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press.
- Foster, Roy F. 1988. Modern Ireland, 1600-1972. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gibson, Andrew. 2002. Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics and Aesthetic in "Ulysses". Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gibson, Andrew and Len Platt. 2006. "Introduction," in Joyce, Ireland, Britain, edited by Andrew Gibson and Len Platt, 1-29. Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press.
- Hutchinson, John. 1987. The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Free State. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Jordan, David P. 2001. "Introduction," in Rethinking France – Les

- Lieux de Mémoire Vol. 1, translated by Mary Trouille under the direction of Pierre Nora, translation directed by David P. Jordan. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Joyce, James. 1952. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Lawless, Emily. 1912. Ireland. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- McHugh, Roland. 1991. Annotations to Finnegans Wake, revised edition. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins Press.
- Nolan, Emer. 1995. Joyce and Nationalism. London: Routledge.
- Nora, Pierre. 1996. "From Lieux de Memoire to Realms of Memory," in Realms of Memory – Rethinking the French Past, Vol. 1, under the direction of Pierre Nora, English language edition edited and with a forward by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- . 2001. "General Introduction," to Rethinking France – Les Lieux de Mémoire Vol. 1, translated by Mary Trouille under the direction of Pierre Nora, translation directed by David P. Jordan. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Norris, Margot. 1996. "The Conceptual History of Finnegans Wake and the Finnegans Wake of Historical Criticism," in Joyce and the Subject of History, edited by Mark A. Wollaeger, Victor Luftig and Robert Spoo, 165-83. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Parley, Peter. 1843. Peter Parley's Tales About Ireland. London: Darton.
- Platt, Len. 1998. Joyce and the Anglo Irish: A Study of Joyce and the Literary Revival. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 2007. Joyce, Race and "Finnegans Wake". Cambridge: Cambridge

Univ. Press.

Spoof, Robert. 1994. James Joyce and the Language of History:

Dedalus's Nightmare. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Stewart, Susan. 1994. On Longing: Narrative Uses of the Miniature,

the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection. Baltimore and

London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thompson, W. I. 1966. The Imagination of an Insurrection: Dublin,

Easter 1916. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Vico, Giambattista. 1999. New Science: Principles of the New Science

Concerning the Common Nature of Nations, translated by David

Marsh with an introduction by Anthony Grafton, 3rd edition.

London: Penguin.

Notes

¹ Historiographical as opposed to, for example, Susan Stewart's work which comes to cultural memory from a cultural studies perspective; see Stewart 1994.

² David P. Jordan is indicative here, when he suggests in his introduction to Rethinking France that "so splendid, informative and intelligent are these essays that the reader may enjoy and profit from them without subscribing to Pierre Nora's master idea" (Jordan 2001, xxviii).

³ Roland McHugh points out the reference to the North, South, East, and West, and the more specific references to Munster and Connacht. Joyce seems to have ancient territorial divisions in mind at this point; see McHugh 1991, 514 and also FW 528.27-32.

⁴ The term "rememorizing" is suggested by Nora's "rememoration;" see Nora 1996, xxiv.

⁵ See, for instance,
<http://www.triskelle.eu/history/partholonians.php?index=060.015.010.020>.
Accessed 25 June 2010.

⁶ Old Sarum was one of the famous "rotten" boroughs which, prior to the 1832 Reform Act, returned two M.P.s to the House of Commons with a handful of constituents.

⁷ See, for example, Vico's comment that "When nations first become aware of their origins and scholars first studied them, they judged them according to the enlightenment, refinement, and magnificence of their age, when in fact by their nature these origins must rather have been small, crude and obscure." Vico approves Diodorus Siculus who thought that "all the nations, both Greek and barbarian, think they were the very first to invent the comforts of human life, and that they preserve memories of their history from the beginning of the world" (Vico 1999, 76). But the myths, legends, genealogies, and histories used to substantiate these fantasies, all written after the events, are actually no more than ideological interventions. In reality, Vico argues, all nations were barbaric in their beginnings.

⁸ "Entrelacement," whereby "the reader moves from the present to a more ancient past and back again," typifies the revivalist historical imagination. In O'Grady's Histories and in the versions of the Red Branch or Ulster Cycle which he wrote for children, "a sequence of events, the present, is set off with its own day-to-day consciousness, then suddenly it intersects with another sequence of events, the past, with a consciousness that understands it even though the present had no knowledge of the other's existence"

(Thompson 1966, 22-23). This is the method ironically used to underpin the "Cyclops" episode of Ulysses, as well as throughout the Wake.

⁹ Foster argues that although "liberal rights were ostensibly guarded in the constitution, the new government was authoritarian; the new regime showed its derivation from Sinn Féin, never unduly fastidious about democratic procedure . . . [it] believed in 'strong,' not to say ruthless, government" (Foster 1988, 519).