

EURAMERICA Vol. 47, No. 2 (June 2017), 215-261  
© Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica  
<http://euramerica.org>

## **“OMNIUM GATHERUM” —Representations of the Intellectuals in “Aeolus”\***

**Hsing-chun Chou**

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures  
National Chung Hsing University  
No. 145, Xingda Rd., South Dist., Taichung 40227, Taiwan  
E-mail: [hcchou@dragon.nchu.edu.tw](mailto:hcchou@dragon.nchu.edu.tw)

### **Abstract**

Intellectuals, admittedly, have dominated central parts in the pages of modern Irish history, and James Joyce incorporates a diverse array of intellectuals into his texts. The “Aeolus” episode in *Ulysses* depicts members of the professional intelligentsia in journalism, law, and education. However, the picture of the independent and nonconforming intellectual functioning as the conscience of the people and speaking truth to power seems gravely distorted in “Aeolus.” Instead of acting as society’s conscience, these Dubliners corrupt the national spirit: their idleness, flatulence, alcoholism, and nostalgia result in failure and unfulfillment, and,

---

Received July 27, 2016; accepted March 22, 2017; last revised March 28, 2017

Proofreaders: Hsueh-mei Chen, Yu-hsien Liao, Kuei-feng Hu

\* This article is the result of a research project sponsored by the National Science Council (NSC 101-2410-H-005-051). I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their careful reading and valuable suggestions. I am also indebted to Professor Yen-Yen Hsiao and Miss Hui-I Sung, who inspired the aforementioned research project, and hence this article.

more grievously, signify the degeneration of the intelligentsia. Retrospective rather than innovative, dedicated to the borrowed rather than the self-created, these “talents” fail to live up to their calling. In contrast with Joyce’s portrayal of his protagonists, his depictions of these “talents” offer critiques of the corruption of certain intellectuals, his dialogue with those who exercised profound influence on modern Ireland, and his rethinking of the role of the intellectual.

**Key Words:** “Aeolus,” James Joyce, intellectuals, Ireland

## I. Introduction

Intellectuals have occupied an essential position in modern history, exercising profound influences in political, economic, sociocultural, and scientific fields. In his Reith lectures on intellectuals, Edward W. Said argues:

There has been no major revolution in modern history without intellectuals; conversely there has been no major counterrevolutionary movement without intellectuals. Intellectuals have been the fathers and mothers of movements, and of course sons and daughters, even nephews and nieces. (1996: 10-11)

Said's comment speaks to the great import of intellectuals in modern history, including Irish history. Since the early nineteenth century, Irish intellectuals have played crucial parts in shaping Ireland; they have adopted diverse stances on matters and taken different approaches to their aims, yet have performed similarly significant roles and their activities have left extensive and profound impacts on Irish society.

The figure who dominated the political arena in the first half of the nineteenth-century was Daniel O'Connell, a barrister and advocate of Catholic sectarianism. In opposition to the Act of Union (1800), which abolished the Dublin Parliament and introduced direct rule from London, O'Connell formed the Catholic Association, determined to bring about the repeal of the Act. He organized massive meetings across the country to promote Catholic Emancipation; his oratorical and organizational skills and his mastery of political theater brought some success to the campaign: in 1829, the British government made concessions to Catholic Emancipation, and O'Connell was known afterwards as "the Liberator." However, in 1843, at the height of his fame, O'Connell submitted to the British prohibition on political meetings on account of his insistence that there be no

bloodshed, and this acquiesce resulted in the dwindling of his influence. In spite of the failed constitutional system, O'Connell remained throughout the nineteenth century a hero for moderate nationalists, upholding parliamentary reforms, Jewish emancipation, and the abolition of slavery (Connolly, 1998: 399-400; Ruckenstein & O'Malley, 2003: 304-305).

Also involved in Repeal movements was Young Ireland, a nationalist group active in the 1840s that was comprised mainly of middle-class graduates from both Catholic and Protestant backgrounds. Disappointed by the Liberator's retreat and critical of his constitutional methods, Young Irelanders tackled O'Connell's sectarian stance, supporting political separation from England and identifying cultural activity as the true course of a more ecumenical nationhood. They founded the *Nation* in 1842, which published essays concerning the Irish language, literature, history, and music, and advocating political autonomy and cultural revival for a nonsectarian Ireland (Connolly, 1998: 602-603; Kiberd, 1996: 22; Ruckenstein & O'Malley, 2003: 450). The group's principal figure was Thomas Davis. Convinced that it was essential to reverse the Anglicization of Irish culture, Davis argued for the revival of the Irish tongue, accentuated Irish cultural self-reliance, and attempted to foster a nationality uniting the Irish of all religious persuasions. His influence on cultural nationalism persisted long after his death in 1845, providing later leaders of the Celtic Revival with many crucial ideas (Connolly, 1998: 137; Ruckenstein & O'Malley, 2003: 103-104).

The most important figure in post-Famine Ireland was undisputedly Charles Stewart Parnell, who dominated Irish political landscape in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The Protestant, Anglo-Irish leader, like the Catholic O'Connell, pursued a purely constitutional campaign for Home Rule. Through obstruction tactics in Parliament, he obtained the

enactment of land reforms, and created a disciplined and independent Irish party which brought the Home Rule issue to the center of British politics, thus winning tremendous popularity with the overwhelming majority of the Irish people. With the dream of Home Rule nearly realized, Parnell became mired in scandal with a married woman, Kitty O’Shea, which brought his political downfall and ultimately resulted in his untimely death; he was known thereafter as “the uncrowned king of Ireland” (Connolly, 1998: 431; Ruckenstein & O’Malley, 2003: 332-333). Parnell’s popularity, before his downfall, was described by Prime Minister Gladstone as “an intellectual phenomenon,” an account James Joyce endorsed as he saw him as “another Moses” leading “a turbulent and unstable people from the house of shame to the verge of the Promised Land” (1989: 225-226).

Following Parnell’s downfall, a disillusioned and embittered nation turned away from parliamentary politics and instead invested its energies in culture. The spirit of the Irish cultural resurrection was greatly magnified by the foundation in 1893 of the Gaelic League, whose first president was the academic Douglas Hyde, a professor of Irish at University College, Dublin, and strong advocate of De-Anglicization. Other major literary figures also came to the forefront of this movement during this period: for instance, W. B. Yeats, Lady Gregory, and others (all from middle- and upper-class Protestant backgrounds) began to formulate plans for a national theater, which led to the creation of the Irish Literary Theatre in 1899, succeeded by the Abbey Theatre in 1904. These writers looked for inspiration to Irish mythology, folklore, and popular culture, seeing Gaelic material as the basis of a revitalized Irish literature; their works epitomized the quest for an Irish identity and spearheaded the Celtic Revival (Connolly, 1998: 319-320; Gibson, 2006: 28; Ruckenstein & O’Malley, 2003: 206-207).

It was in such a cultural milieu that Joyce grew into an intellectual. Like his predecessors and contemporaries, Joyce had his finger on the pulse of political turmoil and social unrest, but took a stance different from theirs. He might have appreciated O'Connell's advocacy of Jewish emancipation and abolition of slavery, but was impatient with his sectarianism. Young Irelanders and Revivalists' appeal to Gaelic materials repulsed him, as he perceived in their ideals parochialism, nostalgia, and divorcement from reality. His admiration for Parnell was sincere, but he chose a literary vocation over politics. In *Ulysses*, Joyce the intellectual writes about intellectuals, anatomizing elite figures in a tumultuous Ireland striving for freedom. Undisputedly, Joyce has been celebrated for his portrayal of the common people, Leopold and Molly Bloom in particular, but he has also presented an unforgettable character of the intelligentsia, Stephen Dedalus, in whose resistance and nonconformity Said sees the defining characteristics of the intellectual (1996: 16-17). In addition to Stephen the artist, we observe in *Ulysses* a diversity of intellectuals: educators, men of letters, politicians, solicitors, physicians, etc. Their appearance in the text reveals Joyce's awareness of the constant presence of intellectuals in early-twentieth-century Dublin. Unlike the much-discussed Stephen, however, these characters have received little critical attention; the question as to how and why Joyce depicts these potentially influential members of the elite remains largely unexplored. In an attempt to dissect Joyce's representations of the intellectuals, this paper will center on "Aeolus," the episode of "OMNIUM GATHERUM" which brings together "[a]ll the talents" (1986: 111)—talents of the press, the law, Classics, and literature.<sup>1</sup> In contrast with those of his

---

<sup>1</sup> "Scylla and Charybdis" and "Oxen of the Sun" are the other episodes which abound in intellectuals, dominated by literary personages and medical students respectively. "Aeolus," on the other hand, gathers intellectuals from

protagonists, Joyce’s portrayals of these “talents” reveal his critique of those corrupt intellectuals who fail to live up to that name, and, more subtly, his intricate dialogue with those who exercised such a profound influence over modern Ireland.<sup>2</sup>

## II. The Intellectual: Some Concepts

To dissect Joyce’s representations of intellectuals, it is of use to examine some background theoretical concepts. For Said, the intellectual is “an individual with a specific public role in society that cannot be reduced simply to being a faceless professional, a competent member of a class just going about her/his business”; rather, this individual is “endowed with a

---

various walks of life, and hence is more representative of the Irish intelligentsia as a whole.

<sup>2</sup> A large number of Joyce scholars have delved into the episode of “Aeolus”; the majority of these studies focus on rhetorical figures and newspaper headlines. M. J. C. Hodgart’s research, for instance, is a classic study of Joyce’s deployment of classical rhetoric (1974: 115-130). Karen R. Lawrence examines headlines and rhetorical figures (1980: 389-405). David Mikics concentrates on rhetoric, looking into the politics and histories hidden in the speeches (1990: 533-558). Stephen Donovan’s article is devoted to the investigation of newspaper typography, another study of Joyce’s use of headlines (2003: 519-541). None of these readings centers on the topic of the intellectual. Some researches on Joyce and journalism, however, are relevant to my study, although they do not address the issue of the intellectual directly. Cheryl Herr explores Joyce’s anatomy of the press, arguing that “Joyce interrogates, often comically, the conditions of production of Irish journalism and the replication of those conditions in other professions such as education and law” (1986: 67). R. Brandon Kershner dissects Joyce’s close connection to journalism and the newspapers and periodicals referred to in *Ulysses*, seeing the *Freeman’s Journal* office as “the arena for performances” for the group of pretentious Dubliners (2010: 83). In his survey of the relation between the Irish press and Catholic nationalism, Len Platt deems the pressmen in “Aeolus” to be the products of conservative reaction to the post-Parnellite era (1998: 735-746). These critiques have shed light on my reading of the intellectuals represented in the episode.

faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public” (1996: 11). This “vocation for the art of representing” characterizes the intellectual, who “raise[s] embarrassing questions,” “confront[s] orthodoxy and dogma,” and “break[s] down the stereotypes and reductive categories” which are “limiting to human thought and communication” (13, 11, xi). Nonconformity, in a word, features in Said’s delineation of the intellectual, a disturber of the status quo rejecting formulas, clichés, or confirmations of what the powerful and conventional say and do (23). Averse to being co-opted by power, this nonconformist sides with the weak and unrepresented, and delineates their suffering (22, 44). Said’s intellectual, in short, is a representative figure with a standpoint of her/his own; this independent figure performs a public role as the conscience of society and “speak[s] the truth to power” (xvi).

Said’s idea of the intellectual is in some respects similar to Julien Benda’s in the classic *La Trahison des clercs*, in which Benda laments the politicization of intellectuals in the early twentieth century. Benda’s terminology of “clerc,” in the medieval sense, means “scribe”—“someone we would now call a member of the intelligentsia” (Kimball, 2009: ix). The “clerks” are set apart from the “laymen,” those who crave after “the pursuit of material interests,” whereas the clerks seek joy “in the possession of non-material advantages” (Benda, 2009: 43). Benda’s “clerks,” in other words, are endowed with moral, religious, and spiritual ideals; they take no interest in material profits and say no to power—a portrait similar to Said’s, despite the latter scholar’s more positive attitude toward the intellectual’s involvement in public affairs. Like Said, Benda also sees the clerks as the conscience of the people: thanks to them, “humanity did evil for two thousand years, but honored good” (2009: 44). At the end of the nineteenth century,

however, those "who had acted as a check on the realism of the people began to act as its stimulators" (45). The clerks' participation in the game of political passions signifies their treason, which results in political turmoil and social upheaval. Benda grieves at this treason, for it indicates the loss of morality, conscience, and universal values.

In contrast to Benda, Antonio Gramsci would accentuate the intellectual's participation in social activities. Gramsci distinguishes between two groups of intellectuals: the traditional and the organic. Traditional intellectuals include professionals in such spheres as the religious, literary, scientific, etc., whose position "derives ultimately from past and present class relations and conceals an attachment to various historical class formations" (Gramsci, 1971: 3). Organic intellectuals, on the other hand, form a new type of intelligentsia; they act as "the thinking and organising element of a particular fundamental social class," characterized "less by their profession . . . than by their function in directing the ideas and aspirations of the class to which they organically belong" (3). For Gramsci, "[a]ll men are intellectuals" (9), in the sense that they have and use their intellect; but only those who participate in social activities and class struggles perform the intellectual function. Gramsci makes it clear: "The mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence . . . but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organiser, 'permanent persuader' and not just a simple orator" (10). Unlike Benda's transcendental clerks, Gramsci's intellectuals are motivated by political passions and devoted to the struggle of social forces—and hence are essential to the workings of modern society.

Michel Foucault also differentiates between two categories of intellectuals: the universal and the specific. Dominant in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the universal intellectual acted as "the spokesman of the universal"

and “the consciousness/conscience of us all,” “counterposing to power, despotism and the abuses and arrogance of wealth the universality of justice and the equity of an ideal law” (1980: 126, 128). This category derives from the jurist or notable, and finds the “fullest manifestation in the writer, the bearer of values and significations” (128). Their place has been taken since the Second World War by the specific type of intellectuals: savants or experts possessing specific knowledge and utilizing their expertise within specific sectors (129). Both categories are closely related to politics: the jurist and the writer have long fought in political struggles, and techno-scientific professionals could encounter manipulation by the powerful and the minority (127-130). Unlike the idealistic Benda, however, Foucault deems it “a dangerous error” to politically disregard the intellectuals (131). What must be taken into account is that they “operate and struggle at the general level of that régime of truth” crucial “to the structure and functioning of our society” (132). In other words, it is the role the intellectuals play with respect to the production of truth that Foucault pays heed to.

Despite their apparently different stances on political involvement, these theoretical concepts share certain commonality: all these thinkers highlight the public role of the intellectuals, who act as the conscience of the people, counteracting the unjust and speaking truth to power, or as the thinking and organizing element of society, directing the ideas and aspirations of the people. Conscientious and nonconforming, these representative figures are linked to the functioning of an apparatus of truth. Such delineation may to some extent appeal to Joyce, a nonconformist who represents the general paralysis of his country, searches for independence from restraints, refuses to serve any master, emphasizes universal values such as love and brotherhood, and repudiates hatred and parochialism. As is generally admitted, resistance

and nonconformity characterize Joyce's portrayal of his younger alter ego, Stephen, who famously claims in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* that "I will not serve": "I will not serve that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church: and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can"; he aims "to forge in the smithy of [his] soul the uncreated conscience of [his] race" (1964: 239, 246-247, 253). In *Ulysses*, Stephen asserts his ideal again: "*Non serviam!*" (1986: 475). It is noteworthy that Bloom shares this characteristic to some degree despite being styled a man of the masses:<sup>3</sup> both he and Stephen "indurated by early domestic training and an inherited tenacity of heterodox resistance professed their disbelief in many orthodox religious, national, social and ethical doctrines" (544). The picture of the independent and nonconforming intellectual functioning as the conscience of the people and speaking the truth seems to be gravely distorted in "Aeolus," which brings together several pressmen, a solicitor, a professor, and a poet. Yet except perhaps for Stephen the poet, these Dublin intellectuals act as simple orators rather than permanent persuaders, pursue personal gain instead of public welfare, and fall short of the production of truth; they fail, in brief, to perform the intellectual function. As the episode is set in the newsroom and dominated by the editor and other pressmen, my discussion will start with the "talents" of the press.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> For Joyce's portrayal of Leopold Bloom as loveable mass man, see Carey (2002: 19-20).

<sup>4</sup> Although "Aeolus" brings together intellectuals from various walks of life, it is the pressmen that dominate the entire episode. A larger proportion of this paper is therefore devoted to the dissection of the pressmen.

### III. Joyce's Representations of the Intellectuals: The Pressmen

Since the nineteenth century, journalism has been a major intellectual institution in Ireland. Intellectuals such as the Young Irelanders engaged in journalism, which served as an important channel for voicing their political ideals. The Irish press, as a matter of fact, had acted as “the major formulator of national consciousness” ever since O’Connell’s emancipation movement; this link with nationalism gave journalists a high status (Platt, 1998: 739-740). As a powerful vehicle, the press could serve either the nation or the Empire (and the Church). With the split in the nationalist party and the death of Parnell, the press ceased to serve as a representative of national spirit; rather than resist oppression, it perpetuated oppression. Joyce was aware of the ambivalent power of journalism, seeing both liberatory and repressive potential in the press (Collier, 2006: 8, 111). The increasing commercialization of journalism tainted further its revolutionary potential. Patriots might have praised the press as an agent of liberty, but journalism was a business, relying on sales to ensure its survival. With the massive expansion of the industry in the second half of the nineteenth century,<sup>5</sup> commercialization became inevitable as newspapers competed for a larger readership. Aiming at profits rather than an ideal, journalism in turn-of-the-century Ireland was considered an institution of changeability.<sup>6</sup> David Dwan’s remark well summarizes the degeneration of Irish journalism over the decades: “The newspaper may have brought a soul to Ireland in the 1840s, but by the end of the nineteenth century it was widely perceived to have corrupted the national spirit”

---

<sup>5</sup> For a historical context of newspapers as being published in Dublin, see Kershner (2010: 96-106).

<sup>6</sup> For the political inconsistency of certain newspapers, e.g., the *Freeman’s Journal*, see Herr (1986: 69-70) and Kershner (2010: 99-101).

(2008: 151). In spite of this, the pressmen possessed as immense power at the turn of the century as they did several decades before. George Russell concurs that this power was “greater than that of any public men, who, to a great extent, rise and fall at [journalists’] bidding” (cited in Kershner, 2010: 83).

Joyce is aware of the great power the pressmen possess.<sup>7</sup> James A. Reppke argues that Joyce recognizes journalism’s potential in shaping the changing world, and is attracted to newspapers “because he saw them as being at the center of almost everything” (2008: 464). Newspapers, Reppke rightly writes, could be deemed to be at the center of almost everything, for, as Declan Kiberd observes, the text of *Ulysses* shows that so many aspects of Dubliners’ life depend on the mediation of papers that the inhabitants could no longer understand their city without the service of the media (2000: 467).<sup>8</sup> In “Aeolus,” Joyce makes substantial allusions to the press and writes about newspapermen, deriving material from actual visits to the *Evening Telegraph* office in 1909 (Béaslaí, 1990: 41-43). If, as Kershner suggests, the true subject of “Aeolus” is the city (2010: 111), we may argue that it is the press which dominates the city, a fact indicating the significance of the press and pressmen in turn-of-the-century Dublin.

The Aeolus who presides over the office of the *Evening Telegraph* (the evening version of the *Freeman’s Journal*)<sup>9</sup> is

---

<sup>7</sup> Joyce, in actuality, was closely related to the newspaper industry. Through his father’s friends, he had plenty of connections to the press (Kershner, 2010: 80-81). The young Joyce even considered journalism as a career path (Collier, 2006: 114). For a detailed portrait of Joyce as a journalist, see Reppke (2008: 459-467).

<sup>8</sup> For example, the funeral of Paddy Dignam, the results of the Gold cup, and so on.

<sup>9</sup> Sharing offices in the same building, the two newspapers were owned by the same company, Freeman’s Journal, Ltd., which also published *Sport* and

Myles Crawford: an editor with a “harsh voice,” “bold blue eyes,” and “a scarlet beaked face, creased by a comb of feathery hair” (Joyce, 1986: 104). Professor MacHugh calls him “the sham squire” (104), in reference to Francis Higgins (1746-1802), an infamous libeler and informer who rose from an attorney’s clerk to eventually the ownership of the *Freeman’s Journal* by palming himself off as a country gentleman and marrying a respectable woman (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 135). The allusion inadvertently relates the *Freeman* to “a rather shameful period” (Kershner, 2010: 99) and associates Crawford with a notorious pressman—an anti-Irish Irishman indeed. Repeated mentions of Crawford’s “scarlet face” (Joyce, 1986: 105) are suggestive of his alcoholism. Ned Lambert whispers to J. J. O’Molloy, “Incipient jigs. Sad case” (105), and MacHugh makes the remark that “He’s pretty well on” (107), respectively suggesting advanced alcoholism and half drunkenness (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 135-136). Throughout the episode, it is drinks, not work, for which Crawford shows greater enthusiasm. So eager is he to go out for a drink that when Bloom informs him of the Keyes advertisement, he responds impatiently with an insult, “He can kiss my royal Irish arse” (Joyce, 1986: 121), oblivious of his position as *the* editor in charge of the office and responsible for the business of the newspaper.

The alcoholic editor is also characterized by changeability. His association with Aeolus inevitably gives him this attribute. Bloom remarks that “Myles Crawford began on the *Independent*” (Joyce, 1986: 103), which was set up after the Parnell scandal and devoted to championing the views of Parnellites, but gradually veered from a radical policy to a

---

other papers (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 129). As the evening version of the *Freeman’s Journal*, the *Evening Telegraph* is closely associated with its sister publication. To discuss the one is thus to include the other.

more conservative stance after changing hands in 1900 (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 134; Kershner, 2010: 100; Platt, 1998: 736). Like Crawford’s former employer, the *Freeman’s Journal* also underwent changes in policy during the long years of its publication: from anti-Catholic in the late eighteenth century to pro-Catholic and supportive of O’Connell during the mid-1800s, to finally abandoning Parnell and falling with him at the turn of the century (Herr, 1986: 69-70; Kershner, 2010: 99). The political inconsistency of Irish journalism is evident in the publishers employing Crawford as well as Crawford himself, who leaves the *Independent* at the promise of advancement, and will likely leave the *Freeman* if he sniffs an even more promising position. Having Crawford in mind, Bloom comments on the pressmen in general:

Funny the way those newspaper men veer about when they get wind of a new opening. Weathercocks. Hot and cold in the same breath. Wouldn’t know which to believe. One story good till you hear the next. Go for one another baldheaded in the papers and then all blows over. Hail fellow well met the next moment. (Joyce, 1986: 103)

The pressmen look for, in a word, profit, unconcerned with consistency and reliability; their changeability renders them untrustworthy. The journalists-as-intellectuals who act as the thinking and organizing element of the people and direct their ideas and aspirations are, ironically, directed by trends. They follow, instead of leading, the public; embrace, rather than scorn, material profit. They may still perform a public role, but are no longer independently representative figures with a standpoint of their own, nor do they speak as the conscience of the people. It is ironic that Crawford’s expectations of advancement probably shade into anxiety, if not regret. After rising along with Parnell and reaching its heights of influence in the late nineteenth century, the *Freeman* began to decline;

the *Independent*, on the other hand, was on the rise in the early 1900s, embodying the innovative new form of journalism that was having a great impact on Irish newspapers (Kershner, 2010: 99, 104).<sup>10</sup> As Kershner comments, “by 1904 [Crawford] must be aware that the historical and commercial momentum is now with his former employer” (2010: 104). Aware of this he may be, yet Crawford makes no attempt to change the status quo. He neither brings a soul to the nation nor profits his employer. His alcoholism may result partly from his frustration over advancement.

A drunken, dissatisfied weathercock, Crawford comforts himself by revelling memories of past glories. So far as the editor is concerned, talented journalists existed in bygone days. He considers Ignatius Gallaher the greatest journalist, who “made his mark” when “[t]he *New York World* cabled for a special” on the Phoenix Park murders (Joyce, 1986: 112). Crawford extols Gallaher’s ingenious device of transforming a newspaper page into a map of the Invincibles’ decoy and escape routes: “Gallaher, that was a pressman for you. . . . That was the smartest piece of journalism ever known” (112); “That’s press. That’s talent” (113); “Where do you find a pressman like that now, eh?” (113). An editor himself, Crawford seems to be oblivious of the fact that he *is* a pressman, liable for smart pieces of journalism. For him, the past outshines the present: influential nationalist leaders used to contribute articles to the *Freeman* (114), but the triumphs of the paper are long past. Kershner argues that “for all Crawford’s energetic rhetoric, the *Freeman’s Journal* is mired in past practices and the memory of past glories” (2010: 104). Its own past achievements prevent the *Freeman* from innovating in the new age; past practices have become

---

<sup>10</sup> The new journalism aimed at, in short, entertaining the public. It was therefore less serious and more commercialized. For its characteristics and the innovations the *Independent* pioneered, see Kershner (2010: 100-104).

obstacles, and past glories, traps. The more Crawford remains dissonantly invested in nostalgia, the less able he is to look forward. A newspaperman is supposed to deal with "news," yet Crawford is preoccupied with the old. Unable to revive past glories, nor to modernize the paper's journalism—where this modernization may lead to is another matter—Crawford falls to alcoholism and cynicism. He may curse his profession (Joyce, 1986: 113), but in this new, competitive age he will soon be eliminated if he fails to adapt. Kershner surmises that Crawford's dismissal of Bloom may be rooted in his uneasiness with the notion that advertising income will gradually replace sales and subscriptions as the main financial support of newspapers: "Much as he might wish to demand that advertisers like Keyes kiss his royal Irish arse . . . under modern economic pressures the reverse is more likely to happen" (2010: 104). Ironically enough, Crawford has inadvertently assimilated ad phrasing and endorsed the significance of advertising. In his description of Gallaher's device, the editor exclaims: "History! . . . Out of an advertisement" (Joyce, 1986: 113). Not only does the exclamation sound like an ad slogan, but the near juxtaposition of "history" and "advertisement" suggests the great import of advertising in modern Irish history. However much he dislikes the emerging ad industry, Crawford has been ensnared in its web, and yet he would passively resent and resist advertising rather than actively turn it to his and the paper's advantage.

Indulging in past glories as he does, Crawford is hopelessly submerged in historical confusion such that his version of history tends to be distorted. When attempting to recruit Stephen to the pressgang, the editor tells the story of the great Gallaher: "That was in eightyone, sixth of May, time of the invincibles, murder in the Phoenix park, before you were born, I suppose" (Joyce, 1986: 112). The Phoenix Park murders occurred not in 1881 but in 1882, the year of

Stephen's birth. Although editor of a major (though steadily declining) newspaper, Crawford cannot even correctly identify the year of a crucial event in modern Irish history. His incompetence bespeaks the perceptible decline of the *Freeman* in 1904. Shortly after making his appearance in the episode, in fact, Crawford confuses fantasy and history. He bursts out all of a sudden: "North Cork militia! . . . We won every time! North Cork and Spanish officers!" (105). When Ned Lambert asks where that was, the editor shouts, "In Ohio!" (105). Crawford's information is simply dubious. The North Cork Militia was loyal to the English ruler, not the nationalists, in the Rebellion of 1798. It suffered defeat in every battle rather than having "won every time." The mention of Spanish officers and Ohio can only be baffling: the battles had nothing to do with either. Don Gifford and Robert J. Seidman suggest that Crawford may have confused the North Cork Militia with the Irish Brigade, which did distinguish itself in battles and was commanded by officers of Spanish-Irish descent (1988: 135). Crawford's "mad historical confusions," Platt remarks, "have the rousing tone of radical discourse but . . . in content hopelessly conflate centuries, allegiances, and failures with victories"; these confusions, as Platt sees them, are "[p]erhaps the most poignant sign of the times" (1998: 743). Most poignant is the fact that these "mad historical confusions" are made by the editor of a major newspaper responsible for inspiring and directing the people in troubled times.

Crawford is not the only editor in "Aeolus." Before his encounter with the editor of the evening daily, Bloom catches a glimpse of William Brayden, a barrister and the actual editor of the morning daily, the *Freeman's Journal*:

a stately figure entered between the newsboards of the *Weekly Freeman and National Press* and the *Freeman's Journal and National Press*. . . . It passed stately up the staircase, steered by an umbrella, a

solemn beardframed face. The broadcloth back ascended each step: back. . . Welts of flesh behind on him. Fat folds of neck, fat, neck, fat, neck. (Joyce, 1986: 97)

Unlike the fictional Crawford who dominates the episode, Brayden makes only a very brief appearance. The representation of this figure seems conflicted: he is "stately" and "solemn" on one hand, but "fat" and ludicrous on the other. Moreover, he is steered by an umbrella, which, like a scepter, or phallic symbol, could signify both his power *and* his lack—he needs something to maintain his stateliness. The conflicting representation of Brayden implies that the pressman—as well as the press generally—is more ludicrous than grand, more pompous than solemn, and more ineffectual than powerful. As Bloom quips: "But will he save the circulation?" (98). However much Brayden attempts to look impressive, Bloom seems to suggest that his efforts to reverse the decline of the *Freeman's Journal* are incompetent. Kiberd argues that Joyce uses the gusts of wind filling Crawford's offices "to evoke the flatulent rhetoric of much *Freeman* journalism" (2000: 467). Before entering Crawford's office, in fact, we sense the flatulence of the *Freeman* through the caricature of its editor. It is interesting that Joyce differently represents two editors: the one is drunken, nostalgic, and incoherent; the other stately and swollen. Together, the fictitious and factual editors speak to the status of the Irish press: presentable on the outside, but corrupt within. Richard Ellmann mentions that in 1903 Joyce intended to set up a "newspaper of the continental type" in Dublin because he considered its newspapers corrupt (1982: 140). If, as Kiberd observes, Joyce has appropriated methods of the popular press and cast himself as the editor working on the newspaper that is *Ulysses* (2000: 463), we may argue that it is his distrust and dissatisfaction with pressmen that drives him to become an

editor himself: one who is inspirational and innovative rather than corrupt.

As mentioned earlier, Crawford considers Gallaher the greatest journalist. Despite the editor's acclaim, Gallaher's "greatness" is highly questionable. His detailed report of the Phoenix Park murders, for one thing, could have been illegal, for English laws limit what can be reported about a crime after individuals face charges and before they come to trial (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 140). An intellectual is surely supposed to act as a nonconformist, a truth-teller and disturber of the status quo. Yet Gallaher's presumable violation of the laws is motivated not by an ideal but by a desire to publish something that would give "him the leg up" (Joyce, 1986: 113) and an enviable position in London. Judging from Joyce's representations of this character in "A Little Cloud," he clearly values personal gain over public benefit. At the beginning of "A Little Cloud," Gallagher, returning home for a holiday, is depicted as the embodiment of success. Little Chandler has a high regard for his friend's changed circumstances: "Gallaher had got on" (1996: 70); he "had become a brilliant figure on the London Press" (71); "Ignatius Gallaher on the London Press!" (72). Clearly, Gallaher's attainment of a place in London fills the stay-at-home with pride. The returnee tells of press life: "It pulls you down. . . . Always hurry and scurry, looking for copy and sometimes not finding it: and then, always to have something new in your stuff. Damn proofs and printers, I say, for a few days" (75). So far as Gallaher is concerned, journalism is characterized by bustle and pressure. Press life, indeed, could be hectic and stressful, but his description does not show much, if any, enthusiasm for journalism; he mentions nothing about his accomplishment or sense of mission as an Irish journalist in London. He is determined to enjoy life, and being a journalist helps him achieve that purpose. Gallaher tells his friend: "Everything in

Paris is gay . . . They believe in enjoying life—and don't you think they're right?" (77). He advises his friend "to knock about a bit in the world" (76), which means to lead a life of debauchery in Paris, London, and other European capitals. He sketches for Little Chandler "some pictures of the corruption which was rife abroad," claiming that "he had had personal experience" (78). Marriage for him signifies a union not with his beloved but with money: "I mean to marry money" (81). Over the course of their conversation, Little Chandler's admiration turns increasingly to disillusionment; he observes "something vulgar in his friend," but attributes it to "the result of living in London amid the bustle and competition of the Press" (76-77). It is thus revealed that Gallaher is not only vulgar but corrupt. "THE GREAT GALLAHER" (Joyce, 1986: 111) has never been a "great" intellectual; his "vagrant and triumphant life" (1996: 80) is a vicious one. "[T]awdry journalism" (80) may have corrupted Gallaher as his friend believes, but the pressman has corrupted the press as well—as Crawford and his like have corrupted Irish journalism.

While the Irish-born Gallaher lives amid the bustle and competition of the London Press, Joseph Patrick Nannetti, a man of Italian descent, works among the loud machinery of the *Freeman* offices. The foreman, also a member of Parliament and later the Lord Mayor of Dublin, "boomed that workaday worker tack for all it was worth" (Joyce, 1986: 98), and could therefore be seen as a Gramscian organic intellectual. Unlike the alcoholic Crawford—more interested in drinking than doing his job—Nannetti is fully preoccupied with his work: he consents to the Keyes advertisement rather than rebuffing the canvasser and the advertiser. So concentrated on work is he that throughout his encounter with Bloom, the foreman speaks only twice: "We can do that . . . Have you the design?"; "We can do that. . . . Let him give us a three months' renewal" (100). After saying that, the foreman "began to check [a

galleypage] *silently*” (100; emphasis added), and ignores Bloom’s presence. Bloom is not the only person to whom he closes his eyes. When Joe Hynes visits him for the report on Dignam’s funeral, Nannetti, “*without answering*, scribbled press on a corner of the sheet and made a sign to a typesetter,” and then “handed the sheet *silently* over the dirty glass screen” (98; emphasis added), giving no heed to Hynes at all. He cannot even remember the name of his colleague: “Where’s what’s his name?” (100). Herr observes that Nannetti “moves and speaks somewhat mechanically” (85). Attentive to his work, the foreman engages in little human interaction, but performs mechanically. However, he also plays the role of politician, supposedly working with and for people. Ironically, the councilor shows no interest in Bloom’s account of the mildly political ad. As Herr points out: “His explanation does not elicit even a spark of interest or patriotic approval from the foreman, merely a businesslike assessment of how long a renewal will be required from Keyes to assure a profit for the paper” (71). In short, Nannetti devotes his attention to profits instead of the content of the ad itself. Being an employee of the *Freeman*, he is more capable and reliable than Crawford, but as a politician, he seems to lack the enthusiasm required of a public servant. “Nannetti’s unresponsiveness,” Herr declares, “suggests both the remoteness of government officials from their constituents . . . and the sometimes peculiar aloofness of the established press in Ireland from certain political issues” (71). Put another way, the politician/pressman displays indifference to both the citizenry and Home Rule. His unresponsiveness to fellow Dubliners and certain political issues notwithstanding, Nannetti responds to the Church immediately and submissively: he demands the archbishop’s letter from his colleague, ordering it “to be repeated in the *Telegraph*” (Joyce, 1986: 100). Ambitious for the mayoralty, he needs the support of the Church, and therefore prefers to

serve the archbishop rather than the common people—he embraces the powerful, not the unrepresented. The organic intellectual who ought to play the role of a “permanent persuader” (Gramsci, 1971: 10) is, ironically, persuaded, or enlisted, by the powerful.

As mentioned previously, Hynes also has a brief encounter with the foreman. A reporter and staunch admirer of Parnell, Hynes first appears in “Ivy Day in the Committee Room,” in which he supports the working-class Colgan in the municipal elections. Unlike the other canvassers who despise their candidate, Tierney, yet solicit votes for him for the sake of money, Hynes defends Colgan when he is slighted: “Hasn’t the working-man as good a right to be in the Corporation as anyone else . . . ?”; “He goes in to represent the labour classes. This fellow you’re working for only wants to get some job or other” (Joyce, 1996: 121). Hynes supports Colgan, it seems, not because he is paid, but because he believes in the candidate and his ideas. O’Connor speaks favorably of Hynes: “Ah, poor Joe is a decent skin” (124); “I think Joe Hynes is a straight man. He’s a clever chap, too, with the pen” (125). His comparative decency notwithstanding, Hynes is as penniless as the others. “Usha, poor Joe!” O’Connor sighs, “he’s hard up like the rest of us” (124). In *Ulysses*, Hynes appears to be as stone-broke as ever, and we learn that he has borrowed money from Bloom. Upon seeing him in Nannetti’s reading closet, Bloom hints at the three-shilling debt: “If you want to draw the cashier is just going to lunch” (1986: 99). Hearing that, the debtor “hurried on eagerly towards the *Freeman’s Journal* office” (99)—without the slightest acknowledgement of the creditor’s hint. Bloom reflects on his unsuccessful attempt: “Three bob I lent him in Meagher’s. Three weeks. Third hint” (99). We later learn in “Cyclops” that Hynes has received his remuneration, but instead of paying off his debt, he treats the Citizen and the I-narrator to several rounds of drinks at Barney

Kiernan's, where Bloom is conversing with them in the meantime. Before he squanders the "[s]weat of [his] brow" (244), we observe him working in "Hades": he attends Dignam's funeral and takes the names of the mourners. The account of the funeral published in the *Evening Telegraph* that Bloom reads in "Eumaeus" is shot through with errors: Bloom's name is stated as L. Boom, the name of the person in a mackintosh is jotted down as M'Intosh, and M'Coy and Stephen, who never showed up to the obsequies, are curiously listed among the mourners (529). "L. Boom" could be a misprint, an error not imputable to the reporter, and M'Coy was said to be present because Bloom, at the absentee's request, asked Hynes to include the name; nevertheless, the mistakes about the mysterious M'Intosh and Stephen could simply be ascribed to carelessness or indifference. Hynes may be as clever with the pen as O'Connor claims, yet he can hardly be called a qualified or committed journalist: he works for a living, not because he feels called to the vocation. Hynes may be more politically consistent than many Dubliners; as Joyce's depiction reveals, however, he is as inadequate as the other journalists.

Despite Hynes's problematic account of the funeral, he at least does his work on 16 June 1904, yet we hardly see Lenehan work as a journalist.<sup>11</sup> A sports reporter for the *Freeman*-affiliated *Sport*, Lenehan also makes his first appearance in *Dubliners*, where he is portrayed as an idling, unashamed, and inveterate sponger:

Most people considered Lenehan a leech . . . He was a sporting vagrant armed with a vast stock of stories, limericks and riddles. He was insensitive to all kinds of discourtesy. No one knew how he

---

<sup>11</sup> Joyce borrows the name from a reporter on the *Irish Times* and the personality from a friend of his father who worked for the racing paper, *Sport*. For the sponger who inspires Joyce's creation of his character, see Ellmann (1982: 365-366).

achieved the stern task of living, but his name was vaguely associated with racing tissues. (Joyce, 1996: 50)

A brazen-faced parasite, Lenehan is probably well-educated: not only is he armed with a large stock of stories, limericks and riddles, but speaks French and has an "air of gentility" (57). It remains uncertain in "Two Gallants" as to how he is associated with racing, but in *Ulysses*, Joyce makes this association clear by depicting him as a reporter for a racing paper: "Lenehan came out of the inner office with *Sport's* tissues," asking, "Who wants a dead cert for the Gold cup?" (1986: 105). Being a sports journalist, he does not cover the race but tips the winner, and this can be counted as a violation of professional ethics. Throughout the entire novel, in fact, we observe Lenehan fawning on his fellow Dubliners, trying to win favor, rather than working as a journalist. His parasitism has gone even farther than before. When O'Molloy offers a cigarette to MacHugh, "Lenehan promptly struck a match for them and lit their cigarettes in turn" (107), thereby obtaining one for himself. Later, the cigarette case is offered to Stephen and Crawford, and once again, "Lenehan lit their cigarettes as before and took his trophy" (115). He also grimaces, caricatures Bloom's walking, recites a limerick, asks a riddle, plays word games, and chimes in whenever he can (106-113). It is noteworthy that his riddle is interrupted by those in the office and that no one attempts to solve it, suggesting their unconcern with him. When Stephen proposes a round of drinks, Lenehan suggests Mooney's and "[leads] the way" (118), and in so doing insinuates himself into the gang. More like a jester than a journalist, Lenehan always tries to interject a word or to amuse people with banal jokes and funny gestures, so as to remind others of his presence and obtain his trophies—cigarettes, drinks, etc. As Bloom remarks when spotting the gang leaving: "Lenehan's yachting cap on the cadge beyond.

Usual blarney” (120). The air of gentility which he seeks to belie in “Two Gallants” has disappeared in *Ulysses*. Kershner argues that Lenehan’s “active and intrusive presence” in the newspaper office suggests that it is “a place where spongers and ne’er-do-wells congregate and are tolerated for their entertainment value” (2010: 84). A sports reporter, Lenehan is not an intruder in the office, but is unquestionably a sponger and ne’er-do-well barely tolerated for his entertainment value.

As mentioned earlier, the Irish press has long played a crucial part in the formation of national spirit; intellectuals such as the Young Irelanders used the press as a channel for advocating their ideals and directing popular aspirations of the people. With the massive expansion of the newspaper industry in the second half of the nineteenth century, the influence of the press grew tremendously: Donovan observes that in *Ulysses* “people live and breathe newspaper typography” (2003: 533). Exercising greater influence, one expects that the pressmen would bear even greater responsibility for informing the people. Nevertheless, the rapid expansion of journalism resulted in a reduction in entry requirements to the field, leading to a situation in which “any untrained scribbler calls himself a journalist” (Dwan, 2008: 171). More alarming is the degeneration—indeed loss—of the professional ethics of the pressmen who work for personal gain, not in the service of the public; also, as Joyce’s representations reveal, they were often alcoholic, nostalgic, incompetent, vulgar, arrogant, and obsequious—in a word, corrupt. Terence Killeen notes the irony apparent in the *Evening Telegraph* office:

people existing in a cut-off world of their own, unaware of anything outside the confines of their own circle—and this despite ostensibly being the people with their fingers on the pulse of public opinion. (2004: 72)

Mark Osteen also has it that the newspapermen circulate borrowed rhetoric and money instead of exchanging news (1995: 204). Remiss in their duties and failing to meet their obligations as pressmen, the Dubliners in the office embody the degenerate and corrupt journalistic intellectuals Joyce distrusts; far from acting as the conscience of the nation, they are concerned more about a drink in the pub and the cash in their pockets than about the soul of Ireland.

#### IV. Joyce's Representations of Other Intellectuals: Lawyers and Educators

Joyce also depicts intellectuals in other fields than the press in “Aeolus.” It is true that Crawford rules over the newspaper office, yet J. J. O'Molloy and Professor MacHugh, representing the law and Classics respectively, dominate the discussion on oratory. At sight of O'Molloy in the office, Bloom comments inwardly:

Cleverest fellow at the junior bar he used to be. Decline, poor chap. That hectic flush spells finis for a man. Touch and go with him. What's in the wind, I wonder. Money worry. . . .

Practice dwindling. A mighthavebeen. Losing heart. Gambling. Debts of honour. Reaping the whirlwind. Used to get good retainers from D. and T. Fitzgerald. . . . Believe he does some literary work for the Express with Gabriel Conroy. Wellread fellow. (Joyce, 1986: 103)

Bloom appreciates O'Molloy's talent at the bar and his versatility, but notes that *now* he is characterized by unfulfillment, deterioration, and bankruptcy. Bloom conjectures correctly about the barrister's purpose in the *Evening Telegraph* office: he comes to see Crawford for a loan, but is refused by the editor, who claims to be as hard up as his

friend (121). O'Molloy is, in a word, a talented barrister on the decline, falling deeper and deeper in debt. "Practice dwindling" might have contributed to his financial difficulty and downfall, but it is gambling which dooms him to disaster and ruination. His financial trouble notwithstanding, O'Molloy endeavors to maintain an air of respectability: he speaks "gently" (108) and "quietly" (109, 114), and offers several rounds of cigarettes in the course of the conversation—the only person who offers cigarettes. As a barrister, ironically, O'Molloy does not work in his office or at the bar, but loafes around with a gang of spongers and ne'er-do-wells in the newspaper office and struggles to get a loan. He is "socially superfluous" as Herr suggests (1986: 73), despite being an intellectual of the third profession.

However, even without his financial problems, O'Molloy cannot be accounted an adequate and respectable lawyer despite Bloom's positive assessment of his capability. For one thing, his statement concerning the wife of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland buying a commemoration postcard of the Invincibles proves to be an embellished flourish, not fact (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 142). When the nostalgic Crawford says with disdain that silver-tongued barristers existed in the past but not at present, O'Molloy retorts, and applauds Seymour Bushe for his eloquence in the Childs murder case, during which Bushe delivered "[o]ne of the most polished periods" he has "ever listened to in [his] life" (Joyce, 1986: 114). As O'Molloy recollects: "[Bushe] spoke on the law of evidence . . . of Roman justice as contrasted with the earlier Mosaic code, the *lex talionis*. And he cited the Moses of Michelangelo in the vatican" (115). O'Molloy's recollection slightly differs from what actually happened in court. To begin with, Bushe did speak on the laws of evidence during the trial, but he compared Irish laws of evidence with English laws, and did not mention the contrast between Roman justice and the Mosaic

code. Furthermore, the statue of Moses stood not in the Vatican but in San Pietro in Vincoli (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 146). As historically confused as Crawford, O’Molloy recalls inaccurately what Bushe said during the trial, though he does remember the periodic sentence clearly:

*that stony effigy in frozen music, horned and terrible,  
of the human form divine, that eternal symbol of  
wisdom and of prophecy which, if aught that the  
imagination or the hand of sculptor has wrought in  
marble of soultransfigured and of soultransfiguring  
deserves to live, deserves to live.* (Joyce, 1986: 115)

Obviously, O’Molloy is attracted to the polished period itself rather than the argumentation. As Herr observes: “He appears to respond to the periodic structure of Bushe’s phrasing without regard to the adequacy of Bushe’s legal stance” (73). Not only is O’Molloy more interested in effective rhetoric than sound reasoning, but he pays great attention to the theatrical performance given. Before reciting the periodic sentence on the *Moses* of Michelangelo, he “took out his matchbox thoughtfully and lit his cigar,” and then “resumed, moulding his words,” and “said of it” at long last (115). After he finishes his recitation begging mercy for the defendant, “[h]is slim hand with a wave graced echo and fall” (115). While Lenehan acts as more a jester than a journalist, O’Molloy behaves more like an actor than a barrister. Osteen (1995: 208) suggests that by quoting the more successful Bushe, O’Molloy attempts to buttress his authority and to conceal his incipient bankruptcy. Similarly, by resorting to a theatrical performance, he indicates that he intends to hold the stage as if still a figure of great weight, not a creature of no importance. His recitation of the speech is therefore “not to invoke justice but merely to prop him up in his friends’ eyes” (208). In so doing, however, O’Molloy misses the point that a barrister is supposed to focus on matters of law instead of rhetorical and theatrical

performance, that he should look to his clients' best interests and speak at the bar rather than chat away his time in the newspaper office and drink at a bar.

The other lawyer worth mentioning in Joyce's text is John Henry Menton, "solicitor, commissioner for oaths and affidavits" (1986: 94), who, like O'Molloy, has a brief encounter with Bloom on 16 June 1904. Recalling who the familiar face belonged to at the cemetery, Menton comments on the man's wife first, seeing Molly as a sex object: "She was a finelooking woman. I danced with her, wait, fifteen seventeen golden years ago, at Mat Dillon's in Roundtown. And a good armful she was" (87). He then confesses that he "fell foul of [Bloom] one evening . . . at bowls" (88), which results in his long-held grudge against the man who beat him at sport. So resentful of his rival is he that after learning of Bloom's relation to Molly, he exclaims, "In God's name . . . what did she marry a coon like that for? She had plenty of game in her then" (88). Bloom also recalls that unpleasant incident later in the same episode:

Got his rag out that evening on the bowlinggreen because I sailed inside him. Pure fluke of mine: the bias. Why he took such a rooted dislike to me. Hate at first sight. Molly and Floey Dillon linked under the lilactree, laughing. Fellow always like that, mortified if women are by. (94-95)

Bloom interprets Menton's "rooted dislike" to him as a reaction to the humiliation he felt at the game, especially when the defeat was witnessed by women. In an attempt to show his friendliness, Bloom tells the solicitor of the dinge in the side of his hat; Menton, however, "stared at [Bloom] for an instant without moving" (95), as though the man's utterances went unheard. It is Martin Cunningham, a Dublin Castle official Menton prefers not to offend, who rescues Bloom from embarrassment. Very likely Menton detests Bloom and treats

him rudely not only because he beat him at bowls long time ago, but because the rival who married a sexually attractive woman is a Jew and canvasser—a member of a degenerate race and not employed in a traditionally respectable occupation. Chauvinistic, narrow-minded, and snobbish, Menton takes advantage of women, harbors long-lasting enmity, and slights the socially inferior—and yet he is supposed to be a practitioner of law and representative of justice. The irony cannot be more obvious.

Besides the talents of the press and the law, those who dominate the conversation in the newspaper office include the Latin professor MacHugh, an intellectual in the field of Classics and education. Sarcastically addressed by Crawford as “bloody old pedagogue” (Joyce, 1986: 104), the professor is portrayed as a shabby scholar with “frayed stained shirtcuffs” (108) and “soiled,” “unglazed linen collar” (116). But what characterizes him when he first appears in the episode is his ravenousness: he busies himself in eating. As Bloom enters the office, MacHugh murmurs “biscuitfully” (102), listening to Ned Lambert’s reading of the Dawson speech on the paper. The professor makes disparaging remarks on the speech, and meanwhile eats biscuits avariciously: “He ate off the crescent of water biscuit he had been nibbling and, hungered, made ready to nibble the biscuit in his other hand” (102). Bloom then inquires about the speech, and “the professor said between his chews” (103). Hungering for food rather than knowledge, showing greediness instead of learnedness, MacHugh undermines what we expect of a scholar and educator: he appears to be more a ravenous animal than a learned intellectual.

An unquestionably oral being, MacHugh is busily engaged not only in eating but also in talking. He begins his lecture on Rome after O’Molloy makes a casual remark on *Imperium romanum*: “We mustn’t be led away by words, by

sounds of words. We think of Rome, imperial, imperious, imperative” (Joyce, 1986: 108). The grandeur of Rome, he argues, lies in the sewers: “What was their civilisation? Vast, I allow: but vile. *Cloacae*: sewers” (108). In his opinion, the Romans focused on grossly materialistic values and disregarded spiritualistic ones, and this rendered their civilization vile. Despite what he says about words, nevertheless, MacHugh is led—or obsessed—by the sounds of words, as evident in the verbal dexterity shown above. Mikics states convincingly that the professor surrenders to the lure of rhetoric when he criticizes the Romans: “MacHugh, denouncing Rome, is transformed into a parody of the Roman orator, a victim of the very rhetoric he pretends to reject” (1990: 541). Indeed, MacHugh acts as the supreme orator in the *Evening Telegraph* office in spite of his rejection of Roman oratory. Although he teaches Latin, moreover, he prefers Greek to “the blatant Latin language”: “The Greek! . . . The radiance of the intellect. I ought to profess Greek, the language of the mind” (Joyce, 1986: 110). MacHugh is clearly trapped in the dichotomy between the spiritual and the material, and therefore disdains the “blatant” Latin. Mikics notes the irony in the professor’s detestation of the language: “MacHugh styles himself a lover of the Hellenic, but as a professor of Latin rather than Greek, he helps perpetuate the culture he complains against” (1990: 541). What is even more ironic is the fact that he associates Greece, “the empire of the spirit,” with “a lost cause,” and denounces success in favor of failure: “We were always loyal to lost causes. . . . Success for us is the death of the intellect and of the imagination. We were never loyal to the successful. We serve them” (Joyce, 1986: 110). At a time when the Irish were striving for freedom, the scholar and educator announces that he embraces failure rather than success. Comparing O’Molloy and MacHugh, Herr has it that whereas the barrister “is simply beaten down by failure,” the professor “perversely glories in it” (74). Seen in light of Ireland’s subjection to the British Empire,

MacHugh's perverse glorification of failure is not only ironic but poignant. Like O'Molloy, MacHugh also confuses fiction with fact. At the mention of the Invincibles, he claims that "some hawkers were up before the recorder" (113), but the hawkers, arrested for selling postcards and mementoes of the Phoenix Park murders, did not appear before the recorder but in police court (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 142). Supposedly a learned man, the professor, it seems, has a preference for hearsay over actuality.

Joyce's representation of MacHugh reaches its climax when the professor recalls "[t]he finest display of oratory [he] ever heard" in response to O'Molloy's recitation of Bushe's polished period: a speech made by John F. Taylor on "the revival of the Irish tongue" (1986: 116). MacHugh declares that the topic was "new for those days," that the Revival "was then a new movement" (116); his account is not altogether correct, though. When Taylor made the speech at the Trinity College Historical Society in 1901, the Gaelic League (founded in 1893) and its campaign for the revival of the Irish language had already made considerable progress (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 147-148); neither Taylor's topic nor the Gaelic Revival was "new." Like O'Molloy, MacHugh performs theatrically before reciting:

He closed his long thin lips an instant but, eager to be on, raised an outspanned hand to his spectacles and, with trembling thumb and ringfinger touching lightly the black rims, steadied them to a new focus. . . .

His gaze turned at once but slowly from J. J. O'Molloy's towards Stephen's face and then bent at once to the ground, seeking. . . .

He raised his head firmly. His eyes bethought themselves once more. Witless shellfish swam in the gross lenses to and fro, seeking outlet. (Joyce, 1986: 116)

After all the acting and gesturing, he finally recites the words “as well as [he] can bring them to mind” (116), and “ceased and looked at [the listeners], enjoying a silence” (117) upon finishing the recitation. “That is oratory,” MacHugh emphasizes (118). Taylor’s speech, in summary, refers to Moses’s repudiation of the Egyptian priest’s command that Israelites accept the language, religion, and culture of Egypt, a reference suggesting that the Irish reject the ruler’s attempt at Anglicizing Ireland. Despite the patriotism manifest in Taylor’s speech, MacHugh focuses on the oratory rather than the content, on the orator’s phrasing rather than his objective, and what follows the recitation is the decision to have drinks at Mooney’s. As MacHugh says of Dawson’s speech, “Bombast! . . . Enough of the inflated windbag!” (104). He is himself an inflated windbag full of bombast, being led away by, and meanwhile leading people away with, words. This ravenous, failure-loving, and bombastic professor, ironically, represents an intellectual in the field of Classics in charge of the edification of the younger generation.

MacHugh’s unreserved praise of the Hellenistic and fierce rejection of the Roman world, Mikics suggests, links him to his ideological opponent Garrett Deasy, the headmaster of the “Nestor” episode (1990: 542-543). Also an educator, Deasy forms a striking contrast to MacHugh in terms of his attitude toward the materialistic and the British ruler. While the professor detests the country which sees time as money and stresses material domination (Joyce, 1986: 115), the headmaster preaches the value of money: “You don’t know yet what money is. Money is power” (25). Giving Stephen his wages, Deasy thus has power over the young man—he wants Stephen, with his literary connections, to have the letter on foot-and-mouth disease published. Unsurprisingly, the preacher of the value of money has a high regard for the very country whose people boast “*I paid my way*” (25). Pro-British

in political orientation, Deasy worries that the Jews keep a firm hand on England and destroy her: "In all the highest places: her finance, her press. And they are the signs of a nation's decay. Wherever they gather they eat up the nation's vital strength. . . . Old England is dying" (28). Despite being a colonial subject, Deasy is deeply concerned about the Empire's impending doom rather than Ireland's long-term subjection. At the end of the episode, he says playfully to Stephen that Ireland never persecuted the Jews because "she never let them in" (30). His statement, inaccurate though it is, reveals his deep-rooted anti-Semitism and bigotry. By keeping the Jews at bay, he seems to suggest, Ireland can be free from the contamination brought about by the degenerate and destructive race. In this respect, Deasy does not differ much from his ideological opponent: his support of a powerful Empire and anti-Semitism points to his inclination toward racial purity, whereas MacHugh's celebration of the Hellenistic and condemnation of the Roman, as well as his acclaim for Taylor's speech, suggests his accentuation of cultural purism.

A counterpart to the professor, the headmaster is also ideologically similar to the lawyer, Menton. While Menton reveals his chauvinism by regarding women as sex objects, Deasy displays misogyny when lecturing Stephen. "We have committed many errors and many sins," he declares, and these errors and sins can be imputed to women:

A woman brought sin into the world. For a woman who was no better than she should be, Helen, the runaway wife of Menelaus, ten years the Greeks made war on Troy. A faithless wife first brought the strangers to our shore here, MacMurrough's wife and her leman, O'Rourke, prince of Breffni. A woman too brought Parnell low. (Joyce, 1986: 29)

Men err and sin, according to Deasy, on account of women, and vices and corruptions would not have come into existence

without the female sex. It is noteworthy that Deasy has the relationship muddled when referring to the first Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland: the faithless wife was wedded to O'Rourke, the prince, not MacMurrough, the seducer (Gifford & Seidman, 1988: 39). A headmaster, he muddles up history as Crawford, O'Molloy, and MacHugh do. Encountering such an educator, Stephen feels stifled: "The same room and hour, the same wisdom: and I the same. Three times now. Three nooses round me here" (Joyce, 1986: 25). This money-loving, anti-Semitic, and misogynistic educator, very likely, ruins rather than illuminates the younger generation.

## V. Conclusion: Joyce's Rethinking of the Intellectual

Intellectuals, admittedly, have dominated central parts in the pages of modern Irish history, and Joyce incorporates a diverse array of intellectuals into his texts. The "Aeolus" episode depicts members of the intelligentsia in the professions of journalism, law, and education. Many of these characters, however, are representatives of disappointment rather than talent. Kiberd comments that the episode "is filled with a sense of missed opportunities" (2009: 121). Indeed, we observe that Crawford works unenthusiastically for a newspaper on the decline; O'Molloy is down on his luck and defeated by life; MacHugh fails to profess the language he adores, and so on. As Platt remarks, the "OMNIUM GATHERUM" in the *Telegraph* office is in fact "a gathering of failure and unfulfillment," where underachievers, not outstanding talents, assemble (1998: 735-736). These characters' underachievements notwithstanding, Kershner notes that "the newspaper office becomes the arena for performances," permeating which is "a sense of expectant nostalgia and a regret for great times past"; the

nostalgia and regret, however, "seems all the more inappropriate in that it takes place in a newspaper office, a locale ostensibly dedicated to the present moment" (2010: 83, 102). Osteen has it that newspaper offices process events and turn them into news, but the occupants of the *Telegraph* office exchange little news; rather they circulate borrowed rhetoric and money (1995: 204). Throughout the episode, undisputedly, these "talents" indulge in borrowed rhetoric. Rhetoric, Killeen argues, is meant "to be kinetic, to move the listeners to do something"; in "Aeolus," nevertheless, rhetoric "is entirely static, existing in a void remote from any action" (2004: 72). The only action these "talents" take is when Stephen proposes a drink at a bar after MacHugh's sentimental and forceful recitation of Taylor's speech on Moses and the Promised Land, a speech supposed to inspire them to patriotism. The "OMNIUM GATHERUM," in other words, is replete with flatulent yet empty words, lacking in practical and consequential actions; these Dubliners' speeches are ineffectual, their "action," heading toward a bar, escapist. Ironically, these personages of empty rhetoric act as the backbone of turn-of-the-century Ireland, liable to inspire and direct the people during times of turmoil, to utilize their expertise in the production of truth. And yet instead of being the conscience of the people, they corrupt the national spirit: their idleness, flatulence, alcoholism, and nostalgia not only result in failure and unfulfillment, but, more gravely, signify the degeneration of the intelligentsia. Retrospective rather than innovative, dedicated to the borrowed rather than the self-created, these Dubliners fail to be the "talents" worthy of their professions.

Joyce's representations of the journalists, lawyer, and professor in the "Aeolus" episode implicitly evoke the intellectuals who dominated nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Irish history. In his portrayals of the "talents" in the *Telegraph* office, Joyce critiques these Dubliners on the one

hand and dialogizes his predecessors and contemporaries on the other. The orators in Crawford's office—the barrister O'Molloy and the academic MacHugh in particular—are somewhat reminiscent of Daniel O'Connell, a lawyer and renowned orator, whose forceful speeches incited audiences and helped bring about the success of Catholic Emancipation. Unlike O'Molloy's and MacHugh's empty talks, O'Connell's oratorical and organizational skills did exercise tremendous power, but there were limits: the *Liberator* acquiesced on the government's prohibition against meetings for fear of risking bloodshed, and this submission, as mentioned before, resulted in a decline in his influence and the failure of the Repeal movement. O'Connell's case suggests that the effectiveness of words is conditional on their being delivered to the public and inspiring action. Deprived of either of those conditions, words are rendered empty and powerless, as were O'Connell's speeches delivered outside of the rallies. The Dubliners' utterances in the newspaper office lack the necessary conditions to be effective; their forceful speeches, repeating others' words in a windy locale occupied by a gang of flatulent underachievers, are therefore reduced to empty rhetoric, and have no practical effect. O'Connell's advocacy of Jewish emancipation, moreover, is replaced by these Dubliners' anti-Semitism, as their hostility toward Bloom demonstrates. Despite Joyce's likely appreciation of O'Connell's espousal of Jewish emancipation and the abolition of slavery, he would have certainly frowned at the *Liberator*'s sectarian inclination, for his idea of Catholic Ireland would have expelled the Anglo-Irish like Parnell from their homeland. Not only do the orators in the *Telegraph* office remind us of O'Connell, but Professor MacHugh's acclaim for Taylor's speech is evocative of Douglas Hyde, also a professor and champion of the revival of Gaelic. The representations of Crawford and other pressmen, furthermore, recall the journalistic intellectuals, the

Young Irelanders, whose attempts at reviving Gaelic elements inspired Revivalists such as Hyde and Yeats. The Revivalists' appeal to Gaelic materials and De-Anglicization, so far as Joyce is concerned, is not only parochial but impractical: the indulgence in past glories and the attempt to eliminate British influences from Ireland is retrospective and pointless, disconnected from both daily life and present reality. As Terry Eagleton remarks, the Gaelic took it home “in the hearts and minds of the intelligentsia,” not in the day-to-day life of the rural people (1995: 263). Joyce himself claims the hybridity of Irish culture, in which Anglicization plays a part: “Our civilization is a vast fabric, in which the most diverse elements are mingled . . . In such a fabric, it is useless to look for a thread that may have remained pure and virgin without having undergone the influence of a neighbouring thread” (1989: 165). Presenting a speech on Celtic Revival through the caricatured MacHugh's mouth, and portraying the pressmen as indulging in past triumphs and empty talks, Joyce insinuates his disapproval of Young Irelanders and Revivalists' stance, indicating the nostalgia, parochialism, and impracticality of these intellectuals' ideas. Eagleton perceives a “traditional gap between rhetoric and reality in Ireland” (1995: 257). This gap is manifested in both fictitious and factual Irish intellectuals. Joyce's representations of the “talents” in “Aeolus,” in this respect, reveal not simply the deterioration of certain intellectuals who failed to be the conscience of the nation in 1904; subtly but significantly, Joyce inserts into the episode his critique of, or dialogue with, those who have shaped Ireland.

It is noteworthy that Stephen, the literary talent, is among the “OMNIUM GATHERUM” in the office. As mentioned earlier, Stephen's rebellion and nonconformity makes him an intellectual to Joyce's mind—the younger Joyce when composing *Portrait*. Stephen's participation in “Aeolus,” however, is complex: on one hand, he rejects the editor's

attempt to recruit him to the pressgang and remains critical of the flatulent Dubliners in the newspaper office, but on the other hand it is he who proposes a round of drinks, and in so doing aligns himself with the alcoholic disappointments. His Parable of the Plums is similarly intricate. In a positive sense, it functions as a seditiously destabilizing force to counteract empty rhetoric, as exemplified by MacHugh's recitation of Taylor's speech: instead of embracing the remote past and cultural purism, the Parable centers on the here and now, reconstructs a realistic picture of the paralytic Irish status quo out of incorporated discourses, and thus achieves the production of truth as expected of an intellectual.<sup>12</sup> Despite his awareness of the pervasively Irish paralysis and his effort to reject the lure of empty rhetoric, Stephen is nevertheless as trapped as the other Dubliners in bitterness, failure, and unfulfillment, and the Parable, uncomprehended, inclines toward empty talk. Seeing Stephen's statement in "Circe," "I must kill the priest and the king" (Joyce, 1986: 481), as "a young man's assertion," Andrew Gibson comments: "The older Joyce got, the more aware he became of the ironical limits to such a project" (2006: 40). The "ironical limits" emerge because Stephen is ensnared in the idealism that

---

<sup>12</sup> The Parable depicts two elderly and abject Dublin women who save up money to see the views of the city from the top of Nelson's pillar, where they spot the roofs of different churches, peer up at the statue of Admiral Lord Nelson, consume brawn, bread, and plums, and spit the plumstones out between the railings. Squandering their hard-earned money in beholding the churches and paying homage to the imperial ruler—the Italian and English masters in Stephen's terminology—these Dublin women enact the willing servants of two masters dominating Ireland, and thus epitomize the paralysis prevalent among the Irish. So paralytic are they that the plumstones, which could germinate, flourish, and fruit if properly planted, are spit out indifferently in the barren cityscape, wasted and bearing no fruit. This realistic delineation of the paralytic Irish status quo functions therefore as the counter-discourse to those nostalgic discourses in "Aeolus," particularly that on Moses and the Promised Land.

characterizes traditional Western intellectuals: a representative of the independent and resistant intellectual, as Said sees him (1996: 16-17)—the embodiment of the idealistic aspects of the intellectual indeed—Stephen of *Portrait* may be proud and rebellious, but is soon defeated by the harsh realities of daily life when setting out to undertake the enterprise of forging the uncreated conscience of his race. Like Icarus, he soars too high in *Portrait*, and the wax on his wings melts; inevitably and heavily, he falls to the ground in *Ulysses*. What remains after the fall is merely glumness, frustration, and wasted potential, and despite the subversive power of the Parable, it is left unappreciated and powerless. Stephen himself is equivocal about his “vision”: “He gave a sudden loud young laugh as a close” (Joyce, 1986: 119, 122), feeling awkward and unconfident, in sharp contrast to the Stephen of *Portrait* who proudly announces his enterprise. Stephen’s predicament reveals the insufficiency of the overtly idealistic aspects characteristic of many intellectuals: ignoring the realistic aspects, they end up being stranded in their idealism, which turns out to be no more than empty rhetoric. O’Connell endeavored to bring about the repeal of the Act of Union by constitutional means supported by stirring speeches, but the government prohibition on rallies, together with his insistence that there be no bloodshed, resulted in the dwindling of his influence and the failure of the parliamentary system. Young Irelanders and Revivalists might have striven to reconstruct an Ireland unspoiled by Anglicization, but this endeavor was doomed to failure on account of its idealization of the remote past and divorce from social reality. Stephen, obviously, is not the only one who confronts limits to his project.

Significantly, Joyce depicts Bloom as an intruder in the “OMNIUM GATHERUM,” the only person who actually

works in Crawford's office.<sup>13</sup> An ad canvasser, Bloom does not belong to the traditional intelligentsia, yet his alienation and nonconformity lend him the qualities of an intellectual. Incessantly pursuing originality and endlessly interrogating the world around him, the "cultured allroundman" who has "a touch of the artist" about him (Joyce, 1986: 193) may be counted as a semi-intellectual: equipped with ideals but simultaneously down to earth, he exhibits both idealistic and materialistic aspects. Throughout the day, indeed, Bloom thinks *and* lives: however luxuriant his mental world, and however nonconforming, Bloom participates in Dublin life. It is through his active participation in everyday life that the intellectual temperament is manifest in Bloom. He does not merely work diligently in "Aeolus," but he points out the changeability of the pressmen, the deterioration of O'Molloy, and the obsequiousness of Lenehan. Instead of indulging in alcoholism and empty talks, he acts: he busies himself with the Keyes advertisement—an ad with nationalistic implications. Aside from the semi-intellectual Bloom, we observe an anti-intellectual, as is commonly assumed, in Joyce's portrayal of the female protagonist of his modern Irish epic, who mistakes "metempsychosis" for "met him pike hoses," and asks her husband to explain things "in plain words" (52). When she first appears in "Calypso," Molly epitomizes an unquestionably materialistic existence: she grunts sleepily, and later, fully awake, breakfasts in bed. In fact, physical needs occupy her day: she eats and drinks, relieves herself, copulates, menstruates, and sleeps. Her interior monologue in "Penelope" centers on food, sex, men, women, her life in Gibraltar and Dublin—on the materialistic aspects of life, in a word. Materialistic she may be, yet her monologue reveals her acute

---

<sup>13</sup> The diligent yet profit-seeking Nannetti also works hard in this episode, though he toils in his reading closet, not in Crawford's office.

observations of the world in which she dwells, exposing the fallacy of religious oppression of sexuality, the brutality of wars, the unreliability of male textuality, the hypocrisy of the Dublin community, etc. As resistant and unconventional as her male counterpart, Molly performs the intellectual function of rejecting ready-made clichés and speaking the truth to power. The representation of the outspoken anti-intellectual Molly who has the last word of *Ulysses*, along with the description of the loveable semi-intellectual Leopold, may suggest on one hand Joyce's poignant critique of the arrogant and snobbish intellectuals such as Deasy and Menton, and the corrupt and degenerate ones like Crawford, O'Molloy, MacHugh, and others who fail to live up to their calling: it is not the social elites, but rather the common people, or the masses, who may act as the backbone and conscience of modern Irish society, and it is the outsider detached from the center of power who is more likely to challenge ready-made ideology and speak the truth to power. Joyce's depictions of Bloom and Molly, on the other hand, may also imply his dialogue with the idealistic intellectuals, his younger self included, who overlook the realistic aspects and confront limits to their projects. The frustrated Stephen needs to strike a balance between idealistic and materialistic aspects, to learn from Bloom to embrace life while rejecting easy formulas, to question authorities but remain open-minded to possibilities, and to replace bitterness and aloofness with caring and tolerance. The materialistic and idealistic aspects, as a matter of fact, form part and parcel of Joyce the mature intellectual. By contrasting Bloom and Molly with the “talents” in *Ulysses*, in summary, Joyce rethinks the role of the intellectual, counteracting the overly idealistic Western philosophy with the representations of his new Irish couple.

## References

- Béaslaí, P. (1990). Joyce among the journalists. In E. H. Mikhail (Ed.), *James Joyce: Interviews and recollections* (pp. 41-43). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benda, J. (2009). *The treason of the intellectuals* (R. Aldington, Trans.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Carey, J. (2002). *The intellectuals and the masses: Pride and prejudice among the literary intelligentsia, 1880-1939*. Chicago: Academy Chicago.
- Collier, P. (2006). *Modernism on Fleet Street*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Connolly, S. J. (Ed.). (1998). *The Oxford companion to Irish history*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Donovan, S. (2003). "Short but to the point": Newspaper typography in "Aeolus." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 40, 3: 519-541.
- Dwan, D. (2008). *The great community: Culture and nationalism in Ireland*. Dublin, Ireland: Field Day.
- Eagleton, T. (1995). *Heathcliff and the great hunger: Studies in Irish culture*. London: Verso.
- Ellmann, R. (1982). *James Joyce* (Rev. ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Ed., C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gibson, A. (2006). *James Joyce*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Gifford, D., & Seidman, R. J. (1988). *Ulysses annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses* (Rev. ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. & Trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- Herr, C. (1986). *Joyce's anatomy of culture*. Urbana, IL:

- University of Illinois Press.
- Hodgart, M. J. C. (1974). Aeolus. In C. Hart & D. Hayman (Eds.), *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical essays* (pp. 115-130). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Joyce, J. (1964). *A portrait of the artist as a young man* (R. Ellmann, Ed.). New York: Viking Press.
- Joyce, J. (1986). *Ulysses: The corrected text* (H. W. Gabler, W. Steppe, & C. Melchior, Eds.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Joyce, J. (1989). *The critical writings of James Joyce* (E. Mason & R. Ellmann, Eds.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Joyce, J. (1996). *Dubliners: Text, criticism, and notes* (R. Scholes & A. W. Litz, Eds.). New York: Penguin Books.
- Kershner, R. B. (2010). *The culture of Joyce's Ulysses*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiberd, D. (1996). *Inventing Ireland: The literature of the modern nation*. London: Vintage Books.
- Kiberd, D. (2000). *Irish classics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kiberd, D. (2009). *Ulysses and us: The art of everyday life in Joyce's masterpiece*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Killeen, T. (2004). *Ulysses unbound: A reader's companion to James Joyce's Ulysses*. Bray, Ireland: Wordwell Books.
- Kimball, R. (2009). Introduction. In J. Benda (Ed.), *The treason of the intellectuals* (R. Aldington, Trans., pp. ix-xxviii). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Lawrence, K. R. (1980). "Aeolus": Interruption and inventory. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 17, 4: 389-405.
- Mikics, D. (1990). History and the rhetoric of the artist in "Aeolus." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 27, 3: 533-558.
- Osteen, M. (1995). *The economy of Ulysses: Making both ends meet*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Platt, L. (1998). Pisgah sights: The national press and the

- Catholic middle class in "Aeolus." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 35, 4 / 36, 1: 735-746.
- Reppke, J. A. (2008). Journalist Joyce: A portrait. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 45, 3/4: 459-467.
- Ruckenstein, L., & O'Malley, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Everything Irish: The history, literature, art, music, people, and places of Ireland, from A to Z*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Said, E. W. (1996). *Representations of the intellectual: The 1993 Reith lectures*. New York: Vintage Books.

「群英會」：  
〈埃俄羅斯〉中知識分子群像

周幸君

國立中興大學外國語文學系  
40227台中市南區興大路145號  
E-mail: hcchou@dragon.nchu.edu.tw

摘 要

無可否認，知識分子在現代愛爾蘭歷史扮演重要角色。詹姆斯·喬伊斯在作品中寫入不少知識分子。《尤利西斯》的〈埃俄羅斯〉一章描繪隸屬於知識階層的新聞記者、律師與教育家。然而，原本應該獨立且拒絕服從、身為人民良知、向權勢說真話的知識分子形象在此章嚴重扭曲。這些都柏林人非但未成為良知，反而敗壞國家精神：其無所事事、吹噓空談、貪杯酗酒以及留戀懷舊不僅造成其個人的挫敗與失意，更影射所有知識分子的頹廢墮落。緬懷過往而不積極創新，致力於仿效挪用而不願自行創造，這些所謂「人才」完全辜負其名。鋪陳這些「人才」以對比其筆下的主人翁，喬伊斯一方面批判這群知識分子的腐敗，另一方面也與深刻影響現代愛爾蘭社會的知識群英對話，並且重新思考知識分子的定位。

**關鍵詞：**〈埃俄羅斯〉、詹姆斯·喬伊斯、知識分子、愛爾蘭