

ABSTRACT

JENKINS, ELIZABETH SPEIGHT. "Faithful Departed": Tracing the Themes of Exile and Betrayal through James Joyce's *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Exiles*. (Under the direction of Mary Helen Thuente).

James Joyce left Ireland in 1904 because he felt betrayed by the publishing industry, several close friends, and the Irish Catholic Church. Although he returned to visit four times, he remained an artist in exile until his death in 1941. Manifest in his writing are feelings of exile and betrayal which reflect his own love/hate relationship with Ireland. In *Dubliners*, Joyce develops several different degrees of exile. In "Eveline," he presents a young girl who longs for physical exile, but in order to do so she must betray her duty to her father, her dead mother, and the Catholic Church. She ultimately cannot achieve physical exile, thereby betraying her future husband. In "A Painful Case," Joyce creates an "inner exile," one who, although he lives in Dublin, is estranged from it culturally and socially. Through his relationship with Mrs. Sinico, he experiences an interpersonal relationship, which, after it ends, leaves him unable to return to his life alienated from the city in which he lives. Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* depicts the journey of Stephen Dedalus from idealistic school boy to exile. In what most critics see as his most autobiographical work, young Stephen inherits many situations Joyce faced as a young man in Dublin. Stephen, who initially trusts the cultural and religious institutions of Ireland, learns through a series of betrayals that physical exile is necessary for him to become an artist. *Exiles*, Joyce's only existing play, depicts the struggle of a writer who, after living in Rome, has returned to Dublin. Richard Rowan longs to be betrayed by his wife to atone for his years of infidelity. Joyce uses the element of betrayal to demonstrate the ways in which it precipitates exile.

“Faithful Departed”: Tracing the Themes of Exile and Betrayal through James Joyce’s
Dubliners, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, and Exiles.

by
Elizabeth Speight Jenkins

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

English

Raleigh, North Carolina

2008

Approved by:

Mary Helen Thunte
Committee Chair

Tom Lisk

Jon Thompson

BIOGRAPHY

Elizabeth Jenkins was raised in Severna Park, Maryland. After graduating from Severna Park High School, she completed her Bachelor of Arts degree at Washington College in Chestertown, Maryland in 2006. She received her Master of Arts degree from North Carolina State University in 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 1: <i>Dubliners</i> | 5 |
| Chapter 2: <i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i> | 28 |
| Chapter 3: <i>Exiles</i> | 49 |
| Conclusion | 74 |
| Bibliography | 77 |
| Appendix | 83 |

INTRODUCTION

Think you're escaping and run into yourself. Longest way
round is the shortest way home (*Ulysses* 377)

Emigration has long been a part of the Irish culture, a phenomenon Seamus Heaney describes as a “fetish”; at some point in their lives, the Irish feel it is their duty to leave their homeland (qtd. in Wondrich 1). Between 1801 and 1921, more than eight million Irish left their native land, making emigration an integral part of Ireland's culture (Hickman 117). Originally, the need to emigrate was precipitated by the economic hardships forced onto the Irish by English rule as well as by the famine of the 1840's. However, as the nineteenth century drew to a close and it appeared that Ireland was on the verge of gaining independence from the United Kingdom, emigrants were leaving to escape the oppressive conditions of industrialized Dublin. It is into this period that James Joyce was born. As he grew more aware of the suffocating conditions of his native city, he looked to exile as his chance to escape. After meeting Nora Barnacle in the summer of 1904, Joyce and Nora left Dublin in September. Returning only a handful of times between 1904 and 1912, Joyce entered the state of self-imposed exile.

Recent studies in the emerging sociological field of Diaspora Studies have shied away from using such an all encompassing term as “exile”. The emphasis instead is put onto the reasons for emigration; those leaving are then named émigrés, tourists, refugees, expatriates, or as John McGahern has diplomatically named them “leavetakers” (Wondrich 2). Each of these various titles carries with it definitions and details about the life of the person leaving. Expatriates leave because of disillusionment with their native

land, renouncing their allegiance to it; tourists are just away on an extended vacation, although they may live away from their homeland for several years¹; refugees take on political motivations for leaving their homeland, but they also bear the burden of forced displacement whereas expatriates leave of their own free will. “Émigrés” carries overtones of political upheaval, as the term was first coined to describe those who left France during the revolution. Finally, Roberta Geftter Wondrich names a different category of exile, “inner exiles” who do not leave their homeland physically, but estrange themselves as much as possible from their native culture. While Joyce’s exiles leave, or attempt to leave, for a variety of reasons, it is the idea of inner exile that Joyce employs most frequently in his writing, as many of his characters are unable to leave Ireland physically.

While contemporary critics have argued that exile within Irish writing has commonly been Romanticized and praised, Joyce’s characters are not idealized and do not see exile as a Romantic escape (Wondrich 2). Rather, they see exile as the only way they can survive. While their country is not literally forcing them out, its actions have betrayed them and their devotion so deeply that they have no choice but to leave. Because of the oppression and dehumanizing practices fostered by major social and religious institutions, the city of Dublin has become inhospitable. These characters do not want to leave Ireland for a short time and return when things get better; they want to leave forever.

¹ The most common example of the tourist exile are the American writers who lived in Paris after the end of World War I. They were not fleeing America because of political reasons and knew that eventually they would return. Therefore, they are just considered extended tourists.

Their desires remain unfulfilled, however, because for none of Joyce's characters in exile is successful. Each returns to Ireland; some never leave. While each character has his or her own motivations to go into exile, elements of autobiography lurking in the background encourage an analysis of Joyce's experiences after he left Ireland. The experiences of Joyce's characters parallel his own and much of the time their actions reflect choices he also faced. Recognizing his position as an artist in exile plays an important role in interpreting his works.

Joyce spent more than two thirds of his life living outside of Ireland, yet his celebrated and influential works center around life in Dublin. For Joyce as an artist, Ireland was a place he could leave physically, but never disconnect from mentally or emotionally. Explaining himself to fellow Irish writer Arthur Power, who was living in Paris in 1921, Joyce said of his writing: "I always write about Dublin, because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities in the world. In the particular is contained the universal" (qtd. in Ellmann 505). By being aware of the universality Dublin represents, Joyce created literature which is not only situated in a specific time and place, but whose themes can be applied to countless locations and ages. Fintan O'Toole describes the idea of "home" in Irish culture "not so much as the place you were as the place you wanted to be, a place as much imagined as remembered or experienced" (137). Joyce depicts his "home" through the use of fiction and imagination, realizing that "Dublin is but a template of all other places, linked...to any other point on the globe" (O'Toole 179).

In Joyce's works betrayal is intrinsically linked to the theme of exile. Just as complicated a term as "exile," "betrayal" can range in meaning from national infidelity to

political unfaithfulness. While not given as many pregnant meanings as exile, the various levels of betrayal are just as complex. The most elementary levels of betrayal deal with breaking promises, devoting oneself to an idea or action only to rescind support later. Betrayal can also escalate into infidelity, when the promise broken is one made publicly and before God, and therefore taking on much more serious consequences. One can also betray or be betrayed based on not following expected actions, especially in terms of their socially defined role. Self-betrayal is also possible when one forgoes one's own desires to follow socially defined roles.

Furthermore, betrayal does not have to be limited to the actions of single characters, a nation can betray its people by not providing them with opportunities for advancement or ways in which to survive and prosper. Contrarily, an individual can betray their nation, most commonly through exile. Removing oneself from the nation as well as renouncing any devotion or desire to return to it, can be considered a form of betrayal. Each of these dimensions of betrayal manifests itself within Joyce's works.

In Joyce's *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Exiles*, the themes of exile and betrayal coexist. Using Dublin as a platform on which to display characters dealing with emotions of jealousy and betrayal, Joyce creates an atmosphere ripe for exile. Each of his characters seeks to thrive in a city which suffers from crippling paralysis, only they fail to see it. Inability to find happiness in Dublin leads each of them to seek refuge somewhere they can be safe which can generally only be achieved by emigrating. Joyce's characters epitomize his own love/hate relationship toward his native country: "he could neither live in Ireland nor write without it" (Riggs and Vance 259).

CHAPTER 1: *Dubliners*

For she must walk out. And it must be with who. Teaseforhim. Toesforhim. Tossforhim.

Two. Else there is danger of. Solitude. (*Finnegans Wake* 246).

Although it was not published until 1914, many of the stories in *Dubliners* were written before Joyce left Ireland in 1904.² Even before his own personal exile had begun, it was imminent in his writing. Having grown up in a slow descent from the middle class into poverty, Joyce's works reflect the voracity with which Dublin society was being consumed by stagnation and oppression. Joyce, breaking the tradition of plot-based story telling, sought to create a "looking glass" fiction in which Ireland would be able to see its decay. He saw that the first step towards liberating his people from this paralysis was to "compose [his] chapter of moral history" (Balzano 83). *Dubliners*, therefore, is not a collection of action stories designed to entertain; instead, it is a depiction of the corruption which had become pervasive within Dublin society.

Joyce's depiction of Dublin is damning. The city he portrays suffers greatly from paralysis, stagnation, and corruption. It is a city so suffocating that living is nearly impossible. In denying its citizens a chance at life, Dublin betrays them. A nation and a city are supposed to provide life and opportunity to its people, not contaminate them. Joyce sees that no retribution from the state is possible, and the only punishment the citizen can impose on its nation is to emigrate. Exile is the only way to escape. Each of

² "Eveline" was first published, in the *Irish Homestead* September 10, 1904, "A Painful Case" was written in July 1905, but revised in 1906.

the characters in “Eveline” and “A Painful Case” represents varying dimensions of exile, be it physical, emotional, or mental.

Eveline is all too aware of the dehumanizing situation in which she is living. She longs to be able to get away from Dublin and begin a new life in a foreign country, but she is torn by the promise she made to her mother to keep the family together as long as possible. No matter which decision she makes, whether to go into exile or to stay in Dublin, she will betray someone. If she leaves Dublin she will be betraying her mother, her father, her brothers, and the church. Choosing to leave, however, also presents the risk of Frank betraying her, either abandoning her in Liverpool or Buenos Aires. If she chooses to stay in Dublin, she will be betraying Frank as well as herself. There are positive and negative aspects to both options. Leaving would allow her the freedom to start her own life, to marry and have a family, as well as gain social status. Staying would allow her to keep her promise to her mother; it would also prevent any possibility of Frank betraying her trust. Furthermore, staying to support her father would fall in line with church teachings, that duty and suffering in this life will lead to eternal glory in heaven. Ultimately, it is the fear of betraying her mother and the church that prevents Eveline from fulfilling her dream of a better life.

Eveline’s relationship with her father is more like that of master and servant than father and daughter. As Eveline thinks about the new life she will have in Argentina, she declares that her life in Dublin is not “wholly undesirable” (Joyce 29). That said, when she thinks back to her childhood there are only two instances she can remember when her father was pleasant to her. Now that she is grown, however, she “sometimes felt herself in danger of her father’s violence...latterly he had begun to threaten her” (28). Her

father's emotional and verbal abuse is escalating into physical violence and Eveline is not safe even in her own house. Escaping the situation has become a necessity for her well-being.

Even as she turns to the church as a source of escape, the physical manifestations of religion in Eveline's room are all broken or tainted: the promises made to the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque are yellowed; the priest, whose picture is also yellowed, has immigrated to Australia; the harmonium is broken (27-28). Ironically, included among the promises made by Christ to the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque are "I will establish peace in their families," as well as "I will bless the houses in which the image of my Heart shall be exposed and honoured" (Torchiana 25). Even though her promises appear on the wall, they are clearly not being implemented in the Hill household.

More important than the mere presence of her promises on the wall of her bedroom, are the similarities between Eveline's life and that of the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, a French nun, now canonized, who revived interest in the order of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. As a child, Alacoque was devoted to the church, educated by the Urbanist Sisters at Charolles, taking her first communion at age nine (Crawley 427). She was also very sickly; suffering from paralysis so severe "that for about four years I [Margaret Mary] was unable to walk, my bones piercing my skin" (Alacoque 21-22). When she was twenty, she was offered a marriage proposal which her mother encouraged her to accept, telling her: "she would die of grief if I became a nun...I would be responsible for her death before God." Nevertheless, she refused it (Crawley 427, Alacoque 32).

Within a year Alacoque joined the Visitation convent at Parlay-le-Monial where she began to have visions of Christ. The most well-documented vision occurred on 27 December 1673 while she was praying at the grille of the chapel (Torchiana 24). She claimed that, through these visions, which lasted about a year and a half, Christ called her to establish a new order for men to devote themselves to Christ. The order was to be the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Alacoque spent her life in masochistic-like suffering, enduring “a course of mortifications and penances” until her death in 1690 (Crawley 427). Some of her self-induced mortifications included binding her “miserable and criminal body with knotted cords which [she] drew so tightly that [she] had difficulty breathing” as well as sleeping “on a plank or on sharply notched sticks” (Alacoque 34). She believed that punishing her body would relieve some of the interior pain she felt because she was a sinner.

Most notably, her visions involved Christ opening his chest to reveal his heart to her. He then removed his heart and placed it in her chest, a feeling she described as: “a resplendent sun, the burning rays of which fell vertically upon my heart, which was inflamed with a fire so fervid that it seemed as if it would reduce me to ashes” (Alacoque 69). Nearly all paintings of Alacoque show her below a figure of Christ revealing his heart to her.

Three details from Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque’s life seem most clearly manifested in Eveline’s character: the age at which she is offered, and refuses, marriage (Eveline is just “over nineteen” (28)), the state of paralysis, and a life of suffering. There are also clear parallels between Alacoque’s visions of Christ and Eveline’s descriptions of her relationship with Frank.

Frank first appears in the story through Eveline's memories and reflections on how they first met and their relationship thus far. Eveline remembers that she first saw Frank "standing at the gate," which parallels Alacoque's first visions of Christ while she was kneeling at the grille of the chapel (29). Eveline then describes Frank as having a "face of bronze," much like that of an idol or sculpture of Christ in a church (29). Eveline goes on about Frank's character: "he was very kind, manly, openhearted" (29). She might be expected to describe her new lover as open-minded or kind-hearted, yet Eveline uses the term "openhearted," which creates an undeniable parallel with Alacoque's devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Christ appeared to her showing his heart aflame, literally open-hearted. Also, while the term "manly" can mean masculine, it also refers to Alacoque because the order she created was designed specifically for men to be able to openly show their devotion to Christ. Furthermore, Frank is offering Eveline a new life and an escape from the paralysis of Dublin. (Alacoque's paralysis was miraculously cured when she joined the convent.) He will lead her to a land that literally means "good air"; she will be able to escape from the "dusty cretonne" of Dublin (26).

Furthermore, the choice of her savior's name as Frank is not, as Hugh Kenner argued, to coincide with her dead brother Ernest, but to allude to Margaret Mary Alacoque's relationship with Saint Francis de Sales. When Alacoque visited her cousin, who was also a nun, at Mâcon, she saw a picture of Saint Francis de Sales and "it seemed to [her] that he called [her] 'my daughter'" (Alacoque 43). Therefore, as a Christ figure, Frank not only represents the love of a savior, but also of a father, something which Eveline greatly lacks in her home life.

The irony of her relationship with Frank lies in the fact that if Frank is a manifestation of Christ, then Eveline should be eager to leave Dublin with him and begin a new and better life. Yet, in denying Frank, and therefore Christ in his purest, most personal incarnation, Eveline feels she is following the Catholic Church's teachings. The Church in Dublin is so repressive that a young girl who has a reputable, Christ-like figure who will allow her to escape the oppression of the city feels that leaving a physically abusive relationship with her father and life of no prospects will be a betrayal of the Church. Eveline has been taught that religion comes first. Loyalty to the church should come before all personal motivations. What she fails to recognize, because she has been so repressed by these false teachings of the church, is just how inaccurate they are. To her, suffering in this life will lead to ultimate and eternal glory in heaven. She is unable to see that there can be a compromise. Life does not have to be torturous. Going into exile with Frank will not damn her to hell. But she has been so beaten down by religion that she fails to see that.

In addition to her devotion to the church, Eveline feels loyalty to her mother. It is her promise to her mother she feels she must fulfill. Eveline would rather spend the rest of her life suffering under her father than to betray her mother. Several times within the story Eveline alludes to the promise she made to her mother "to keep the home together as long as she could," which seems to echo one of the promises to Alacoque (30). Although Alacoque's promise to "establish peace" in families has not been kept, Eveline's promise to her mother can be (Torchiana 25). She feels that it is her duty to fulfill that responsibility and that failing to do so would be an attack against her mother's

life because her mother had worked so long to keep the family together. The fear of betraying her mother is another way Eveline justifies her decision to betray Frank.

As Eveline remembers the last night of her mother's life, she "muse[s] the pitiful vision" that her mother's life had become (31). Even though she sees what has become of her mother, because she chose to marry and assume the traditional role of mother, Eveline feels the "spell" of her mother's life "on the very quick of her being" (31). Seeing the truth of her mother's situation, she recognizes at that moment that she is looking at her own future. Yet, she still denies this truth and feels compelled to be obedient to her mother's wishes. Perhaps Eveline feels that if she is able to keep the family together, then she will not end up in the same situation as her mother. Also, echoing in the background of the scene is sound of the street vendor playing a "melancholy air of Italy" (30). This image can be seen as the call of the Catholic church from Rome, reassuring Mrs. Hill that her sacrifices are about to be rewarded as well as reminding Eveline that her suffering is yet to come. It might also bring to Eveline's mind the fifth commandment, to honor one's father and mother. The combination of her mother's "spell" as well as the call of the church reinforces Eveline's decision to remain loyal to her mother and betray Frank. As Alacoque's own mother told her, "she looked to [her] as the only hope of putting an end to her misery" (Alacoque 31).

The irony reverberating throughout Eveline's devotion to the church is echoed in her view of motherhood. To Eveline, her mother is "pitiful"; her life was made up of "commonplace sacrifices" (31). But when Eveline herself is given the chance to have a better life, to make something of herself and be happy, she is unable to act, unable to go into exile. Eveline's own name alludes to the original mother figure, without whom there

would be no life. Through the conservative practices of the church as well as the social conditions of early twentieth-century Dublin, Joyce suggests the role of mother has become tainted. Eveline fears becoming a mother. While she knows that going into exile with Frank will allow her to escape from her abusive father, it will also force her to become a wife, and most likely a mother. What keeps Eveline in Dublin is not only the promise she made to her mother, but also her own fear of motherhood.

Eveline describes her mother's final words as "constantly repeating with foolish insistence" (31). No matter their true meaning³, the way Eveline interprets them, as a call to action, causes her, for the first time, to act. She stands up and declares that she needs to escape. When she arrives at the dock with Frank, however, her mood quickly changes. The underlying reservations she has about the trip are manifested in the way that Joyce presents her view of the harbor. Eveline sees the ship as a "black mass. . . lying in beside the quay wall" (31). Joyce puns on the "black mass" as a funeral mass, and "lying in" as giving birth, becoming a mother and perpetuating the cycle. A "black mass" is also a sacrilegious ceremony which serves as a parody of the Catholic mass by offering devotion to the Devil. In this way, Eveline sees exile as an act of sacrilege against the Church. The boat then blows "a long, mournful whistle into the mist," creating images of the unknown as well as allusions to sadness and death (31). She feels her cheeks becoming "pale and cold" like those of a corpse (31). Finally, "a bell clangs upon her

³ For a variety of interpretations of the meaning of *Derevaun Seraun* see: Jim LeBlanc. "More on Derevaun Seraun." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1998 (Summer). 849-851. Coflín Owens. "Entends sa Voix: Eveline's Swan Song." *Eire-Ireland; a Journal of Irish Studies*. Vol. 28. 1993. 37-53. Wim Tiggs. "Derevaun Seraun." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1994 (Fall). 102-104.

heart” like that of funeral mass (31). Eveline sees the journey she is about to undertake as a betrayal of her mother and the Church.

Going into exile with Frank, Eveline realizes, means that she will become a mother, and like her mother, could be confined and restricted by a loveless marriage to a man she hardly knows. In justifying her reasons leave with Frank, Eveline says: “He would give her life, *perhaps* love too” (31 emphasis mine). She is not in love with him, nor is he with her; their relationship is built on convenience. In pretending their relationship is real, Eveline betrays Frank. She is using him only as a means of escape. Eveline fails to realize that marriage to Frank is her way out of paralysis. Her mother has instilled in her a fear of motherhood and the church has instilled in her an urge for masochistic suffering. She fears betraying her mother and her church and therefore is unable to go into exile.

In the final lines of the story, as the ship is about to leave and Eveline is standing on the dock unable to move, Frank calls to her three times. Three times she refuses to acknowledge that she knows him, her eyes offering “no sign of...recognition” (32). This final action, or lack of action, alluding to John 18:15-18, Peter’s three denials of Christ, supports the idea that Frank is a Christ figure who has the power to save Eveline from the paralysis of Dublin. Eveline fails to see Frank as her savior and therefore betrays him, leaving him to sail off to Argentina without her, betraying her own desires, and resigning herself to an emotional death and life of constant suffering.

In addition to the final scene, Joyce’s description of Frank’s character also alludes to Christ. Frank, being a sailor, is constantly associated with water. He works on the water, he and Eveline are going to leave by way of the water, and the song he sings to her

is about “a lass that loved a sailor” (29). Not only does Christ present himself as the source of “living water” and the “water of life” in John, but one of his main teachings is to make the disciples into “fishers of men” (Mt. 4:19). There are numerous other associations of Christ with water,⁴ furthering Frank’s identification with Christ.

Remembering again the yellowing poster of Margaret Mary Alacoque in Eveline’s room, the two biblical passages which appear under the promises reveal the connection of Frank to Christ. From Matthew: “Come to me all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest” (11:28) and from John: “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (14:6). As Christ, Frank is offering Eveline a refuge from the troubles she faces at home in her relationship to her father, as well as from the fatigue she feels from her responsibilities. He offers her a way out and the chance for a new life.

The final scene on the docks, especially knowing that Eveline and Frank are going to be married, also alludes to several Biblical passages⁵ wherein Christ refers to himself as the bridegroom. Entering into a relationship with Christ parallels the act of marriage. Since Eveline denies Frank by denying him marriage, she is in essence rejecting true religion and accepting the false religion of Dublin. That a young girl would deny a Christ-figure who represents true human emotion and the divine in order to remain true to Catholicism’s dehumanizing teachings demonstrates the repression of the church.

Eveline’s sense of exile is largely material. She wants to leave her nation for socio-economic reasons. Leaving will allow her to marry, have security, and gain a place within society; it might also allow her to finally be happy. Secondary to her is the ability

⁴ These include Christ walking on water, controlling water, and again serving as a fisherman on the water. Passages dealing with Christ and water include: Matthew 8:23-27, Matthew 14:22-36, and Mark 6:45-56.

⁵ Most notably: Matthew 9:15, Matthew 25:1-13; Revelation 19:7-9; Isaiah 54:5-7; Isaiah 62:5

to escape from the paralysis and stagnation of Dublin and her relationship with her family, especially her abusive father. For her, exile is the only means of escape; if she stays in Dublin she will end up like her mother or Maria in “Clay,” alone and holding a prayer book, a symbol of entering the religious life.

Eveline, whether she goes with Frank or not, exiles herself from her family. By writing the letters to her father and her brother, which they will read not knowing that she will be returning, she has sealed her fate. Knowing the abusiveness of her father, there is little hope that he will be able to forgive his daughter for abandoning him, or even threatening to abandon him. There is little chance that he will forgive her when she returns and let her life return to the way it was before she met Frank. She will either be married to a man of her father’s choosing or she will be sent off to join a convent. The irony of this last possibility is not lost on Joyce. Packing the story with Biblical connections as well as allusions to Margaret Mary Alacoque reinforces Eveline’s fate. By choosing to follow the church she is most likely sentencing herself to a lifetime devoted to its teachings. She has already given her chance at life up for the church so there is really not much left for her to do but to formally dedicate her life to the church and become a nun.

Accepting the role of nun is appropriate for Eveline because by choosing to leave Frank and her only chance to escape from Dublin, she has become a “none.” She has exiled herself from her lover, abandoning him at her moment of escape; she has exiled herself from her family, betraying them in her letters and her insubordinate relationship with Frank; she has exiled herself from her dreams, divorcing them from her consciousness. All she has left at the end of the story is a promise to her dead mother and

the church. By exiling herself from her family she will be unable to keep her promise to her mother, leaving her the church alone. So she will live out her life devoted to the teachings which ended her hope for real life; she will become a “none,” a nonentity rather than a person.

While in “Eveline” Joyce presents a girl who has suffered because of her devotion to the church, he also condemns those who seek to escape all society and live the life of an inner exile, a term which Roberta Geffer Wonderich defines as “those who stay at home but are equally alien and estranged from their own country” (2). In “A Painful Case,” Mr. James Duffy represents this class of Dubliner who finds himself above the laws of society, having removed himself from any sort of outside relationship. He has no friends, no relationship with his family, no religious affiliation. He exists in his routines and his selfishness.

While Eveline’s devotion to the church prevents her from leaving Dublin and going into exile, for James Duffy, removal from the church allows him to exile himself from society. Not only does Mr. Duffy exile himself from the church, but from politics, family, friends, and society. He lives in Chapelizod outside of Dublin because he finds all other suburbs of the city “mean, modern, and pretentious” (89). Mr. Duffy embraces the inner-exile to which Eveline banishes herself by the end of her story.

Mr. Duffy has systematically and methodically removed himself from existence, “he is suspended beyond life” (Corrington 184); he has created an inner-exile so extreme that he could hardly be considered human at the beginning of his story. He exists, but he does not live. His house is furnished sparsely and harshly, with iron railings, whitewashed wood, and black and scarlet rugs (89). He has decorated his house to reflect

his view of life that everything is black and white. Mr. Duffy lives outside of the city he is a citizen of, works in a private bank, does not frequent pubs, and visits his family only at Christmas and funerals. He has no connection to any other human. He is alone.

However, he is alone by his own choice and therefore he does not feel lonely. He has cut himself off from society to such an extent that he has never had a spoiled relationship to cause him pain. His opinion is that “there is no friction where there is no contact” (Corrington 184).

His lack of relationships with other people is epitomized by the “overripe apple which might have been left there and forgotten” in his desk (90). The forgotten apple symbolizes Eve, womanhood, reproduction. In his systematic removal from society, Mr. Duffy has not had any contact with women, no wife, no relationships; nor has he produced any offspring to perpetuate his family line. Not having anyone left to remember him, his life and memory will cease to exist when he dies. Mr. Duffy does not seem fazed by this, “concede[ing] nothing further to the conventions which regulate the civic life” (91).

Mr. Duffy’s carefully constructed nonexistence comes to an abrupt end one evening when he breaks his normal hermetic routine by attending a concert at the Rotunda. His first introduction to Mrs. Sinico destroys his inner-exile. “While they talked he tried to fix her permanently in his memory,” a task he had never before undertaken (91). Before he even knows her name or anything about her, Mr. Duffy has created a memory of this woman and she has therefore become a part of him. Accepting Mrs. Sinico into his life changes Mr. Duffy; he is drawn into society, into a relationship, into an arena of feelings.

While Mr. Duffy views the relationship as purely platonic, his lack of relationships with women prevents him from realizing Mrs. Sinico's growing attachment. Although their relationship is not physical, clearly she is having an emotional affair. In much the same way that Richard Rowan encourages Bertha's affair with Robert Hand in *Exiles*, Mrs. Sinico's husband encourages their meetings and growing relationship. Contrary to Richard's masochistic intentions, however, Captain Sinico believes his daughter's hand is in question. He fails to realize that he has been actually encouraging his wife's betrayal. As a constant reminder of Mrs. Sinico's betrayal, she is never referred to by her first name, except in her death notice. She is always called Mrs. Sinico, always attached to her husband.

When Mr. Duffy meets Mrs. Sinico, her personal life and relationship with her husband remain hidden from him. He is unaware of Mrs. Sinico's loneliness; he sees her husband's frequent business trips and her daughter's music lessons as time they can spend together alone. He fails to recognize that before their relationship began, this is time Mrs. Sinico spent alone, abandoned, with no company or friendship to provide her an escape. He does not know that the reason her husband assumes he is after his daughter's hand is because "he had...dismissed his wife from his gallery of pleasures," no longer deriving any joy from their marriage and relationship (92). While Mr. Duffy does not realize it, his relationship with her has not only brought him into the realm of human relationships, but also provided Mrs. Sinico with an outlet for her emotions and intellect. The opportunity to have someone interested in her intelligence (the first thing Mr. Duffy notices about her is her intelligent face) validates her self-worth, and pulls

Mrs. Sinico wholly into this relationship (91). She, much like Eveline, has found her savior, the one who will allow her to escape the oppression of her everyday life.

At Mrs. Sinico's cottage outside of Dublin (a setting which will again prove an important location for the affair between Bertha and Robert), their affair continues, the relationship growing stronger as each becomes more invested in the other. Their relationship reaches fever pitch as Mr. Duffy "attached the fervent nature of his companion to himself" (93). She is obviously emotionally attached to Mr. Duffy, and now he has reciprocated, attaching her to himself. He has formed a symbiotic relationship with a woman; he has rejected his self-exile and entered the realm of personal relationships.

In an instant, their affair ends. Mrs. Sinico presses his hand to her cheek (93). While Mr. Duffy had encouraged their emotional and intellectual union, he had never expected it to become physical. Before he lost his faith, Mr. Duffy learned the church's sexual puritanism. He was taught that a woman's role was wife and mother, yet it was their responsibility to remain pure. Therefore, by taking the initiative to begin a physical relationship, Mrs. Sinico crosses the line; she has "betrayed her function" (Corrington 186). After avoiding her for more than a week, he agrees to meet with her to formally end their relationship. The reason he offers her reflects his return to emotionless philosophy: "every bond is a bond to sorrow" (93). Then, as if Mrs. Sinico was yesterday's newspaper, he gets rid of her and tries to pretend that she never existed. He tries to return to his safe routine, removing himself once again from society, avoiding music halls and staying at home. He attempts to retreat into inner-exile. In this he is unsuccessful.

Having known companionship, he cannot return unscathed into isolation. Two months after ending his affair with Mrs. Sinico, Mr. Duffy pens the lesson he has learned from his relationship: "Love between man and man is impossible because there must not be sexual intercourse and friendship between man and woman is impossible because there must be sexual intercourse" (94). He comes to the conclusion that human relationships cannot exist. Because Mrs. Sinico could not abide by his rules in their relationship, that it involve no physical contact and that he be allowed to retain total control and be the center of attention, he assumes that all relationships are doomed to failure. He fails to realize how his fear of sexuality affected his relationship with Mrs. Sinico. He allows an emotional affair between a depressed, married woman and an egocentric misanthrope to represent all human relationships, a gross oversimplification. Nevertheless, Mr. Duffy continues his attempt at inner-exile for the next four years, maintaining as rigid a schedule as possible.

While Mr. Duffy philosophizes on human relationships, he never stops to think about how ending their affair has affected Mrs. Sinico. His selfishness overshadows his empathy. Mrs. Sinico had longed for an escape from the boredom and isolation of her marriage. Her husband had ways to escape; his job allowed him the opportunity to travel all over Europe for weeks at a time. Her daughter had a means of escape as well: her music lessons. Only Mrs. Sinico is left without a way to vent her frustrations and relieve the monotony of Dublin life. After Mr. Duffy breaks off the relationship, suddenly and without explanation, she is not only left alone, as she was before, but alone and depressed. She now has to deal with the loss of her relationship, however tainted and one-sided it was. Mr. Duffy was her escape; she was able to have intelligent conversations

with him, listen to his views of life, and have a creative outlet. After he takes that away from her she is left with little choice of how to deal with her pain. With her husband and her daughter gone most of the time, the only alternative she thinks she has is alcohol. In a city from which women could not physically escape into exile, Mrs. Sinico turns to “spirits” as her only option (96).

Mrs. Sinico’s need to escape from her situation extends into the account of her death. The reader discovers that the area of Dublin Mrs. Sinico lived in was Sydney Parade which recalls the priest of Eveline’s story who has immigrated to Melbourne. Furthermore, there are several small details which display her desire for exile. The train station at which she was killed was the Sydney Parade station, which while it would have most likely been the station nearest her house also repeats Sydney, a common location for Irish exiles. Furthermore, the train which hits Mrs. Sinico is the slow train from Kingstown, an important harbor just outside Dublin. Kingstown, more importantly, was a major landing site for ferries running between Ireland and Wales, an avenue to physical exile. While it is unlikely that Mrs. Sinico knew which train was going to hit her, there is strong irony in the fact that it was the train leading from the ferry dock.

An ongoing scholarly conversation surrounding the nature of Mrs. Sinico’s death⁶ debates whether her death was an accident or suicide. Critics have been quick to blame Duffy for causing her death; however, there is a small detail in the story which should cause considerable pause: “four years passed” (94). A lapse of time this great demonstrates that Mrs. Sinico’s actions were not motivated by a failed relationship with

⁶ For more on this discussion see especially: John William Corrington. “Isolation as Motif in ‘A Painful Case’.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1966. 182-191; Mary Lowe-Evans. “Who Killed Mrs. Sinico?.” *Studies in Short Fiction*. Vol. 32, no. 3. 1995 (Summer). 395-402; Fritz Senn. “Distancing in ‘A Painful Case’.” *Les Revue des Lettres Modernes*. 1988. 25-38.

Mr. Duffy nor by its consequences. Blaming him gives him far too much credit and attention. Rather, her relationship with Mr. Duffy allowed her to realize that life did not have to be full of suffering and misery. There might have been some hope that her affair would lead to a dissolution of her marriage, but more likely, it allowed her to realize that she had the power to take action and do something about her situation. In the newspaper article, her husband tells says that their marriage was fine until “two years ago”; furthermore her daughter says that she had only been going out to buy alcohol “of late” (96). Therefore, there is a two year gap wherein Mrs. Sinico’s activities are unknown. It is possible that she had other affairs, returned to her love of music halls, or found some other outlet for her frustration. It is not until very near her death that she begins to take more drastic measures. Alcoholism is a chronic disease; there seems only a slight possibility that it could lead to her death after such a short period of time. What seems more likely is that alcohol allowed Mrs. Sinico to lower her inhibitions, making the jump from intoxication to suicide far less extreme. Mrs. Sinico walked in front of a train; she is solely responsible for her own death.

While Mrs. Sinico evidently sought more satisfying modes of living, Mr. Duffy pacified himself with philosophy and isolation. One night at dinner, however, his affair catches up with him. As successfully as he has been able to put Mrs. Sinico from his mind, all the details of their relationship come rushing back to him as he learns of her death. His reaction to the news demonstrates the effect that their relationship had on him; it verifies his inability to return to inner-exile. His relationship with Mrs. Sinico awakened his feelings for other people. His reaction mimics the five stages of grief:

denial, anger, depression, bargaining, and acceptance, first formally identified by Elisabeth Kübler-Ross.

Mr. Duffy first discovers the news of Mrs. Sinico's death while routinely eating his dinner one night. The news shocks him and he has to read and reread the article several times. The effect of the news, causing him to break his routine, stop eating his dinner, in a manner so unlike himself that the waitress comes over to ask if anything is wrong, displays the stage of denial. The adjectives which Joyce uses to describe the scene reflect Mr. Duffy's break from his normal routine; he walked along a "*lonely* road," his breath issuing "*irregularly*;" he reread the article in the "*failing* light" (94-95 emphasis mine).

Almost instantly Mr. Duffy shifts from denial to anger, although not anger that she is dead (that would be too empathic for him) rather anger about how she died and the fact that he ever knew her at all. Selfishly, as if his reputation were on the line, Mr. Duffy reacts by feeling "revolted by the narrative of her death," not that fact that she is dead, but rather how she died (97). He is angry that her death was "commonplace" and "vulgar," again showing no empathy (97). His anger reaches its climax when he blames her not only for how she died, but also for the fact that the way she died has "degraded" him (97). Mr. Duffy, a man with no friends, little contact with his family, and a strictly professional relationship with his co-workers irrationally thinks others will look down on him because of her death. The irony of his flawed thinking is that because he has so isolated himself from society that even if her death did in some way degrade him, there is no one to chastise him.

Reeling from his narcissistic anger at her intemperate habits, Mr. Duffy goes to the closest pub. While he does not engage in bargaining in the traditional sense, asking God what he can do to bring her back, he does engage in economic bargaining. A man never taken to the society of pubs, Mr. Duffy sits in silence, surrounded by workingmen, allowing himself to be continuously served by the barkeeper. Mr. Duffy sits for a while over his drink, reflecting on his relationship with Mrs. Sinico. Drinking allows him to erase her death from his mind, a form of keeping her alive if not bringing her back. The only sound he hears is the tram going by, no doubt calling his mind back to the manner of her death.

Whether brought on by the unaccustomed alcohol, or self-reflection, Mr. Duffy's thoughts turn to depression and guilt over her death. He starts to blame himself for betraying her. She tried to use him as a means of escape and he denied her. The reality of her death then begins to sink in: "he realised that she was dead...that she had become a memory" (98). But again, instead of being depressed that she is gone and that he can no longer have the option to return to her (whether he actually wanted to or not), he becomes depressed about his own life. For the first time, through all of his narcissistic self-pity, Mr. Duffy realizes what his life has become. He is alone; he has no friends, no relationship with his family, his father is dead, he has no church, no faith. It takes Mrs. Sinico's death for Mr. Duffy to realize that she was not trying to corrupt him, she just wanted companionship, a release from the depression of her marriage "and he denied her life" (98). Now, with her death, there is no one to offer him that escape, no matter how temporary.

He realizes that he has not been reacting to her death; he was reacting to his loss, which had occurred four years before. At the time he was so self-absorbed that he failed to see the impact she had had on his life. Whether he wanted to admit it or not, she made him feel emotion, made him interact with another human being, have a relationship, feel companionship. Losing her as a confidant had not caused him pain, perhaps because he knew (or thought) that if he ever wanted her back all he had to do was ask and she would return to him. Now that she is dead, however, he has lost all his power. He realizes that there are aspects of life over which he has no control, most notably death. All he has left are his memories of how badly he treated her. Ironically, he understands friendship only by losing it.

This realization allows Duffy to move into the final stage of grief: acceptance. For him, acceptance of Mrs. Sinico's death comes hand in hand with the acceptance of his own incurable loneliness. As he stands atop Magazine Hall, the memories of Mrs. Sinico slowly fade. He can no longer hear her, or see her, or feel her. She is gone. While all through his life he has been separated from society, he never felt lonely because he had never experienced a relationship. Now that he has, and it is gone, Mr. Duffy is left with no one to comfort him. He is totally alone.

Throughout his entire life, Mr. Duffy's goal was to separate himself from society, to live his life at a distance, allowing himself to thus control it. He knew that allowing anyone or anything else into his life would be a sacrifice of some of his control. He is able to achieve a sense of inner exile because he does not worry about being able to maintain relationships with other people. His relationship with his homeland is interesting because as much as he tries to distance himself from Dublin, he never desires to leave it

physically for another. He is content to simply exist on the outskirts, as he is content to live on the outskirts of life. Because of his decision to live as a domesticated exile, he has failed to have any impact on society.

After his relationship with Mrs. Sinico, however, he is unable to continue in his inner exile. Having formed a relationship, he affects someone else's life. While Mr. Duffy cannot be held responsible for what happened to Mrs. Sinico, he can be counted as a source for her desire to escape. It is because she had the opportunity to have a relationship with a person outside of her family that she was able to realize that she did not have to exist solely as subordinate housewife and mother. Their relationship inspired her to look for other means of escape. Mr. Duffy is not responsible for her death, Dublin is. Just as the teachings of the church and the demands of society suffocate Eveline and prevent her from escaping into exile, so too do those same forces act upon Mrs. Sinico. She is forced to live in a society wherein women do not have the power to control their own lives. She is stuck in a loveless marriage with no hope of relief. The paralysis which pervades all of the stories of *Dubliners* prevents Mrs. Sinico from escaping. The stagnation of life in Dublin ultimately leads to her demise. She has no way to find a meaningful life.

Throughout *Dubliners*, Joyce presents characters trapped in the city to which they belong. He portrays Dublin as a "hemiplegia," growing stronger as it weakens the population (qtd. in Ellmann 140). The characters of each story represent areas of Dublin life which Joyce felt had been paralyzed. Much of Joyce's animosity towards the city stems from his personal experiences growing up there. He felt that the nation had betrayed him. The censorship of his writing was so strong that he struggled to see his

works through to print. While some of the stories of *Dubliners* were printed while Joyce still lived in the city, the majority took years to be published. The ten year battle fought over *Dubliners'* publication demonstrates the book's power. Publishers claimed that they could not print it because of his foul language, use of actual place names, and political overtones. One might also argue, however, that the portrait Joyce painted of the city was so true to life, so accurate, that they feared publishing it because they were afraid to face the truth that he presented about Dublin.

CHAPTER 2: *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*

This lovely land that always sent
 Her writers and artists to banishment
 And in a spirit of Irish fun
 Betrayed her own leaders, one by one

(*Gas from a Burner*)

In *Dubliners*, Joyce presents a portrait of a city in peril from a wide variety of viewpoints and experiences. Each facet of society is depicted, from children to adults, and each story provides a snapshot of the paralysis plaguing Dublin. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* moves beyond multiple perspectives to an in-depth account of a student trying to find a place for himself within society. Each of the major sites of paralysis presented briefly in *Dubliners*, the Catholic Church, politics, and Irish womanhood, are interpreted from a single character's perspective. Autobiographical elements enable the reader to see Stephen Dedalus as a mouthpiece for Joyce, speaking out against the repression of his native city and explaining the reasons behind his own journey into exile.

In dealing with each of the major dehumanizing institutions of Dublin, Joyce uses betrayal as a catalyst for exile. The novel is divided into three separate attempts at exile on Stephen's part, each of which ends in failure. His first experience with exile involves being sent away to school, which can be seen as his exile from childhood. He must learn to become independent from his family and begin the search for his place within society. During his time at Belvedere, he finds himself drawn to religion as a refuge from the isolation he feels. However, because of the state of the Catholic Church in Dublin, his

devotion to its teachings leads to his second exile, exile from his essential humanity. The dehumanizing effect of the church causes Stephen to abandon his individuality and assume the role the church desires of him. Realizing the repressive nature of the church, and that a life in the priesthood would entail a separation from the arts and from life, Stephen embarks on his final attempt at exile. Seeking refuge in art and literature, he sees the only way to reclaim his humanity and nourish his writing will be to exile himself physically from Ireland. He seeks sanctuary in Europe where he can create art without fear of censorship. His last attempt at exile, like each of his others, ends in failure. While it seems valiant, it is idealistic, and ultimately impossible. *Ulysses* opens with Stephen back in Dublin, after only a few months in Paris. Not even the desire for artistic freedom allows him to escape the nets holding him back, making him betray his essential humanity. Like Eveline Hill and James Duffy, Stephen Dedalus too is unable to achieve exile.

Stephen's first experience with exile comes at an early age. Shortly after the novel opens, Stephen has been forced to leave his home. His parents have left him alone at school and he will not be allowed to return home for some months. Removal from the comforts of an established home to the cold restrictions of life at Clongowes introduces Stephen to the nature of exile. At the age of six he becomes aware that removal from "home" can cause emotional trauma and, knowing that he will not be allowed to return in the near future, a strong desire to escape his present situation.

As he remembers his parents dropping him off on the first day of school, Stephen thinks of the advice his father gave him: "whatever he did, never to peach on a fellow" (7). In addition to being introduced to exile, Stephen also quickly learns about betrayal.

Even though he believes his family has betrayed him by rejecting him, he learns from his father that the most important lesson to remember at school is never to betray a friend. Stephen takes his father's advice to heart, and while he is betrayed several times throughout the novel, he never retaliates with betrayal himself.

The first sign of Stephen's desire to return home comes shortly after he has arrived at school. Sitting at his desk in study hall, "he changed the number pasted up inside from seventyseven to seventysix" (12). Even though there are clearly more than two months until he will be able to return home for Christmas, Stephen is already counting the days. His increasing desire to return home manifests itself in his dreams. Stephen dreams that he is returning home for the holidays, but now his dreams are not only of returning home, but of returning home to warm welcomes from his family and to his father getting a promotion,⁷ "his father was a marshal now: higher than a magistrate" (17). His dreams of returning home are quickly squelched by illness. Stephen's illness is apparent to the other boys when he wakes from his dream in a cold sweat. From the infirmary, his longing for home escalates, even going so far as to make him mentally draft a letter home to his mother. While he never actually writes the letter, his thoughts continue along the same path, thinking that he will die at school, in the infirmary, before his mother can come to see him.

Stephen's distaste for exile and desire to return home are appeased when he is allowed to leave school for the Christmas holidays. However, far from alleviating his

⁷ This scene parallels *Exiles* wherein Richard Rowan, also viewed by critics as a fictional manifestation of Joyce, returns to his homeland lauded as a successful writer, who after spending years in exile, is welcomed home with open arms. The situation Stephen actually experiences reflects Robert Hand's encounters with life in Dublin, trying to become a successful journalist, yet feeling rejection by his homeland, and therefore forced to go into exile.

troubles, his return to a home so fraught with political obsession that he is not welcomed as he was in his dream, with open arms and his father's promotion, he is forced into a new lesson on betrayal. More than simply starting his formal education and teaching him the importance of being self-sufficient, his time at Clongowes has caused Stephen to grow up. When he returns home at Christmas he is not the same boy he was when he left. He has become exiled from childhood innocence, which he only comes to realize after he is included in the Christmas dinner discussion. He then realizes that, having once experienced adulthood, it is impossible to retreat to childhood innocence. He has entered a world where disloyalty takes center stage.

Only six or seven at the time these events take place, young Stephen is unaware of the rising political conflict in 1891 Dublin. The conversation he overhears during Christmas dinner reflects Stephen's disconnection from the events at the time. He does not realize the full implications of the positions of each side, nor does he understand the allusions each party makes to specific events which have been occurring in Ireland over the past several months and years. Instead, like the reader, he takes the language at face value and chooses sides based on emotion rather than fact. He sides with his father because he sees how emotionally involved in the discussion his father becomes. The lesson Stephen learns is one of a changing national identity in Ireland. The man who was leading Ireland to freedom, who had been working for more than a decade to pass a Home Rule bill in London, had been betrayed by his own people, for his personal, not political, life.

The downfall of Charles Stewart Parnell epitomized both national and personal betrayal to Joyce. Allusions to Parnell appear in all of Joyce's works, much of the time

allied with Christ, as a martyr, and used as a demonstration of Ireland's corruption and deviousness. The Christmas dinner scene in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is no exception; through the conversation among Dante, John Casey and Simon Dedalus, young Stephen (i.e. young Joyce) finds himself in the middle of the crossfire. He gets his first glance at the corruption in politics as well as of the Catholic Church. Through this scandal he sees that while many of the Irish blamed England for years of struggle and corruption, "it is not England that is Ireland's chief betrayer; it is Ireland itself" (Schwarze 243).

When Parnell first rose to power in the 1880's, he led a unified Ireland that sought more independence from England. One reason for his success was the universal support he received from the Catholic Church. Even though he was a Protestant, having an affair with a married, Protestant woman, the church was able to look the other way and focus on his role as a politician and the benefits his rule could bring to Ireland. Stephen can remember a time when Dante and his father were not divided over politics:

he was for Ireland and Parnell and so was his father: and so was Dante too
for one night at the band on the esplanade she had hit a gentleman on the
head with her umbrella because he had taken off his hat when the band
played *God Save the Queen* at the end (32).

Once Kitty O'Shea and her husband decided to divorce, because of her affair with Parnell, the Church lashed out, damning Parnell for his behavior and painting Kitty O'Shea as a whore. Kitty O'Shea's divorce suit was brought before the courts in early November 1890 and within less than a month both she and Parnell were being vilified in the press.

The shame surrounding the affair, once it became public, parallels the sense of shame and anger Mr. Duffy feels once he learns of Mrs. Sinico's death (by reading it in a public newspaper). Even in America, the *New York Times* published articles questioning Parnell's sanity. On 7 December 1890, they published an article entitled "Is Parnell a Crazy Man: His Foul Betrayal of the Cause of Ireland" in which he is labeled a "freak," "malignant," and "despotic" having committed "wanton mischief" and "treason." The article even declared "no son of Ireland has aimed at his mother country such a cruel and treacherous blow," describing his alleged abuse of the public's trust. It is no surprise then, when Stephen returns home for Christmas, after Parnell's fall, he sees his family ripped apart, a microcosm of the nation, and does not know whom to side with.

While the battle ensues seemingly about whom to blame for his downfall and subsequent death, Parnell himself or the church, Joyce subverts another established role, that of Irish womanhood. The church not only condemned Parnell and O'Shea for their adulterous relationship, and their marriage, but because as an adulteress, O'Shea besmirched the purity of Irish womanhood. Dante equates Irishness with Catholicism and Catholicism with chastity; therefore, Irish women, like good Catholics, are chaste. Kitty O'Shea, a Protestant adulteress, can therefore not be seen as a true Irish woman (Schwarze 248). In her affair she has not only betrayed herself and Ireland (for having the affair with a top Irish leader) but all Irish women. O'Shea can even be aligned with Eve, whose fall to temptation and irresponsibility caused the downfall of man.

Dante, representing the "pure" and "true" Irish woman, supports the church's involvement in the scandal, feeling it is an issue of "public morality. A priest would not be a priest if he did not tell his flock what is right and what is wrong" (27). She thinks the

church has every right to “preach politics from the altar” because it is the priests’ role to remind the population that what Parnell did was not morally right (27). Because he performed an immoral act, he cannot be supported by the Church and should not be supported by those who believe in the church. Again, even American Bishops, such as Philadelphia’s Bishop Ryan, released statements to the *New York Times* declaring their allegiance to Gladstone and not Parnell.

When Mr. Casey attempts to defend Parnell and O’Shea, Dante retaliates, not by insulting his nationalistic devotion or pride, but his religion. She calls him a “renegade catholic” and “the blackest protestant in the land” (29, 30). Likewise, Mr. Casey replies by accusing her, and the Catholic church, of “sell[ing] our faith,” turning religion into a marketable commodity whose support can be bought for the right price (30). Mr. Casey’s reply not only insults Dante but opens Stephen’s eyes to the corruption of the church. Dante fears that when he grows up Stephen will remember the “language he heard against God and religion and priests” (29). Of course Stephen (as Joyce, now writing this scene) does remember, and more than the insults against the church, Stephen remembers what his father wants him to, how “when he was down they turned on him to betray him and rend him like rats in a sewer” (29). In “The Shade of Parnell,” an article he wrote for the *Piccolo Della Sera* 16 May 1912, Joyce described the Irish people’s reaction to Parnell’s downfall: “They did not throw him to the English wolves; they tore him to pieces themselves” (“The Shade of Parnell”).

One element that both Dante and John Casey can agree upon is seeing Parnell as a Christ figure. For Dante, Parnell can be seen as a manifestation of Christ only while he remains sexually pure; once he becomes a “public sinner” he is no longer fit to lead

(Schwarze 249). Once the church recognizes his sin publicly, he becomes like Judas, one who for so long led the nation to believe he was going to help, only to betray them in the end. On the other hand, for John Casey and Simon Dedalus, Parnell has been betrayed by those closest to him in the same way Christ was. Parnell, to them, was a great leader, who was only moments away from acquiring Home Rule for the Irish. Just as Christ was martyred by the Pharisees, the men blame Parnell's downfall on his betrayal by the church and the nation. The Church, which for so long supported Parnell and preached him into reelection, had Judas-like turned on him. Parnell's quick descent from uncrowned king of Ireland to public sinner and death demonstrates the Church's power of persuasion. While Stephen does not yet realize this power, his eventual exile from the Catholic Church will hinge on his recognition of its abuse of power.

When Stephen enters Belvedere College a couple of years later, he seems to have been able to put his feelings about the church aside. At a school run by Jesuits, Stephen did not have much choice but to follow the rules and honor the church. After a brief stint rejecting the church and doing as he pleased morally, including frequenting bordellos, Stephen's devotions begin to shift back to the teachings of the church. He and his classmates attend a weekend long retreat of spiritual renewal. The retreat opens Stephen's eyes to the sins he has been committing and causes him to turn his life around, to reject sins of the flesh and return to devotion of the teachings of the church. What he fails to see, however, is the severe repression and corrupt morals the church is instilling in him. Like so many other parishioners, he follows unquestioningly the letter of the law as the church decrees. He exiles himself from what he sees as the impurity of society, devoting

his life to the church, and unintentionally exiles himself from his essential humanity, becoming a uniform member of the flock.

The purpose of the sermon Father Arnall presents to the boys on the retreat is to motivate them to confess their sins and live a purer life. Such intentions seem good enough; however, looking more closely, the message demonstrates one of the methods the church uses to control its congregation: fear. In order for the boys to think about how their temperaments during mass do little to conceal the true nature of their actions, Father Arnall addresses them as “hypocrites...O you who present a smooth smiling face to the world while your soul within is a foul swamp of sin” (100). His words could just as easily be directed towards the institution of the Catholic Church, presenting a strong stoic face, all the while masking internal corruption of true Christian dogma based on love not fear. Yet, as a dutiful student Stephen listens to all, thinking “every word of it was for him” (101). Not only does he take Father Arnall’s words as truth, but he feels as though they are being targeted directly at him. From this point on, Stephen accepts everything Father Arnall preaches as truth.

Father Arnall describes the downfall of Satan to teach about the ills of pride and rebellion and the fact that rebellion does not have to involve physical rebellion, but can be mental or intellectual. He tells the boys “it was the sin of pride, the sinful thought conceived in an instant: *non serviam: I will not serve*. That instant was his ruin” (103). A sinner can be cast out of heaven in an instant, not only for actions against God, but simply because of a thought against him. Father Arnall teaches the boys that if they do not follow the teachings of the church every minute of every day, if they for an instant *think* of rebelling, they will be cast out of heaven to spend eternity in hell. He fails to

teach the boys about the redeeming qualities of faith, such as grace, and the forgiveness which God offers to sinners. Instead he uses his influence and power as a “messenger of God” to convince these boys, who are too young to question his authority, that even thinking about not following sanctioned practices will sentence them to eternal damnation.

To drive the point home even further, Father Arnall describes to the boys what hell will be like. The words which he speaks to these impressionable children contain so much power and strength, are so vivid and sensory, the boys cannot help but to be drawn under the spell. Father Arnall describes the effects of hell on each of the senses, beginning with sight, “it is a neverending storm of darkness, dark flames and dark smoke of burning brimstone, amid which there are bodies heaped upon one another” (105). He then exposes what hell smells like, “imagine some foul and putrid corpse that has lain rotting and decomposing in the grave, a jellylike mass of liquid corruption” (105). The fires of hell, eternally dark, burn the flesh without abeyance; the only sounds sinners hear are shrieks of pain; even the mouth tastes “foul matter, leprous corruption, nameless suffocating filth” (107).

Young Stephen sits in the front pew mesmerized. Remembering the first lesson Father Arnall taught him, never to disobey the church, he drinks in this description of hell as fact, vowing to himself that he will never think of sinning, for fear of ending up in hell. After mass that evening, Stephen leaves the church afraid. While the other boys shrug off the sermon, saying “it put us all into a blue funk,” Stephen feels personally tormented, fearing “an eternity of endless agony, of endless bodily and spiritual torment, without one ray of hope, without one moment of cessation, of agony limitless in extent” (109, 116).

While young Stephen engages with Father Arnall's sermon, absorbing every word and every image, one must remember that Father Arnall it is not actually the author of his own sermon; it is ultimately Joyce who creates this scene for young Stephen (himself as a child). As disgusting as the description of hell is, there is also great beauty in Joyce's use of language in the sermon. In the end, it is the language of the priest which convinces Stephen, not his actions. It does not matter what the priest who originally presented the sermon to Joyce as a child actually said, rather, how Joyce remembers and reinterprets his words. The truth is irrelevant, only the impression the original sermon made that matters. By remembering the true author of the hell fire sermon, the reader is again reminded of the change which will occur in Stephen. While currently he believes everything the priest tells him, he will shortly come to realize the hypocrisy of the church and the power of words. By creating such a strong sermon for Father Arnall to present, Joyce demonstrates the extremes the church would go to in order to demonstrate their power and authority, as well as the ways in which they would further abuse that power to control their congregations.

The intensity of the sermon scares Stephen so much that he runs through the streets of Dublin to find a church where he can confess his sins. Stephen is not able to absolve himself from sin by simply kneeling in silence and praying to God for forgiveness. Like Eveline and Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque, Stephen must enter into a series of masochistic penances for his sins. He torments himself mentally about his need to "confess! He had to confess every sin...how could explain without dying of shame" (122). Now, in addition to fear and suffering, Stephen also begins to experience guilt for his actions against God. His desire for absolution grows stronger. Finally, he finds a

priest and confesses, his sins “trickl[ing] in shameful drops from his soul festering and oozing like a sore, a squalid stream of vice” (126). After reciting each sin, reliving its pain, and dwelling again in shame, the priest forgives Stephen and, at least temporarily, he feels relieved.

Then, as though he were addicted to some drug, Stephen thrives on the suffering his guilt creates. He turns to self-mortification as a means of punishing himself further for his sins. Just as Father Arnall warned him that he would suffer greatly in hell, so Stephen mortifies each of his senses to chastise himself. To mortify his sight he walked with downcast eyes; to mortify his hearing he would not sing, nor remove himself from situations wherein he heard irritable noises; to mortify his smell he subjected himself to “a certain stale fishy stink like that of longstanding urine”; to mortify taste, he observed rigorous fasts; to mortify touch he constantly sat “in the most uncomfortable positions...remained on his knees all through mass except at the gospels” (131). Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque explained she had an “ardent desire...to suffer, that thereby [she] might render [her]self conformable to suffering Jesus” (Alacoque 25). Similarly, Stephen feels that by punishing himself physically he will be a better Catholic, less inclined to sin, and avoid the rebelliousness Father Arnall had warned him against. He finds, however, that his corporeal mortifications do not prevent him from falling prey to “childish and unworthy imperfections” (132). He thinks that in order for God to love him and accept him into heaven he must be perfect. The opposite could not be more true, but Stephen’s distorted view of salvation is fostered by the Catholic Church.

The longer he puts himself through this regimen of sensory deprivation, the more depressed he becomes, because he realizes that no matter how hard he tries he will not be

perfect. Instead of teaching him that imperfections are universal, the church teaches Stephen that he is not good enough, leaving him with an overpowering sense of guilt

It humiliated and shamed him to think that he would never be freed from it wholly, however holily he might live or whatever virtues or perfections he might attain. A restless feeling of guilt would always be present with him: he would confess repent and be absolved, confess and repent again and be absolved again, fruitlessly (133).

He has created a cycle of disappointment from which he cannot escape. He is destined to fail at his attempts to live a good life. Religion is supposed to relieve the tension caused by lapses in judgment; grace redeems sinners. But instead of preaching grace and forgiveness, all Stephen learns from the church is pain, fear, and guilt. The church's definition of human experience is flawed, causing Stephen to become exiled from his humanity. He has become selfish, thinking only of ways in which he can better himself. He cannot accept that he will never be perfect, because the church demands perfection, leaving no room for mistakes. Stephen's attempts at perfection cause him to remove himself so far from ordinary life, that he has essentially dehumanized himself, only he cannot yet realize it.

While most people might turn away from an institution that causes so much pain, Stephen embraces it, and others begin to notice his devotion. The director of Belvedere calls Stephen into his office to discuss his future. After asking if he has ever felt a call to the priesthood, he tells Stephen about the benefits of being a priest:

No king or emperor on this earth has the *power* of the priest of God. No angel or archangel in heaven, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself

has the *power* of a priest of God: the *power* of the keys, the *power* to bind and loose from sin, the *power* of exorcism, the *power* to cast out from the creatures of God the evil spirits that have *power* over them, the *power* of authority, to make the great God of Heaven come down...What an awful *power*, Stephen! (137-138 emphasis mine).

The director relishes the power and authority that the priest has, greater than the saints, the angels, even giving them a higher rank than the Virgin Mary. The powers that he offers to Stephen are all of the powers being abused by the church. The director even goes so far as to say he would have power over God, being able to call him down at will from heaven to be transubstantiated into the Eucharist. Having been made powerless for so long by the church, Stephen anxiously drinks in the possibility of regaining power and learning the secrets of the priests. He does not want to be a priest to serve God, or save souls, or offer redemption to the sick; he wants to know church secrets, hear other people's sins, and have power. The church has taught Stephen to value a corrupt set of values. The very power the priest offers works against love, which is supposed to be the foundation of Christian doctrine. Accepting this emphasis on power, rather than the love, which is supposed to be the central focus of Christianity, Stephen becomes dehumanized.

As Stephen rises to leave the director's office, he pauses to shake hands just as a quartet passes by outside "swaying their heads and stepping to the agile melody of their leader's concertina" (140). The music catches his attention and distracts him momentarily. When he returns his attention to the director, however, he finds his face to be "a mirthless reflection of the sunken day" (140). The priest, if he has heard the music, chose to ignore it, in essence rejecting the joy in life it represents. As soon as Stephen

recognizes this rejection of the arts his thoughts about the priesthood and the church take a radical turn. He is instantly disillusioned with the power of the priest and sees the dehumanizing effect of the Catholic Church and its doctrines. His description of the priesthood shifts to “grave,” “ordered,” and “passionless” (140). By the time he reaches the hallway, “the chill and order of the life repelled him” (141).

For Stephen, seeing the priest completely oblivious to the beauty of music and the arts calls into question the entire nature of religion. He realizes all at once how inhuman the life of a priest really is. In rejecting the priesthood, he reclaims his humanity, his connection to society, which the church had attempted to take from him. He can clearly see how pointless his self-mortifications have been and how tainted the church has become. He can see now that priests should not be worried about the power that they have over their parishioners. No doubt he remembers the Christmas dinner conversation and can see how the church betrayed Parnell and thus committed simony. Not only can Stephen recognize the corruption of the church, but he feels again the sting of betrayal. The Catholic Church is an institution he had spent his entire life trusting. The past few months he had dedicated his every waking moment to pleasing the priests, only to realize now that what the church was teaching was completely wrong. Unable to forgive the church of its sins, he rejects it completely realizing “his destiny was to be elusive of social or religious orders” (141).

Realizing the current nature of the Irish Catholic Church, Stephen rejects it and seeks refuge in his true calling, literature. He also realizes that while he has suffered exile from his childhood innocence, as well as exile from his essential humanity, he “was

destined to learn his own wisdom apart from others” (142). In order to achieve his true calling, he must once again seek exile.

It is at this point in his journey that he discovers his connection to the mythological Daedalus. Stephen now sees his name as a harbinger of his fate. He, like Daedalus, will become an artist, creating a new form, a new representation of art. He will do with words what no writer has ever done before, but in order to be a successful artist he will have to leave Ireland and embark on his own adventure, alone. As he thinks about what his future holds, Stephen achieves spiritual cleansing when “his soul was soaring in an air beyond the world and the body he knew was purified and commingled with the element of the spirit” (148). He tried for months to purify himself by following the church’s teachings, mortifying his senses, abstaining from sex, alcohol, and other worldly temptations, but now he can see that all that brought him was failure and guilt. Able now to realize his true calling as an artist, he instantaneously feels pure and connected to his spirit. Art can transform him in a way religion never could. He has been freed from the constraints of the church and can look at women “without shame or wantonness,” recognizing human experience involves not only sin and failure but also joy “to live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life” (150).

Stephen embraces his destiny, and even before he prepares to leave Ireland physically, becomes an inner exile, in some ways like Mr. Duffy. His friends even notice his withdrawal from society, “Daedalus, you’re an antisocial being, wrapped up in yourself” (155). Instead of feeling guilty about his removal, he acknowledges that he is chosen and must be set apart from his friends. Stephen seems to internalize George Bernard Shaw’s philosophy on exile: “every Irishman who felt that his business in life

was on the higher planes of the cultural professions felt...his first business was to get out of Ireland” (qtd. in Foster 291).

Stephen learns to think for himself and not just accept what is handed to him as the truth by social and religious institutions. After his acceptance as a man “set apart,” he finally understands he can reject his fatherland. Davin tries to convince Stephen to shed his pride and accept that he is an Irishman, that he should learn the Irish language and appreciate things as they are without question. But Stephen is beyond his ethnic identity, which in many ways can be just as limiting as religious identity. He can now only see nationalists as the traitors who tore Parnell apart: “you sold him to the enemy or failed him in need or reviled him and left him for another” (178). Having been betrayed by the church himself, he understands the complexity of betrayal. Not only can betrayal involve abandoning someone, but also putting them in a situation wherein they will surely fail, putting them on a pedestal and slowly shredding their character, or convincing them to trust, only to leave them “in their hour of need” (*Exiles* 129). He can no longer be a member of a society or church that commits merciless, guiltless betrayal.

Furthermore, Stephen comes to understand the oppression of Dublin society. If Stephen had been able to read *Dubliners*, he would have seen the stagnation and paralysis around him, but instead he has to figure it out on his own. As a small child he watched his family move in slow decline from middle class status to the borders of poverty. Stephen (and Joyce) would probably not readily recognize his father’s liability in the family’s downfall, choosing instead to focus on the pervasiveness of alcoholism and gambling which were endemic in Dublin society. Stephen’s mind is made up that it is impossible to grow, morally and intellectually in Ireland. As he has been able to reject his

nation in terms of politics, he can now reject it culturally “when the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight” (179). He follows this revelation up with another instance of Irish betrayal, “Ireland is the old sow that eats her farrow” (179).

Stephen can no longer trust in nor be a part of an institution which betrayed him so deeply. He can, however, subvert their teachings and apply them to his writing. He sees the role of the artist as similar to the role of the priest, “transmuting the daily bread of experience into the radiant body of everliving life” (195). He will become the vessel through which others will also be able to realize the lessons he has learned. He will be able to write “a moral history” of his country (Balzano 83).

His feeling of betrayal climaxes when he is finally able to declare out loud his rejection of his fatherland and his desire to go permanently into exile:

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, using for my defence only the arms I allow myself to use, silence, exile, and cunning (218).

Stephen quotes Satan in his declaration, demonstrating his complete removal from the church. While Father Arnall preached the dangers of rebellion of the intellect, Stephen rebels anyway, saying he will “take the risk” (218). After having been betrayed so deeply and on so many levels, Stephen believes he has no choice but to begin his life anew somewhere else.

As he prepares to go into exile, Stephen runs into Davin one last time. When Davin questions whether or not Stephen is really leaving; Stephen replies “told him the shortest way to Tara was via Holyhead” (221-222). The easiest way to be appreciated as an artist, or to become truly Irish, venerated like the ancient kings of Ireland is to take the ferry to Wales. In order to write about Ireland, the artist has to leave it. Distance from family, church, and home is essential for spiritual and artistic growth. Stephen, like Joyce, was not the first to realize the necessity of exile to succeed in Ireland. Fintan O’Toole declares, in *The Ex-Isle of Ireland*, “the sense of belonging to a place has often been, in modern Irish culture, in direct proportion to one’s distance from it” (134). Desmond Ryan too could see the benefits of exile from Ireland, “to leave Ireland often means to know Ireland better...looking back over their shoulder they [exiles] see the thing half seen before” (qtd. in Foster 301). Now ready to realize his destiny, Stephen ends his journal entries by accepting his role as artist, preparing to exile himself from his fatherland.

As firm as Stephen is in his conviction to leave Ireland and never return, he, like all of Joyce’s exiles, is unsuccessful. *Ulysses* opens just months after Stephen’s declaration of exile, with him having returned from Paris and living, once again, in Dublin. While it remains a mystery whether Stephen makes another attempt at exile or not, Joyce’s fate is certain. After his brief stint in Paris in 1902, he returned to Ireland only to leave permanently two years later.

The shift from *Dubliners* to *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is a shift from a panoramic view of Dublin to one specific person’s experiences growing up there. This shift from general to specific also means a shift from the public to the personal in terms

of Joyce's biographical presence within the work. While there are elements from Joyce's own experiences in *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* reads like an autobiography. Stephen Dedalus's philosophizing about the role of the artist in Ireland can be read as Joyce's own. The same harsh criticism of Irish society is reflected in many nonfiction writings Joyce was producing around the same time. In 1905 Joyce presented a series of lectures on Ireland at the Berlitz school in Trieste wherein he described Dubliners as "the most hopeless, useless, and inconsistent race of charlatans I have ever come across" (qtd. in Ellmann 225). Joyce also shares Stephen's disdain for the government saying they "sowed hunger, syphilis, superstition, and alcoholism there; puritans, Jesuits, and bigots have sprung up" (qtd. in Ellmann 225). Clearly Joyce used Stephen as his mouthpiece in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* to offer an explanation of his reasons for his exile from Ireland.

In summary, structuring the novel into cycles of exile and betrayal allows Joyce to explicate the ways in which many of Dublin's institutions personally disappointed and harmed him. He begins with his initial, forced exile from home which teaches him how to feel betrayal. His triumphant journey home is spoiled by the Christmas dinner dispute over the church and nationalist party's involvement in Parnell's downfall, signaling his exile from the innocence of childhood. As a way to remove himself from the perils of temptation and the impurities he sees around him in society, Stephen turns to the church as a place of refuge. He becomes more and more devoted, engaging in corporeal mortifications, removing himself from the society of others, so much so that he is offered a vocation, finally realizing that in doing so he will lose his humanity. After he becomes aware that a life in the priesthood will entail separating himself from life itself, he

becomes disillusioned with the church, feeling it has betrayed his trust. He finally turns to literature and the arts, his true calling, only to realize that in order to achieve success he must go into physical exile from Ireland. Exile becomes essential because conformity to religious and nationalist values would be demanded of him if he remained in Ireland. Feeling betrayed by his nation, his society, and his religion, he faces his exile head on, only to fail and return to Dublin after only a few short months in Paris.

While Stephen returns home after only a short time in exile, Richard Rowan spends several years in exile doing just what Stephen wanted to, becoming a well-respected artist. If *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* depicts the truth about Joyce's adolescence and first attempt at leaving Ireland, then *Exiles* provides the ending Joyce desired for so long, the artist's triumphant return. While on the outside, Richard seems to have the perfect life, the audience quickly realizes that he and the other characters in *Exiles* are in a state of exile more extreme than any Joyce has created before.

CHAPTER 3: *Exiles*

Greater love than this, he said, no man hath that a man
lay down his wife for a friend. (*Ulysses* 393)

Dubliners presented a city in the midst of decay and paralysis; *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* showed one boy's journey from innocence to experience; *Exiles* displays a family seemingly proud of their successful return to Ireland. However, as the play unfolds, the cost of that success quickly becomes evident. The ultimate goal of a triumphant return to the native city is underscored by the emotional damage caused by months of abandonment and infidelity. Scholars note that in *Exiles*: "every major character is in exile—from country, from family, from self" (Katherine Hill-Miller 356). Extending far deeper than Eveline's desire for escape or Stephen Dedalus' desire for artistic freedom, the characters of Joyce's only surviving play have experienced betrayal and exile so deep they may not be able to recover.

While *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* deal with the possibility or longing for physical exile, in Joyce's play, exile is realized. Indeed, Richard and Bertha have spent eight years as émigrés living in Rome; Bertha has been emotionally exiled from her husband, who pushes her to have an affair with Robert, while having an emotional affair himself with Beatrice; Robert longs to be in exile, as Richard was, as well as participating in Bertha's emotional exile from her husband. Exile is conflated with betrayal within Joyce's text through the possibility of the affairs of both Richard and Bertha. Also, Robert feels rejected by his own country, as though all of his work while Richard was away has been ignored. Because he failed to be lauded as an important writer and thinker, Richard chose to exile himself from Ireland. When he

returns, he hopes to finally be recognized as a success, but his success as a writer is undercut by the betrayal he feels by his wife and the betrayal he commits with Beatrice.

The first act opens with Richard and Bertha's return to Ireland from the continent, and Beatrice's return from visiting family in County Cork. Immediately, the return to Dublin becomes associated with a desire for renewal. Beatrice needs to be reunited with Richard. She goes to see him within hours of returning to the city, under the guise of teaching Archie a music lesson for which she forgot to bring the music. Richard also sees the return to Dublin as a renewal of artistic inspiration. He has returned to accept a position teaching at the university, as well as rejuvenating his relationship with Beatrice.

The first conversation of the play, between Richard and Beatrice, introduces several relationships which shape the rest of the work. Through their immediately intimate conversation, it quickly becomes apparent that Beatrice has been Richard's literary inspiration in their years apart. After nine years of correspondence, they have been reunited and Richard questions Beatrice about her desire to see what he has written about her. His egoism surfaces as he tells her that the reason she wants to see his writing is because he is the one who wrote it. These opening pages are evidence of a romantic relationship between Richard and Beatrice which has not yet become physical, but is deeply rooted emotionally.

The theme of betrayal arises in this opening conversation, first about Beatrice's secret engagement to her cousin, Richard's best friend, Robert Hand. Richard had long desired a relationship with Beatrice but it never came to fruition because she was always around Robert, and he was in a committed relationship with Bertha. While Beatrice thought that she was successful at keeping her engagement a secret, Richard knew about

it the entire time. Richard felt betrayed by Robert's relationship with Beatrice, even though Robert never knew of Richard's desire to be with her.

Another aspect of betrayal which surfaces in the opening scene is the relationship between Richard and his mother. While rumors abounded that he refused to return to Ireland upon his mother's death despite her many requests, Richard informs Beatrice that his mother never called for him and never forgave him. He feels betrayed by his mother because she was unable to understand him and unable to accept his son Archie as a member of the family. Because he and Bertha were not married and their son was born out of wedlock, Richard's mother would not recognize him. Richard even goes so far as to blame his mother: "She drove me away. On account of her I lived years in exile" (24). Because he sees his mother as the source of his need to go into exile, Richard can place the blame on her for everything that has gone wrong in his life since leaving Ireland.

Richard is aware of how his relationship with Beatrice affects Bertha, yet, he seems to feed off of his ability to betray her emotionally while remaining faithful to her physically. His relationship with his wife mirrors his relationship with his homeland: he has betrayed it physically by leaving, yet remained emotionally faithful, commemorating it through his art. Richard cheated on Bertha numerous times before, as he mentions while describing their lives in Rome. Even though he hurt her, she always remained faithful, emotionally and physically. His relationship with Beatrice, however, signifies the first time in which he has become emotionally involved with another woman. His constant betrayal of his wife is related to his desire to be betrayed. He has tried to push Bertha away by having affairs with women, but instead, all he did was make her more faithful to him. This time, he hopes by becoming emotionally invested in another woman,

he will be able to hurt Bertha, and possibly drive her away. If he can hurt her deeply enough to drive her away, then he will become the victim rather than the guilty party in their relationship.

Richard becomes obsessed with Bertha's relationship with Robert, in which she does not seem to be emotionally invested. As much as Richard desires for his wife to be cheating on him, the affair between Robert and Bertha appears in the first act to be one-sided. When they are alone together for the first time, Robert aggressively pursues Bertha even though she does not seem to reciprocate his feelings.

Robert: [*He kisses her again.*] I will speak to you; tell you all, then. I will
kiss you, then, long long kisses—when you come to me—long
long sweet kisses.

Bertha: Where?

Robert: [*In the tone of passion.*] Your eyes. Your lips. All your divine body.

Bertha: [*Repelling his embrace, confused.*] I meant where do you wish me
to come (41).

Bertha attempts to physically push Robert away from her as he advances to kiss her. Her actions signify that she does not desire the same type of relationship with him as he desires with her. No matter how ardently Richard encourages her to become involved with Robert, Bertha remains steadfastly devoted to her husband.

Another relationship that sets itself up for betrayal in the first act is between Richard and Robert. Clearly on a collision course from the start, with each man having an affair with the other's partner, Richard makes Robert aware from the beginning that Robert will betray him. Robert tells Richard that he has worked all of the years which

Richard spent in exile to bring him back to Dublin, to secure a teaching position for him, and clear his name of many malicious rumors. All of this, he says, he has done selflessly, in order to make a path for Richard's return and a prosperous future for his family. Yet, his true motivations lie in his desire to be with Bertha. He needs to keep Richard in Dublin in order for Bertha to stay there too. Richard, however, is not deceived and detects Robert's ulterior motives:

Richard: There is a faith stranger still than the faith of the disciple in his
master.

Robert: And that is?

Richard: The faith of the master in the disciple who will betray him (52).

Richard's comment serves as another example of Joyce aligning betrayal with an allusion to Christ. In this case, Richard makes his friend out to be Judas-like, just as Stephen learned to view the priests during the Christmas dinner scene. Whether acting to protect what he sees as a secretive relationship with Bertha, or out of pure ignorance, Robert ignores Richard's comment, and their conversation quickly ends.

Bertha remains involved in the relationship with Robert as a means of pacifying Richard. He experiences the emotional betrayal which he seems to long for as a way of justifying his own actions of betrayal against Bertha. Richard constantly prods Bertha to reveal details of the time she has spent with Robert, especially, the physical nature of their relationship:

Richard: I want to find out what he means or feels just as you do.

Bertha: Remember you allowed me to go on, I told you the whole thing from the beginning... He kissed me.

Richard: Your mouth?

Bertha: Once or twice.

Richard: Long kisses?

Bertha: Fairly long (*reflects.*) Yes, the last time.

Richard: (*Rubs his hands slowly; then*) With his lips? Or...the other way? (59-60)

He gets more satisfaction out of her relationship with Robert than any of his affairs with other women. He knows that Bertha is the only woman who can truly have an effect on him, so the best way he knows to provoke her is to force her to relive her relationship with Robert. If he can force her to hurt him, then he can reap the emotional benefits of betrayal and in turn manifest them in his writing.

Bertha informs Richard that Robert requested to meet her that evening at his cottage in the suburbs of Dublin, a house where he and Richard had many “wild nights” as well as where Richard and Beatrice carried on their affair before Richard’s exile (62). While Bertha is “shocked” to learn that the cottage she has been invited to has such a seedy reputation, Richard quickly becomes irate, yet excited, that Robert is going to try and push his relationship with Bertha to the next level (62). Feeling the first twinges of betrayal, Richard calls Robert “a liar, a thief, and a fool!” (63).

Bertha, having just confirmed her suspicions before they left Ireland that her husband was having an affair with Beatrice, realizes that their relationship is ongoing. Richard defends his actions by claiming that since he was honest about his relationship

and did not deceive Bertha, that his affair was not immoral. He argues that since he has given her the freedom to have a relationship with Robert (one Richard cultivates, encourages, and which is entirely one-sided), he should be able to have a relationship with Beatrice. Standing up for herself for the first time, Bertha fires back:

Bertha: [*In a calm decided tone.*] I know why you have allowed me what
you call complete liberty.

Richard: Why?

Bertha: To have complete liberty with—that girl (66).

She defends Robert by saying that he at least is not hypocritical about his relationships with women. Knowing that the angrier Bertha becomes, the more likely she is to keep her appointment with Robert, and that a meeting between Robert and Bertha will allow him to feel betrayed by both his wife and his best friend, Richard pushes Bertha away from him even more. While he does not outwardly encourage her to meet Robert, he does not forbid it, telling her to decide for herself, that she is free (70).

The second act of *Exiles* opens at the cottage at Ranelagh, with Robert anxiously awaiting Bertha's arrival. Rather than Bertha, Richard greets Robert at the door.

Flustered and surprised, Robert allows him into the house where Richard tells him that he has known about the affair between Robert and Bertha since it began. When Robert finds out that Richard is aware of his relationship with Bertha, he realizes he has betrayed one of his best friends. This response is exactly what Richard is looking for. He manipulates Robert's feelings of betrayal and paints himself as the victim: "I did not hate you. The whole thing made me sad all at once" (76). It is clear that Richard had not felt any

sadness when he was encouraging his wife to meet with Robert in the past, nor when he forced her to relate, in detail, their physical interactions earlier in the day.

Then, instead of getting angry with Robert for his relationship with his wife, which might be the expected reaction, Richard launches into a discussion about personal freedom. He tells Robert that if he wants to have an affair with Bertha it is all right because he does not have power over her body; she is free to make any decisions she wishes, even if they involve betraying him. Robert would not be stealing her from him because she is free. Their conversation creates an interesting tension between Richard's intellectual ideas about personal freedom and the emotion of jealousy that both men feel.

Their discussion soon turns to Richard's infidelities. Richard admits to Robert that he cheated on Bertha many times:

Richard: I wakened her from her sleep and told her. I cried beside
her bed; and I pierced her heart.

Robert: O, Richard, why did you do that?

Richard: Betray her?

Robert: No. But tell her, waken her from her sleep to tell her. It was
piercing her heart (84).

Richard went out of his way to hurt his wife with his affairs but again paints himself as the victim. He does not say that she cried when he told her. He says he pierced her heart, but he never gives voice to her actual response to the news of his first affair. Instead, he reiterates the point that *he* knelt down and cried. He then continues, exaggerating the effect of his affair on Bertha, even going so far as to say he killed a part of her, stole her innocence, and thwarted her hopes of happiness with him. He, again, never actually gives

her a voice; he assigns emotions to her that fulfill his needs. His outburst demonstrates the sense of power and control he feels over his wife. He paints his actions against her as strong enough to have ruined her life, yet still manages to come out the victim because of the toll her reaction took on him. Richard even goes so far as to argue that the pain he felt from his affair could only be alleviated if Bertha reacted by cheating on him: "I longed to be betrayed by you and by her" (88). Richard ends his conversation by telling Robert to free himself by taking his affair with Bertha to the next level of intimacy. Because Richard feels no sense of guilt for his relationships, Bertha's affair is how he achieves emotional retribution.

After their discussion on personal freedom and relationships, Robert goes out into the garden to wait for Richard to explain their situation to Bertha, who has just arrived. After Richard confesses to her that he told Robert of his awareness of their relationship, Bertha feels guilty, thinking she has betrayed Robert's trust. Richard tells her he will leave her there, making her suspect that he is going to meet with Beatrice. Realizing this, she tells him, "Now I know what to do" (94). Angered, Richard provokes her more about her relationship with Robert, asking if he was respectful, to which Bertha replies he was. She then asks why he did not ask his love, Beatrice, to go away with him nine years ago, which she answers herself: he "knew the answer he would get" (95). Bertha now feels the full wrath of Richard's betrayal far more deeply than when he cheated on her in Rome. She has now discovered that the only reason she even has a relationship with her husband is because the woman he really wanted to be with turned him down. Her growing awareness of not only the extent of Richard's infidelities, but of his duplicity and disloyalty to her fuel her desire to act against him.

Throughout their argument, Richard remains calm, aware that he is about to receive the ultimate satisfaction, betrayal by his wife. His goal throughout the play has been to paint himself as the victim in order to make his wife feel as guilty as he does about having been unfaithful. At this point, having realized that she has been intensely betrayed, Bertha is the ultimate victim. Only by consummating her affair with Robert can Richard reap the emotional benefits he so craves.

The third act opens with the audience unaware of what eventually transpired between Robert and Bertha the night before. When Richard and Bertha are finally left to themselves, Richard begins prodding Bertha for the details of her meeting with Robert, but this time she refuses to say what went on. For the first time she shows some emotion and says threateningly to Richard: “For your own sake you urged me into it” (133). She forces Richard to face the true motivation of his actions; he becomes infuriated, but tries to mask his anger by reiterating to Bertha that she is free to make her own decisions about her life and her body. Her response epitomizes all her feelings towards Richard that she has never been able to voice before: “Don’t touch me! You are a stranger to me. You do not understand anything in me—not one thing in my heart or soul. A stranger! I am living with a stranger!” (135).

Bertha’s emotional outburst serves as the impetus of Richard’s actions throughout the rest of the play. He has been searching, probing, trying to urge some sort of emotional response out of his wife. He thought for years that cheating on her, having a physical relationship with another woman, would be enough to send her over the edge. But it is not until he overtly rejects her and tells her that she does not in any way belong to him, that she provides him with the emotion he has been longing for. He makes use of her

angry outburst and, in the final scene of the play, presents himself to the audience and his repentant wife, as the ultimate victim.

She tells him that she has always remained true to him throughout their marriage; that she gave up much of herself to make him happy and support his lifestyle. She believes that all of the pain she went through was worth it, because she still sees Richard as he was when they first met. He, however, after her admission that she feels he is a stranger, does not understand her at all, and is unable to see her as he used to. Just as he pierced her heart when he told her of his first affair, he declares now that she has wounded him: “I have a deep, deep wound of doubt in my soul” (146). Bertha tells him again and again that she loves him, has been faithful to him, and would never do anything to hurt him, but to no avail. He pushes her away with the pain her wound has caused *him*: “To hold you by no bonds, even of love, to be united with you in body and soul in utter nakedness—for this I longed. And now I am tired for a while, Bertha. My wound tires me” (147). Richard’s view of the perfect relationship with his wife is to reduce their relationship from a socially constructed contract, which he has already denied her in refusing a legal marriage, to an elemental desire. He has longed for betrayal as a way of demonstrating to Bertha that their relationship should be free of social restrictions and expectations, existing only at the most basic level of human passion. Her inability to understand this is what ultimately leads to their inability to communicate at the end of the play, as Richard speaks his last lines, “as if to an absent person” (147).

Richard’s longing for a relationship with Bertha in which she felt no social tie or personal obligation between them, manifests itself through his constant affairs. When he tries to force her to hold their relationship to the same degree of openness, by

encouraging the relationship with Robert, he pushed her too far. When Robert confirms that Bertha refused to sleep with him, left him alone to return to her husband, Richard can no longer look upon their relationship as a source for emotional betrayal. He now blames Bertha for causing the question of her faithfulness to be raised. His wound, he says, is of “doubt”; while he has had numerous affairs, physically and emotionally, it is the question of his wife’s emotional infidelity, which she, and her lover, deny, which allows Richard to push her away and feel betrayed (146). Richard cannot see that for Bertha, there will always be a connection and a bond between them. She will always think of him as the man he was when they first became involved. Vehemently denying any infidelity, her final lines call out to him: “love me as you did the first time” (147).

Having Bertha’s lines as the last of the play help to mitigate the sympathy Richard creates for himself throughout the rest of the play. While he takes advantage of nearly every situation and uses it to further his cause, Richard is not the ultimate victim. What Richard longed for, more than a physical affair and betrayal by Bertha, was for her to completely reject him. He was never able to gain his mother’s approval and acceptance, so he feels unworthy of Bertha’s unconditional love for him. He tells Beatrice: “I fought against her spirit while she lived to the bitter end. [*He presses his hand to his forehead.*] It fights against me still—in here” (24). Bertha’s emotional outburst, her verbal rejection of him, is the strongest betrayal he could have asked for from her.

Eleven major dialogue fragments⁸ were removed from the published version of the play and taking them into consideration of an examination of *Exiles* adds an interesting dimension of character analysis. The fragments for the most part involve conversations either between Richard and Robert or Richard and Bertha (the only exception is a short fragment between Bertha and Brigid). The dialogue fragments reveal much about Richard's character as well as his relationship with his wife. While some of the deleted lines of these fragments were reworked to be included in the final text, many of them, if they had been included, would have created very different characters. The fragments illuminate Richard and Bertha's relationship while they were living in Rome. Bertha expresses her depression and feelings of rejection while she was left alone in their apartment to take care of herself and their son, while Richard was busy writing and exploring the city. The fragments show Bertha as a much more sympathetic character rather than the cold, detached woman depicted in the final version of the play, they also make Richard out to be the main source of Bertha's pain.

Dialogue fragments six and seven are taken from a conversation between Richard and Robert. Reading them in conjunction with the final version of the play, they seem to take place within the men's conversation in act two. In fragment six, Richard offers justification for his "liberal attitude" toward his wife's relationship with Robert. He says that he allowed her to remain free within her relationship for his own sake. He could have forbid her to pursue the relationship, but he found it to his benefit to allow it to continue:

⁸ I will be referring to each fragment as it is numbered in the Cornell manuscript. A copy of my transcription of these fragments appears as an appendix to this paper.

Richard: I had only to forbid her: and I did not. I had only to say a tender word to her of—of our own past life: and I did not. I left you both free.

Robert: For our sakes?

Richard: For my own sake (72).

This admission supports Bertha's angry comments to Richard in the third act. If Joyce had allowed this fragment to be included in the final version of the text, Richard would be viewed in a much less sympathetic light. When Bertha finally confronts Richard, she says that he was selfish in his actions, and his statements within this fragment support her claim.

Fragment six is interesting for more than its subject matter. In this fragment, Richard and Robert seem to switch roles: Robert becomes the interrogator and Richard becomes the interrogated. Robert takes a distinct upper hand and manipulates the situation to fit his argument, something which he does not do at any other point in the play. He asks Richard, if he knew Bertha would have left him for Robert, would he still have let her pursue the relationship. Richard answers simply: "Then no" (73). Robert gets Richard to reveal that he never wanted Bertha to actually cheat on him or leave him. He just wanted to feel the threat of it. Richard does not need her to go through with the affair in order for him to reap the emotional benefits which he so desires from it. He can feel betrayal just by the thought, or possibility, of an affair between Robert and Bertha; he never wanted her to actually do it.

Dialogue fragment seven, another discarded conversation between Richard and Robert, presumably takes place in act two. This fragment depicts another role reversal

between the two men where Robert becomes more articulate, explaining the true nature of freedom and Richard offers only short responses. Robert deals with some of the major philosophical questions which are raised in other parts of the play. The Robert of this conversation denounces religion and says that since he never really believed, freedom is irrelevant. Though inconsistent with Robert's character in the rest of the play, within this argument, he offers a strong counterpoint to Richard who so often holds such controversial ideas. Robert's speech sounds like something written for Richard:

Of the two of us, it is I who am free. I have never really believed, not even as a boy. I have never wept, as you did, for my sins. I do not even know that sin is. I have never believed in truth or man or woman. I have never been true to myself....I have freed myself within and without. I care nothing for humans in legal bonds or laws of moral prejudice (75).

The trend of providing lines for Robert that seem more suitable to Richard continues as Robert turns to the subject of Bertha:

She was not free even last night. The shadow of her fear of you was over her. You have not healed your soul. You have wounded it—a deep wound of doubt which neither her word nor mine can heal completely (76).

Again, these lines seem perfectly suited for Richard, and in this case, Joyce too must have realized that they did not fit Robert's personality, because they appear, in a slightly altered form, in the last scene of act three between Bertha and Richard. In the final

version, Richard speaks the lines about the deep wound of doubt about the pain which Bertha's betrayal and rejection caused him. In the context of fragment seven, the lines make Richard seem weak and transparent, as Robert realizes something that Richard cannot. But transposed into the final version of the play, they become essential to Richard's sense of self and accomplishment. Throughout the play his goal has been, masochistically, to be betrayed by his wife and he speaks these lines to show Bertha that she has hurt him in a way from which he can never be healed (probably because he does not want to be).

Dialogue fragments eight and ten contain conversations between Richard and Bertha about their relationship and her affair with Robert. It is difficult to place them within the text because they do not seem to fit in with the final characterization of Bertha. These fragments portray Bertha as a much more sympathetic and well-rounded character. In fragment eight, Bertha asserts that she has always remained true to her husband and was never unfaithful. She gave herself wholly to him, and he abandoned her: "I gave you myself. You took me and you left me...Those long evenings in Rome, what I went through!" (78). She turns the tables on his desire for betrayal and explains the ways in which he has betrayed her. Importantly, this gives glimpse into what life was like while they were living in exile gives her a voice and creates sympathy.

Bertha voices her feelings of abandonment in conjunction with feelings of inferiority caused by Richard's treatment of her. She was often left alone in the apartment for long periods of time with their child, with little contact to the outside world. She says: "I was so sad. I was alone, forgotten by you and by all. You had grown tired of me because I was too simple and uneducated for a person like you. I thought my life was

over” (79). These powerful lines create strong sympathy for a woman who seems to have been emotionally abused by her husband. This fragment paints a much bleaker, less sympathetic view of Richard’s motivations to push Bertha away from him and hurt her for his own benefit and also illuminate his masochistic actions. In this fragment, Bertha becomes the victim entirely, which clearly deviates from the overall impression of the work. There is no way Richard would be able to play the victim with his wife voicing her opinion of their life in exile as she does in this fragment.

The deleted dialogue is also an interesting statement on the nature of exile. While Richard thrives on being away from their home in Ireland, where he can interact with history in a city such as Rome, as well as perhaps, gain some distance from the land and people whom he is writing about, he seems blissfully unaware of how his actions affect those around him. Exile, as exemplified in this fragment, is a double-edged sword. Bertha too is in exile, but for her it is a negative experience. She is withdrawn, depressed, and alone in a city where she does not know anyone and cannot even speak the language. She is unable to communicate and unable to free herself, yet her husband claims she has been entirely free throughout the duration of their marriage.

In dialogue fragment ten, also between Richard and Bertha, further demonstrates these ideas. Bertha again feels isolated and rejected by Richard while they are living abroad, but this time admits that in these times her thoughts turned to her childhood, the relationships of her youth, and Robert. Richard’s interest in Bertha’s teenage relationships becomes especially important after an investigation of the autobiographical elements in the play. Bertha does not discuss physical desire for Robert, but a desire to be with someone who accepts her as she is and will pay attention to her. Richard, again

trying to feel some sense of betrayal by his wife, asks her if during those times she loved Robert to which she answers: “[*simply*] No. I loved you” (84).

Of all of the dialogue fragments, this one could have been left in with the least amount of alteration of the final text. While it creates a certain amount of sympathy for Bertha, the final version would be improved if she was a more well-rounded character as she is in this scene. The dialogue also supports Richard’s characterization and personality. The dialogue fragments Joyce chose to remove from the final published version of *Exiles* thus cast an interesting perspective onto the characters. Richard’s characterization suffers the most in them which is probably the reason they were cut. Overall, they paint Robert as a stronger character, Bertha as a more sympathetic character, and Richard as a weaker character who is less able to justify his actions towards his wife.

Throughout the small body of critical work surrounding *Exiles*, the one thing that critics have been able to agree upon is that Joyce’s biography plays an important role within his only surviving attempt at drama. Perhaps, as Carole Brown suggests, it is because the genre of drama removes an element of artistic distance. While all of Joyce’s works contain autobiographical elements, only in *Exiles* do we find attempts to label the protagonist as an extension of Joyce himself. Clearly elements of Joyce’s life appear in Richard Rowan, but to go so far as to declare Rowan an extension of Joyce is to remove the last sense of artistic distance Joyce maintains throughout this play. Joyce’s notes, now commonly published with the text of the play, reveal which elements of his life Joyce had in mind while he was writing *Exiles*. The play seems to be a “what if” scenario, an experiment, on paper, to see what life would have been like had the Joyces returned to

Ireland to live after several years on the continent. Noting the reception the play received, its lack of stage productions, and the failure of its main character to find acceptance and success in Dublin, it is probably best that Joyce left his experiment to paper.

In the summer of 1912, Joyce made his last visit to Ireland. He, Nora, Giorgio, and Lucia went to visit both the Joyce family in Dublin and the Barnacle family in Galway. Joyce's stay in Galway was marked most notably by his visit Oughterard, a cemetery outside of Galway where, in "The Dead" Michael Furey lies buried. Furey was a fictional recreation of Michael Bodkin, Nora's first love, who died young, before their love could be fulfilled. He was actually buried in Ragoon, a small cemetery in Galway City.⁹ Joyce had for years dealt with insecurity about his wife, even though she had never cheated on him or even acted suspiciously. He had a terrible time dealing with the fact that Nora had been in love with someone before she met him, especially because they had been childhood sweethearts. His jealousy and sense of betrayal manifest themselves in Richard's view of Bertha's relationship with Robert Hand in *Exiles*.

⁹ After visiting Galway Joyce made another attempt, on 20 August 1912, to explain his mixed emotions towards Nora and her life before they met in his poem "She Weeps Over Ragoon":

Rain on Ragoon falls softly, softly falling,
Where my dark lover lies.
Sad is his voice that calls me, sadly calling,
At grey moonrise.

Love, hear thou
How soft, how sad his voice is ever calling,
Ever unanswered and the dark rain falling,
Then as now.

Dark too our hearts, O love, shall lie cold
As his sad heart has lain
Under the moongrey nettles, the black mould
And muttering rain.

On a trip to Ireland, three years earlier, Joyce's fears of betrayal were fed by his one-time friend Vincent Cosgrave, who informed Joyce that in the summer of 1904, when Joyce and Nora first met, Cosgrave too had met Nora. Before Joyce and Nora decided to run away together, Nora and Cosgrave used to walk together by the Liffey in the evenings (Ellmann 288-289). Joyce was devastated, even though their relationship had been innocent, with no physical consummation of love or even emotional investment. As soon as he was given the news, he wrote to Nora (who was in Trieste): "If I could...forget that the girl I loved was false to me and remember her only as I saw her with the eyes of my boyish love" (Ellmann 289). Joyce's words sound very similar to Bertha's at the end of *Exiles*: "Forget me and love me again as you did the first time" (147). After this incident, which Joyce never forgot, although he did forgive Nora, he became hyperaware of Nora's past relationships with men.

This hypersensitivity was at play in 1912 when Joyce went to Oughterard. In his notes to the play, Joyce lists Nora's initials followed by: "Bodkin died. Kearns died. In the convent they called her the man-killer," so clearly the visit was on his mind when he began to write *Exiles* (152). Bodkin's relationship with Nora affected Joyce as deeply as Cosgrave's, if not more so, because with Bodkin Nora had experienced an emotional, although not physical, bond. Joyce had never been in an emotional relationship with a woman before he met Nora, and the fact that Nora had been in one with Bodkin disturbed him. Joyce was troubled by the thought that if Bodkin had not died as a young man, there was a very good possibility that he would have married Nora, and Joyce would have been left alone. In a strange twist of fate, while he was walking around Oughterard, Joyce

found a headstone bearing the name: J. Joyce (Ellmann 336). Always aware of coincidences, Joyce took the headstone as a sign of Nora's separation from him.

In addition to the visit to Galway, another important fact about the 1912 visit to Ireland was that it would be Joyce's last. In addition to feelings of betrayal because of his wife's earlier relationships, Joyce felt betrayed by the city of Dublin and the nation as a whole. The main motivation for his journey was to meet with publishers to secure the publication of *Dubliners* which he had been unable to get published despite nearly a decade of attempts. Even after spending weeks in negotiations about scenes that the publishers were afraid would be rejected by the censor, Joyce's publication hopes fell through again. The fact that the book that bore the city's name could not be accepted by the people of Dublin deeply hurt Joyce. If *Dubliners* could not find a home in Dublin, where could it find a home?

This final rejection of his work served to destroy the last bit of faith Joyce had in Ireland. He would never return, yet his career would forever depend on the love/hate relationship he had with Ireland. In 1912, he realized that he would never share in Richard Rowan's success, always ending up like Robert Hand or Stephen Dedalus, having to seek exile in order to find success. It is because Ireland, as he saw it, forced him into exile that all of his works focus on it: "he would be able to conquer Ireland, in the artist's traditional way, by setting up the criteria by which it must judge and be judged" (Ellmann 344).

Recognizing the connection he and Robert shared, Joyce's feelings about Ireland manifest themselves in Hand's article about Richard published in the morning paper in the final act of *Exiles*. Robert entitles the work "The Distinguished Irishman," which all

of the other characters assume is meant literally. Only Richard picks up on the notes of sarcasm and bitterness in the piece. Beatrice sees the work as a laudatory article about an Irishman who has returned from exile. Richard sees it for what it really is, an expression of Robert's bitterness about Richard's success, while he has suffered at home for years, not being able to make anything of himself and not even being successful in his attempted relationship with Bertha. His article reads as if he were the older brother of the prodigal son. He speaks of Richard as "having left her [Ireland] in her hour of need" now called back "on the eve of her longawaited victory, to her whom in loneliness and exile they have at last learned to love" (128-129). Robert's bitterness extends so far that he, like Eveline or Stephen Dedalus, has decided to leave Ireland, in search of the same success that Richard found after he became an émigré.

After reading the article, Richard again feels a sense of betrayal, this time by his best friend. A friend proving himself to be an enemy was not new to Joyce. Having previously aligned himself with the likes of Christ and Parnell (and as he does again in the notes to *Exiles*), it was easy for Joyce to see Robert as a Judas figure. In act one, Richard predicts that like Christ and Parnell, he will be betrayed by his closest follower. The article in the third act serves as the kiss of betrayal. In 1914, Joyce would go on to categorize all of the friendships he had experienced in his life: "a friend is someone who wants to possess your mind and your wife's body, and longs to prove himself your disciple by betraying you" (Ellmann 366). By the end of the play, Robert has proven himself not only disciple, but also betrayer, just as Richard expected and needed.

In September 1912, Joyce left Ireland with a renewed sense of betrayal and an understanding that he would spend the rest of his life in exile. Richard Rowan's

experiences in Dublin reflect the reception Joyce longed for during his last visit. He, like Richard, had been a successful writer abroad; he too, like Richard, had taken a common law wife with him and started a family in Italy. But unlike Richard, Joyce's return to Ireland met with only slamming doors and further instances of rejection and betrayal. As Katherine Hill-Miller notes in her analysis of the play: "In Joyce's daily world, as in his fictive world, from his early work through his mature career, triumphal return from exile would always remain a luxury of the imagination" (357).

The themes of exile and betrayal run deep in all of Joyce's works and spring clearly from his life. Joyce's personal resentment towards the nation of Ireland and the city of Dublin, in addition to the feelings of betrayal aroused by Nora and well as childhood friend Vincent Cosgrave, supplied Joyce with a lifelong theme of betrayal. *Exiles*, perhaps because of its form as a drama, allows Joyce to work closely with these deeply personal themes. The form of the work forces Joyce to create characters who have to talk to one another. Because the work is made up entirely of dialogue, the characters do not have the option to have to live in silent self-exile, or spend time thinking about their personal philosophies, as James Duffy does. Instead, they are paired off and forced to talk about the issues they have with one another.

While the themes of exile and betrayal appear in *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, it is in *Exiles* in particular that they are most directly associated with Joyce's own life and personal experiences. Just as Joyce felt betrayed by his wife because of her youthful relationship with Bodkin, as well as her walks along the river with Cosgrave, so too does Richard Rowan long for his wife to betray him. Just as Joyce felt betrayed by Cosgrave for meeting with Nora when he knew Joyce was dating her, so

too does Richard realize that he will be betrayed by Robert Hand. While in both instances, the betrayal is in the mind of the beholder and never comes to fruition, the fear of betrayal is enough to drive the emotions of both Joyce and Richard Rowan. Thus, critics often read Richard as an embodiment of Joyce. While there are clear connections between them, it is unwise to jump to the conclusion that Richard is Joyce. It is safer to argue that Richard, at least in terms of his success, the way he is welcomed back to Dublin, is who Joyce longed to be.

After his final visit to Ireland, several years before he would begin writing *Exiles*, Joyce knew that he would never return. Richard is able to find acceptance within the Dublin community; he has had his book published there and has even been offered a teaching position at the university. Joyce never received any of these acclamations, and had he, he probably would have refused them, as he refused invitations to return to Ireland late in his life. While Joyce was unable to find success and acceptance in Ireland, he did not abandon her; instead he used her as the setting for all of his works. When he achieved commendation later in his life for the stories which Ireland had for years rejected, he got his revenge and his immortality. Shortly after his final visit to his fatherland he came to the epiphany: “I find it difficult to come to any other conclusion but this—that the intention was to weary me out and if possible strangle me once and for all. But in this they did not succeed” (Ellmann 349).

CONCLUSION

“Departure from his country was a strategy of combat. Another strategy, which was closely connected with it, was writing” (Ellmann 110).

Exile is not simply about leaving a place; going into exile involves both leaving and arriving at a new destination. For Joyce, exile was as much about arriving in Europe as it was about leaving Ireland. He saw exile as a form of freedom, freedom from the restrictions of the church, freedom from the censorship of the press which kept his books out of print, the freedom to find himself as an artist. In order to be able to express oneself, one must be removed from the repressive situation. So it is his characters also seek the freedom he found after leaving Ireland.

Ellmann views Joyce's craft as a way of escaping Dublin reality: “Writing was itself a form of exile for him, a source of detachment” (Ellmann 110). Writing allows the artist to create a new reality. While Joyce's autobiography appears to some extent in nearly all his works, his role as the artist cannot be forgotten. As much as critics attempt to declare that certain of his characters, namely Stephen Dedalus and Richard Rowan, are fictional recreations of Joyce himself, the fact remains that they are *fictional*. None of Joyce's works is purely autobiography. Writing allows the author to step back from the world which he or she has created through language, however realistic it may seem. While he was still living in Ireland, creating his earliest stories which would become *Dubliners*, Joyce used his writing as a way to detach himself from his schoolmates and family. However, it was not until he left Ireland that he was able to see the society which he left. Looking in from the outside, Joyce was able to see more clearly the paralysis of

Dublin. Richard Ellmann describes Joyce's thoughts about exile before his first attempt in 1902: "To measure himself and his country he needed to take the measure of a more alien world" (110).

Even "Eveline," which was first published in Dublin before Joyce left Ireland permanently in 1904, underwent several rounds of revision after Joyce arrived in Trieste. The distance created by his exile allowed Joyce to take a more candid view of his native city. One of the changes Joyce made to the text of "Eveline" was the removal of the phrase, "was it honourable?" which Eveline asks herself about her intended exile (216). Perhaps because he had found the answer through his own exile, in *Dubliners* Joyce no longer has Eveline ask if exile can be considered an honorable choice.

More famously than the revisions which "Eveline" faced after Joyce left Dublin was the nearly complete destruction of *Stephen Hero*, in essence the first draft of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. After working for years and writing nearly a thousand pages, Joyce tossed the manuscript into the fire. After his mother rescued them, he carried the remains of *Stephen Hero* with him after he left Ireland and reworked many of the themes and characters into his later novel. It was, again, the distance from Ireland which exile gave him that allowed Joyce to reconsider the work he had done on *Stephen Hero*.

Exiles too, as I have demonstrated by analyzing Joyce's discarded dialogue fragments, faced rounds of revision. These examples of the changes Joyce made throughout his works serve not only to demonstrate the evolution of the works over time, but to emphasize the importance of the distance time and location create. Exile, then, for Joyce was about more than fleeing the paralysis of Dublin. Leaving gave him the

opportunity to assess Dublin from a distance. In order to understand the true nature of the Irish society which he left behind Joyce had to experience another culture. Without a basis for comparison, it would have been impossible to cast judgment on Ireland. While that distance did little to soften his view of Dublin society, it did allow for the creation of great literature.

Throughout each of the works which I have analyzed, the desire for exile is equated with freedom. Exile will give Eveline the freedom from an abusive relationship with her father. It will allow her to live her own life without feeling trapped by the social expectations placed on her by her native society. Inner exile allows James Duffy freedom from personal relationships. For him, however, the loss of his status as an inner exile grants him the freedom to finally experience an emotional connection to another human being. Stephen Dedalus, much like Joyce, seeks exile for artistic freedom. Being able to get away from Dublin will give him the space he needs to write without constraints. Finally, for Robert Hand, leaving would allow him to escape from the shadow of Richard Rowan. His role as a writer cannot be fulfilled while the two live in the same city. Leaving will allow him to seek success abroad.

After visiting Dublin and Galway in 1912, one of only three visits he made after leaving in 1904, Joyce never returned to Ireland, solidifying his classification as a permanent exile. His works symbolically catalogue the lifelong tension he felt towards his native land. Without his negative experiences in Ireland, he would not have been able to transform them into the themes of his writing. Yet, the experiences he did have, cut him so deeply that he could no longer survive in Dublin's toxic atmosphere. To Joyce, Ireland betrayed him time and again. When he was a young artist trying to find himself, the press

rejected his works; when he was a young man in love, his best friend covertly dated his future wife; as he became a mature man returning to hopes of success and publication, his publisher declared his works blasphemous and “offensive” (“A Curious History” 161). After this final betrayal he never returned, but instead sought success, “sen[ding] his characters back, and shar[ing] vicariously in their presence in the Dublin scene as well as their partial estrangement from it” (Ellmann 338).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alacoque, Marguerite Marie, Saint. *The Autobiography of Margaret Mary Alacoque*.
Trans. Sisters of the Visitation (Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex).
Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers. 1986.
- “Archbishop Ryan Speaks: He is Opposed to Parnell and Stands with Gladstone.” *New York Times*. 12 Dec. 1890. 2.
- Balazno, Wanda. “‘Eveline,’ or the Veils of Cleaning.” *A New and Complex Sensation: Essays on Joyce’s Dubliners*. Ed. Oona Frawley. Dublin: Lilliput Press. 2004.
- Benstock, Bernard. “The Kenner Conundrum: Or Who Does What With Which to Whom.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. No. 13, 1976 (Summer). 428-435.
- Bowen, Zack. “*Exiles*: The Confessional Mode.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. Spring 1992: 581-586.
- Brivic, Sheldon. “Structure and Meaning in Joyce’s *Exiles*.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. Vol. 6 (1968): 29-52.
- Brown, Carole. “James Joyce’s *Exiles*: The Ordeal of Richard Rowan.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. Vol. 17 (1979): 7-20.
- Bulson, Eric. *The Cambridge Introduction to James Joyce*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2006.
- “Charles Stewart Parnell.” *New York Times*. 8 Oct. 1891. 4.
- Corrington, John William. “Isolation as Motif in ‘A Painful Case’.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1966. 182-191.
- Crawley, John J. “Saint Francis de Sales.” *Lives of Saints*. New York: John J. Crawley and Co., 1954. 392-405.

- . "Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque." *Lives of Saints*. New York: John J. Crawley and Co., 1954. 426-429.
- Dahlie, Hallvard. "Brian Moore and the Meaning of Exile." *Medieval and Modern Ireland*. Ed. Richard Wall. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1998. 91-107.
- Daiches, David. "James Joyce: The Artist as Exile." *College English*. Vol. 2, no. 3, Dec. 1940. 197-206.
- Doherty, Gerald. "Upright Man/Fallen Women: Identification and Desire in James Joyce's 'A Painful Case'." *Style*. Vol. 35, no. 1. 2001 (Spring). 99-110.
- Ellman, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- "The Fatal Illness: Details of Parnell's Death—Little Information Given Out." *New York Times*. 8 Oct. 1891. 1.
- Feschbach, Sidney. "Fallen on his Feet in Buenos Ayres: Frank in 'Eveline'." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1983 (Winter). 223-227.
- Foster, R. F. "Marginal Men and Micks on the Make: The Uses of Irish Exile c. 1840-1922." *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History*. London: Penguin Books, 1995. 281-305.
- Friedman, Alan Warren. "Stephen Dedalus's *non serviam*: Patriarchal and Performative Failure in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." *Joyce Studies Annual*. Vol. 13, 2002 (Summer). 64-85.
- Hendricks, William and Michael West. "The Genesis and Significance of Joyce's Irony in 'A Painful Case.'" *ELH*. Vol. 44, No. 4, 1977 (Winter). 701-727.

- Hickman, Mary J. "Migration and Diaspora." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Irish Culture*. Ed. Joe Cleary and Claire Connolly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005. 117-136.
- Hill-Miller, Katherine. "James Joyce." *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century: An Analysis and Bibliographical Dictionary*. Ed. Martin Tucker. New York: Greenwood Press. 1991.
- "Is Parnell a Crazy Man: His Foul Betrayal of the Cause of Ireland." *New York Times*. 7 Dec. 1890. 12.
- Joyce, James. "A Curious History." *Occasional, Critical, and Political Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- . "Eveline." *Dubliners*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2006. 26-32.
- . "A Painful Case". *Dubliners*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2006. 89-98.
- . *Exiles*. New York: Penguin Books. 1979.
- . *Exiles MS. The James Joyce Archive*. Ed. Michael Groden. New York: Garland Publishing. 1978.
- . *Finnegans Wake*. London: Penguin Books. 2000.
- . "Gas from a Burner." *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1982. 335-337.
- . *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007.
- . "The Shade of Parnell." *Occasional, Critical, and Political Writing*. Trans. Conor Deane. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- . *Ulysses*. New York: Random House, Inc. 1990.

Kenner, Hugh. "Molly's Masterstroke." *James Joyce Quarterly*. Vol. 10, No. 1. 1972. 19-28.

Krause, David. "Joyce's *Exiles*: A Comedy in 'Three Cat and Mouse Acts'." *Irish University Review*. Vol. 22, No. 2. Autumn/Winter 1992. 261-277.

LeBlanc, Jim. "More on Derevaun Seraun." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1998 (Summer). 849-851.

Leonard, Garry. "Wondering Where All the Dust Comes From: Jouissance in 'Eveline'." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1991 (Fall). 23-41.

Lowe-Evans, Mary. "Who Killed Mrs. Sinico?" *Studies in Short Fiction*. Vol. 32, no. 3. 1995 (Summer). 395-402.

Maddox, Brenda. *Nora: The Real Life of Molly Bloom*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1988.

Melzer, Sondra. "In the Beginning There was Eveline." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1979. 479-485.

Mullin, Katherine. "Don't Cry for Me Argentina: 'Eveline' and the Seductions of Emigration Propaganda." *Semicolonial Joyce*. Ed. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2000. 172-200.

O'Toole, Fintan. *The Ex-Isle of Erin: Images of a Global Ireland*. Dublin: New Island Books, 1998.

---. "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch: Images of Ireland and America." *The Lie of the Land: Irish Identities*. Dublin: Verso. 1998. 31-45.

Owens, Coílín. "Entends sa Voix: Eveline's Swan Song." *Eire-Ireland; a Journal of Irish Studies*. Vol. 28. 1993. 37-53.

“Parnell’s Life and Work: His Rise to Great Power and Sudden Fall.” *New York Times*. 8 Oct. 1891. 9.

“Parnell Losing His Head: The Irish Fast Awakening to the True Issues.” *New York Times*. 17 Dec. 1890. 1.

“Parnell Makes No Defense: A Sensational Outcome of the O’Shea Divorce Suit.” *New York Times*. 16 Nov. 1890. 3.

Pound, Ezra. *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce with Pound’s Essays on Joyce*. Ed. Forrest Read. New York: New Directions Publishing. 1967.

Riggs, Pádraigín and Norman Vance. “Irish Prose Fiction.” *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Irish Culture*. Ed. Joe Cleary and Claire Connolly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005. 245-266.

San Juan, Jr., Epifano. “Eveline: Joyce’s Affirmation of Ireland.” *Eire-Ireland; a Journal of Irish Studies*. 1969. 46-52.

Scholossman, Beryl. “Retrospective Beginnings.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. Fall 1991: 85-101.

Schwarze, Tracey Teets. “Silencing Stephen: Colonial Pathologies in Victorian Dublin.” *Twentieth Century Literature: A Scholarly and Critical Journal*. Vol. 43, no. 3. 1997 (Fall). 243-263.

Senn, Fritz. “Distancing in ‘A Painful Case’.” *Les Revue des Lettres Modernes*. 1988. 25-38.

Sloan, Barbara. “The D’Annunzian Narrator in ‘A Painful Case’: Silent, Exiled, and Cunning.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1971. 26-36.

- Solomon, Albert. "The Backgrounds of 'Eveline'." *Eire-Ireland; a Journal of Irish Studies*. Vol. 6, no. 3. 1971. 23-38.
- Thuente, Mary Helen. "Development of the Exile Motif in Songs of Emigration and Nationalism." *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*. Vol. 26, No.1. Spring 2000. 8-24.
- Tiggs, Wim. "Derevaun Seraun." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1994 (Fall). 102-104.
- Torchiana, Donald. "Joyce's Eveline and the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 1968. 22-28.
- Tucker, Lindsey. "Duffy's Last Supper: Food, Language, and the Failure of Integrative Processes in 'A Painful Case'." *Irish Renaissance Annual*. Vol. 4, 1983. 118-127.
- Wondrich, Roberta Geftter. "Exilic Returns: Self and History Outside Ireland in Recent Irish Fiction." *Irish University Review*. Vol. 30, No. 1. 2000 (Spring/Summer). 1-16.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Exiles: Notes, Manuscript, and Proofs

Dialogue Fragments as numbered in the Cornell MS

Fragment 1 (page 64¹⁰)

Richard

But in such a way—like thieves—at night—in such a place—it is not for people like us.

It is not for me, not for her: it is not even for you.

Robert

Yes, you are right. You are so young and yet you seem to be her father and mine. I have acted a little (on/a) common man.

Richard

When I met her first she was eighteen and since that time I have (watched). I have felt her soul (unfolding). Sometimes I have to look at her in our room. I mean when I am writing. She is lying on the bed reading some book that I have given her—(Wagner's) letters of a novel of Jacobsen. She is struggling with sleep. You say I am like her father. Do you know what I feel then when I look at her?

Robert

What?

Richard

I feel as if I had carried her inside my own body, in my womb.

(page 65)

¹⁰ The page numbers appear as they are cited in the thesis. Words in parenthesis were hard to distinguish in the MS.

Robert

Can a man feel like that?

Richard

Her books, her music, the fire of thought stolen from on high out of whose (flowers/house) all ease and culture have come, the---with which she fuels the body we drive—whose work is that? I feel that it is mine. It is my work and the work of others like me now or in the other lives. It is we who have conceived her and brought her forth. Our minds flowing together as the womb in which we have formed her.

Fragment 2 (page 66)

Richard

You (sported/exposed) of our boyhood. Since our boyhood together our ways have been different.

Robert

[sighs] Ah, yes.

Richard

You have taken the smooth path, accepting in (ami)cally everything in which you disbelieved and building for your body and for that function of it which I suppose you call your soul a peace of prudence, irony, and pleasure.

Robert

Are those things good?

Richard

I have not chosen them.

Robert

I know that. As it was in my character to choose them it was in yours to reject them.

Richard

I have lived without prudence, risking everything, destroying everything in an effort to create again.

Robert

You will. I feel that you will.

(page 67)

Richard

I have done something already. I have destroyed and recreated in my own image a woman.

Robert

Bertha?

Richard

I carried her with me into exile and now, after years, I carry her back again, remade in my own image. And this I did for you.

Robert

For me?

Richard

Yes, for you who risked nothing and lived prudently.

Robert

[*smiling*] It is a queer kind of present, Richard, like the giver. You see of course that I have no intention of accepting it. No, you have made her new and strange, keep her.

Richard

Because you are generous to allow me?

Fragment 3 (page 68)

Robert

Then it was not (reality) you felt.

Richard

I felt what I tell you—(loathing).

Robert

No hatred of me? But how?

Richard

And for all I know jealousy, as you call it, may be this (loathing).

Fragment 4 (page 69)

Bertha

No, thank you Brigid. Just a cup of tea will do.

Brigid

Or a bit of toast?

Bertha

No thanks.

Brigid

Maybe it was them---yesterday upset your stomach, ma'am. They upsets some people that way.

Bertha

I supposed so.

[Brigid goes out.]

Fragment 5 (page 70)

Bertha

I wish I had never met you.

Richard

You would like to be freer now that you are.

Bertha

Yes.

Richard

So that you could go to that house at night more freely to meet your lover.

Bertha

[Putting her arms around his neck] Yes, dear, I wish I had never met you. I wish you were my lover waiting for me.

Richard

Is he?

Bertha

[shaking her head] Yes, dear, I want to love you over again. I want to forget you *[kissing him]*. Love me, Dick. Forget me and love me.

Richard

Have you forgotten me for him?

Bertha

No. I remember you. You have a different way of giving (page 71) yourself to a woman—a more beautiful was than he has [*she smooths back his hair*]. Dick, never (remember/embrace) her the way men do.

Richard

Her? Who?

Bertha

Beatrice. Never do. Let her remember you always as I can see you now.

Richard

And if she does will you not envy her?

Bertha

No. I want her to remember you always and think of you. But not like others. Because she is a fine kind of person too.

Fragment 6 (page 72)

Robert

Jealousy. Not that of common men of course [*with a smile*]. That of Richard Rowan.

Richard

I (forced) myself. I gave you both your freedom. I tried to feel for you and for her, to consider you both. I had only to forbid her: and I did not. I had only to say a tender word to her of—of our own past life: and I did not. I left you both free.

Robert

For our sakes?

Richard

For my own sake, do you think?

Robert

Would you have left us free then—nine years ago?

Richard

You met her often then with me and without me.

Robert

Would you have allowed us the same freedom then? Answer me that.

Richard

If she has desired you then I should have left her to you. She did not.

(page 73)

Robert

[quietly] No, she did not. If she has you would not have left her to me. At least that is not exactly the way to put it.

Richard

[simply] No?

Robert

She would not have been yours to leave, but mine—then? Am I right?

Richard

[turns towards him] Yes.

Robert

[waves his hand] That is past. But look you, knowing that she was yours then, would you then have chosen the freedom you lose now—for our sake?

Richard

Then no.

Robert

[bends across the table] Then no. because then only one woman was in your heart. That is why.

Richard

You think that now...?

Robert

Yes, I do think it.

(page 74)

Richard

Has Bertha told you?

Robert

I saw it without being told. I know you and I know *[he points with his thumb over his shoulder]* my (interesting) is somewhat melancholy cousin.

[He leans back in his chair, smiling. Richard rises slowly and walks to and fro, his hand at his back.]

Fragment 7

Robert

[after a long silence] Appearances are against me.

Richard

You mean I judge by them?

Robert

I mean you cannot enter into my mind. It is I who have won freedom for myself.

Richard

Speak out your mind. What freedom?

Robert

I will. Of us two it is I who am free. I have (never) really believed, not even as a boy. I have never wept, as you did, for my sins. I do not know what sin is. I have never believed in truth of man or woman. I have never been true to myself. To what or to whom sin is all chance and (change) I have freed myself within and without. I care nothing for humans in legal bonds or laws of moral prejudice. I do not even come to make my life fit my ideas. I live by what I disbelieve in. I do not even feel this excitement of revolt against it. And that is my greater (page 76) freedom. It is you, Richard, with all your talent who are still the slave.

Richard

[shaken but calm] How well I know the tempter's voice!

Robert

The voice of reality. She was not free even last night. The shadow of her fear of you was over her. You have not healed your soul. You have wounded it—a deep wound of doubt which neither her word nor mine can heal completely.

Richard

Is it not at least as noble to fight on in doubt or in fault?

Robert

It may be nobler. I still admire the noble friend in you and love him all the more since I see that he who is the victim of a delusion.

Richard

Delusion! Because I believe in myself—and in her?

(page 77)

Robert

Because, Richard, I see that your type is (mad/not), or you wish to believe, the type of humanity which will come after us.

Richard

But you are that type—is that your delusion?

Robert

I am not—wholly.

Richard

Who then?

Robert

Perhaps—your son. Your ---less, lawless, fearless son.

Richard

[*slowly*] Archie!...and you?

Robert

I am his godfather. [*He takes his hat from the table.*]

Richard

[*repeats*] Perhaps.

Robert

I said perhaps because he is yours. I could say almost surely if...

Richard

If...?

Robert

[*with a smile*] If he were mine.

Fragment 8 (page 78)

Bertha

[*putting an arm about his waist*] I have been true to you, Dick, have I not?

Richard

[*smiling*] You know that best yourself.

Bertha

[*averting her eyes*] I have been. Very true, I gave you myself. You took me and you left me.

Richard

Left you!

Bertha

You left me: and I waited for you to come back to me.

Richard

[*disturbed*] Yes, I know what you mean.

Bertha

O, Dick, those long evenings in Rome, what I went through! Do you remember the---on the tops of the house where we lived?

Richard

Yes.

Bertha

I used to sit there, waiting, with the poor child playing with his toys, waiting until he got sleepy. I could see all over the city, the sun setting and right under me the River, the Tevere, what is it called in English? I forget.

(page 79)

Richard

The Tiber.

Bertha

Yes. It was lovely, Dick, only for I was so sad. I was alone, forgotten by you and by all. You had grown tired of me because I was too simple and uneducated for a person like you. I thought my life was over and yours too.

Richard

It had not begun.

Bertha

And I used to look at the sky, so beautiful, without a cloud and at the city you said was so old. It was all something high and beautiful. But it made me cry.

Richard

Why, dear?

Bertha

Because I was so uneducated. I knew nothing about all these things. I still I was moved by them.

Fragment 9 (page 80)

Richard

I suffered too.

Bertha

But not like I did, Dick.

Richard

Yes. I know what you felt. That I was living to smother the finer part of myself and only what was loss to you.

Bertha

I could not bear that. I tried to understand everything in your strange character, but that no.

Richard

It was said in your eyes, a vague fear, the fear of life. I head it in your voice, your wonder. You were asking yourself what was this thing in life, in love itself; and you were praying almost in your heart that it might not come, even that life or love might die before it came.

Bertha

[pointing to her breast] In there, dear. In my heart I felt something breaking. That you saw in my eyes.

Richard

[seizing her hands, kisses her (page 81) passionately] O, how I loved you then! My little bride in exile!

Bertha

Am I useful to you in your life, dear, in something?

Richard

[laughing, shakes his head] No quite useless!

Bertha

Ah, tell me! I want to know.

Fragment 10 (page 82)

Bertha

When you said goodnight to me I know by your voice you wanted to be alone. I felt so sad then, Richard. Your lips when you kissed me were so soft and cold. I could not speak to you as if the world was between us and when I was in bed, alone in the room, in the silence and sad little lamp burning on the washstand I thought of my girlhood.

Richard

[tenderly] Tell me more, dearest.

Bertha

I thought I was in the room I used to sleep in when I was a girl, that I had never been in a man's arms, that I was still innocent and yours. I was innocent when I met you first, Richard, was I not?

Richard

[touching her sleeve with his lips] Always. Always.

Bertha

I thought I was in that room and I could see it, the little oil lamp burning quietly near my bed and on the wall I could see the picture of Robert Emmet that used to (page 83) be on the wall. You know? In the green uniform, with his hat off, with Dan Kearns. Then...

Richard

Then?

Bertha

Then I thought of Robert. I felt you were gone away and would never come back to me. I felt that you were not thinking of me but of her and perhaps he was. I felt lonely for someone.

Richard

How did you think of him?

Bertha

His name, his eyes, and how his voice it when he says my name. I was glad to think that he sleeps alone: and I said his name to myself softly thinking perhaps he might hear me somehow.

Richard

[walks to and fro a little in silence, then standing near her] Bertha!

Bertha

What?

Richard

Did you feel then that you (page 84) were beginning to love him? Tell me the truth.

Bertha

[simply] No. I loved you.

Richard

Even then?

Bertha

I felt I had lost you. I could not understand why. It was useless to think what it meant.

You were lost for me.

Fragment 11 (page 85)

Richard

What you wished has taken place and what I wished. In this case when events were in our power we cannot blame them.