Questions of identity are central to Joyce’s artistic engagement with Ireland.¹ His identification with his native country and simultaneous resistance to her corrupted myths prompted him to probe the Irish psyche, stripping naive nationalist assumptions and simplistic religious ideologies of their prescribed authenticity while laying bare the multiple cultural, religious, and historical identities of the Irish people.² These complexities of character are not only mirrored by the complexities of Joyce’s construction of Irishness in his work but also by the intricate ways in which he sets them off against another referent acting as a foil to an embattled nationhood—Jewishness. His choice is determined by the many convergences between Irish and Jewish identities. For example, Irishness, like Jewishness, is commonly the subject of an ideological discourse in which identity is fixed by multiple relationships between internal and external forces. There is no unequivocal answer to the question of what it means to be Irish, and the same is true of being Jewish.³ Critics have seized upon the perceived unfixed nature of Jewishness as a significant artistic method by which Joyce is able to manipulate questions of character, selfhood, and identity in his writing. During the last two decades, Joyce studies have generated several authoritative accounts of the
representation and construction of Jewishness in *Ulysses*, and they generally emphasize the parallels between Joyce’s own fractured cultural identity and that of Jews reflected through ambiguous and inconsistent prejudice in Europe at the turn of the century. Yet *Ulysses* is widely regarded as the seminal text for this line of inquiry, I propose that Joyce’s earlier works are unduly overlooked as part of the argument. One reason for this neglect is the paucity of identifiable evidence in *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Only a handful of allusions to Jews or Jewishness can be found in both texts, not enough, perhaps, to form the basis of a sustainable theory. One story in *Dubliners*, however, deserves closer inspection since it reveals a complexity of engagement between Irishness and Jewishness similar to that in *Ulysses*, especially when seen in dialogue with the typically ambivalent Joycean perspective on Ireland. As Joyce highlights Irish ambivalence towards Jews, he simultaneously reveals his own ambiguous reaction to Ireland by availing himself of Jewishness as the emblematic figure of “otherness.”

“Grace” was originally conceived as the final story of *Dubliners* (*LettersII* 124) and thus presents the climax of Joyce’s moral history of his community (*LettersI* 62-63) to which “The Dead” acts as the denouement. “Grace” also provides the most direct link to *Ulysses* with characters from the story reappearing in the novel’s “Hades” episode. The tale is constructed from the weft and warp of meanings that, once unraveled, disclose the familiar topical strands of fatuous religious observance, social snobbery, and corrupt politics informing Joyce’s exploration of Dublin as the “centre of
paralysis” (LettersII 134). It describes a few days in the life of Tom Kernan, tea-taster, apostate, and Dublin character, whose social decline is illustrated by his compromised position with which the story opens. Yet hardly any critic has pondered how Kernan came to be in the pitiful state in which he is found, even though the narrative begins in the middle of a sequence of events that started the previous Friday. Only Scott W. Klein, who is indebted to Margot Norris’s gender-based examination of Joyce’s narratives, provides an angle that accounts for Kernan’s deplorable situation and explains the ubiquitous references to credit rewarded and sums unpaid in “Grace” in his essay, “Strongarming ‘Grace.’” Based on Kernan’s reticence to recount the story of his accident, Klein develops a compelling second story in which Kernan was intercepted by a loan shark and shaken down for the money owed. This “strongarming” reveals a credible picture of Irish economic relations frequently based on extortion and usury. In the depiction of what he knew from personal experience was endemic among his father’s family and friends, Joyce composes a multilayered narrative of loyalties and obligations at the center of which is the ambivalent figure of a “Jew” or, rather, that of a Jewish stereotype. Klein and Norris both deduce from Kernan’s tight-lipped remarks about his drinking companions that his nemesis is no other than Mr. Harford, the “Irish Jew” (D 159). What started as an amusing story of Dublin pub life suddenly becomes much more sinister.

Even though Harford, who, as Robert Boyle first observed in 1965, may have been modeled on Reuben J. Dodd, is not actually Jewish (neither was Dodd), he becomes the butt of anti-Jewish
insults because of his profession. The tension between the uncertainty of identity and the readiness to resort to racial stereotypes that turns “Grace” into an important contribution to the study of Irishness and Jewishness and a foundation for analysis of the interplay between these discourses in Joyce’s critique of Irish cultural nationalism. It is a credible source for an initial exploration of what was later to become a staple line of inquiry regarding questions of belonging that Joyce connected with the constructed identity of an “Irish Jew.”

***

Central to this exploration is the equivocal nature of what is meant by the term “the Jew.” Bryan Cheyette emphasizes that Joyce finds in this perceived ambiguity a fertile ground for his own specific interpretation of what “the Jew” actually connotes. Rather than modeling them on actual people, Joyce freely constructs his Jewish characters from selected stereotypes or, more often than not, as Ira Nadel notes (49-50), in opposition to the common anti-Semitic slander of his time. Furthermore, the composition of “Grace” is contemporary with an event that must have added to Joyce’s developing exploration of the connections between Irish ethnicity and anti-Semitic prejudice: the so-called Limerick boycott. On 11 January 1904, the Redemptorist Father John Creagh preached a sermon against the alleged usurious business practices of the Jewish traders in Limerick that included a veritable litany of common anti-Semitic slurs. He called for a boycott of the “foreign” traders in support of native shopkeepers that continued for two years and resulted in the eventual dissolution of the Limerick Jewish
congregation. The course of the boycott, which was widely discussed in the nationalist press, was a momentous episode in which Joyce’s countrymen betrayed all those characteristics which he deplored: hypocrisy, narrow-mindedness, and injustice. Joyce was thus poised in 1905 and 1906 to explore the ambiguities of what Neil Davison calls the “Irish uses of anti-Jewish myths” in his writing from that moment (103).

Whereas David Ben Gurion’s apocryphal statement, “everyone is a Jew who says he is,” is based on self-image as an important aspect of Jewish identity, but Joyce approaches this issue from a diametrically opposed position in his writing. He presents characters who have to overcome the sense of self assigned to them by others. Through what Cheyette calls his “haphazard designation of the word ‘Jew’” (43), Joyce explores reductive Jewish stereotypes in the form of a literary contrivance, a character who is typecast for exhibiting alleged “Jewish traits.” In this sense, everyone is a Jew who is perceived as one. These characters are, in Marilyn Reizbaum’s term, “Jew-ish” (13). In “Grace,” Joyce employs one such “Jew-ish” character, Harford, who is intended to challenge, in particular, two aspects of Irish identity foregrounded in the story: the “good Catholic” and the “Irish patriot.” In both instances, the text reveals how common anti-Semitic stereotypes can be thrown back into the faces of the accusers. Thus, Joyce exposes not the “Jew” as the enemy of the Irish people, as Creagh insinuated, but the vacuous Catholic priest and the duplicitous Nationalist.

Len Platt argues that Joyce represents race consciousness in daily social and cultural life through gossip and idle chatter (4).
Hence, when Kernan reveals Harford as one of his drinking companions to the friends in his sickroom, Joyce exposes the "moral intention" of Martin Cunningham's monosyllabic censure of this piece of information by cataloguing the Irish anti-Semitic stereotypes in one compact paragraph and leaves them to be discerned by the reader (D 159). First, Harford works with a "very fat short gentleman," a Mr. Goldberg, who is a standard caricature of a capitalist, thus revealing the prejudices against him as prejudice-by-association (D 159). Furthermore, the syllogism in operation here—"Harford is a moneylender; All moneylenders are Jews; Harford is a Jew"—is based on an incorrect universal premise, since not all moneylenders are Jews. In fact, the Irish created a word specifically for a native usurer and moneylender, the gombeen man, which indicates how much Irish social and economic relations relied on unofficial systems of credit and money-lending. As R. F. Foster points out, personal interest, corruption, and fraud habitually halted any improvement of the Irish economy. Jewish shopkeepers like those in Limerick were thus pressed into a mold initially created for an Irish stereotype. Therefore, it is Fogarty, the benevolent grocer, not Harford, who tries to overcome bankruptcy by using alleged "Jewish" business practices as put forward by Creagh, such as ingratiating himself with his female customers.

The ironic application of the term "Jewish ethical code" (D 159)—commonly understood by anti-Semites to mean deceit, ruinous usury, and malice—transforms it into a straightforward anti-Semitic stereotype. Similar sardonic force is applied in the formulation "divine disapproval of usury" (D 159). Catholic doctrine implicitly
underscores the stereotype of the “usurious Jew,” because Jews were historically exempt from canonical condemnation of lending money at interest. In fact, God’s condemnation of the sins of Jerusalem, one of which was usury, is not supported by an absolute disapproval of levying interest on loans. The laws of human relations merely state, “Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother (but) unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury” (Deut. 23:19-20). Old and New Testament texts naturally magnify the virtue of charity over lending, but the Catholic Church recognized that it could not legislate against budding money economies and allowed the taking of interest also for Christians. They joined the Jews to whom immunity had been granted by the Church earlier, thereby rendering useless the specialized charge of usury against Jews.

Anti-Semitic indictments against the “usurious Jew,” therefore, reveal the nature of prejudice, which is based on individual anxiety and social psychology. What fanned the hatred of anti-Semites against Jewish moneylenders in the first place is the fact that lending money at interest gives the creditor power over his vulnerable debtors. These power relations between two parties are especially awkward if the debtor believes himself or herself in some way morally and culturally superior to the creditor, a fact Creagh insisted on in his sermon (36). The resentment against the immigrants who seemed to rise so quickly from penurious peddlers to prosperous moneylenders was thus rooted in a moral indignation that merely masked economic jealousy. Cormac Ó Gráda believes that Kernan’s decline can accordingly be seen in relation to this aspect of Jewish upward social mobility (History 78-83). Usury was also
chiefly attributed to Jews because of their allegedly inferior moral nature. The perceived immorality of Jews can be punished, as is shown by Joyce’s reference to Harford’s “idiot son” (D 159), putting this reference to mental illness within the realm of modern pseudoscientific degeneration theories. These stipulate that increased suicidal tendencies, practices of incest, hysteria, and neurasthenia are endemic in the Jewish race and hinder the begetting of healthy offspring. In particular, Robert Byrnes’s study of the “Circe” episode in Ulysses pinpoints Joyce’s satiric engagement with these degeneration models, though Richard Ellmann shows that Joyce’s reading list already betrays knowledge of some of these texts by the time he was writing “Grace” (JJI 477).

At first glance, then, the “Harford episode” gives the impression of Harford as a typical “shyster” who got his pound of flesh in the form of Kernan’s minute piece of tongue, which was bitten off during his fall down the lavatory steps. Yet Joyce exploits this conceit in the story for his critique of a fabricated Irishness. The action is carried into the final scene in which we encounter Harford in person. Here he performs the role of archetypal outsider and scapegoat, who sits apart in Church and is blamed, at least indirectly, for Kernan’s fall from grace. The scenes in which Harford appears as a stereotypical “Jew” do not, however, conclude Joyce’s engagement with the way in which anti-Semitic prejudice creates a racial “Other” against which the Irish attempt to define themselves. I argue that “Grace” in its entirety discloses the way the Jewish stereotype acts as a foil for Joyce’s primary targets, the “subtleties of Catholic thought and Irish politics” (JJI 528).
The critique he levels against the pillars of Irish identity—the priest and the patriot—is made even more poignant by the fact that Harford is not actually a Jew. This precludes any attempt to rationalize anti-Semitic prejudice.

***

Brewster Ghiselin was one of the first critics to put the subversion of the holy sacraments and Church doctrine by secular elements at the center of his examination of “Grace.”26 Evidence of this can be found in Joyce’s use of a vocabulary having both religious and secular meanings, while the title “Grace” itself typifies this technique on which Joyce’s story hinges.27 Sanctifying grace has been profaned and is used only in its trivial manifestations. Kernan, for instance, puts great importance on his attire: “He had never been seen in the city without a silk hat of some decency and a pair of gaiters. By grace of these two articles of clothing, he said, a man could always pass muster” (D 154). His reliance on outward appearance is an indication of an irreligious understanding of “grace,” highlighted by Joyce through Kernan’s battered silk hat and filthy clothes after his “fall.” The secularization of erstwhile religious concepts is, according to Corinna del Greco Lobner, due to equivocation, and she points out that the univocal expression of theological truths through language became impossible as a result of the fall.28 Wolfgang Wicht elaborates on her idea and describes grace as a signifier that has lost a distinct signified meaning.29 Both critics note that this ambiguity makes religious discourse unreliable.
The unreliability of doctrine, in itself an elaborate attack by Joyce on the Catholic Church, is further explored though depictions of the corruptibility of spiritual values by material possessions. Whereas Irishness commonly presents itself as a particularly spiritual identity, materialism of spirit is, in turn, a charge commonly leveled against the Jewish faith by anti-Semites. Nevertheless, it is Kernan who feels at home among the Irish pawnbrokers, moneylenders, and other commercial figures at the retreat for businessmen, not least because he and his friends are in chronic and mysterious debt. They all depend on the period of grace afforded to them by their creditors to hold up a semblance of sham gentility. In contrast, Harford’s presence illustrates how this materialism is projected away from its original Irish source onto the constructed identity of an “Irish Jew.” Joyce shows how sanctifying grace has become a trade-off between the Catholic Church and its congregation, while the humanist approach to grace and original sin, founded in Jewish tradition, is censured by Christian prejudice through isolating the alleged instigator of profligacy. “‘Grace,’” Cheryl Herr declares, is an indictment “of the financial enterprise of the Church and its accommodation of theology to secular demands.” This indictment is made even more evident through its link with anti-Semitic condemnation. Accordingly, Joyce’s dispute with a supposedly spiritual Catholicism expresses itself directly through simony, the “exchange of spiritual for temporal things.” Whereas usury is a vice routinely, though wrongly, reserved for Jews, simony is a sin strictly reserved for the clergy. Father Purdon is a simoniacal priest, and the secular violation of
ecclesiastical law among a congregation of Irish moneylenders and pawnbrokers indicts the whole cast of the story in the economic “strongarming” which, at the beginning, was reserved solely for Harford, the “Irish Jew.” A fraudulent and corrupt Church is, however, merely one indication of widespread social and political complaints in Ireland. As Warren Beck illustrates, a further aspect to consider in “Grace” is the corruption of national pride and history by an “insular chauvinism.”

Here the argument is that Irish pride in Dubliners decisively fails to manifest itself in positive terms but is instead represented as a harassment of those who are perceived as being “outside the pale” of Irish patriotism.

In Ireland, national identity was built along sectarian lines, each side claiming to represent true Irishness. According to Foster, the validity of an Irish Protestantism put forward by the Dublin University Magazine vies with Catholicism as a mark of native identity (306, 340). He historian like Foster declares that Catholic emancipation in 1829 “laid the foundation of politics as interpreted in terms of confessional identification. The priest had arrived in politics” (316). This is illustrated by Pope Leo XIII, who is lauded in “Grace” as “one of the lights of his age” (D 167). He urged all Catholics to “give their attention to nationalist politics” in chapter 44 of his encyclical Immortale Die of 1885. Foster further outlines the way nationalist institutions like the Gaelic League thrived on sentiments that “patriotism was Gaelicist and spiritually Catholic” (453). In 1901, the chauvinistic journalist D. P. Moran stated even more clearly that “the Irish nation is de facto a Catholic nation,” yet the link between patriotism and denomination
is, according to Joyce, fatuous. After all, as Keogh observes, Creagh justified his sermon on grounds of his patriotism (36). Joyce, therefore, satirizes the vainglorious and pompous Catholic clergy as representatives of an essentializing and nationalistic Irishness. His bungling conversationalists eulogize the Jesuits, Father Tom Burke, and Archbishop John MacHale for their patriotism but denigrate the Protestant Grays, even though Sir John Gray was an acknowledged Irish patriot. Kernan is of Protestant stock and “fond, moreover, of giving side-thrusts at Catholicism,” even though he cannot remember the “Protestant theology on some thorny points” (D 157, 168). Similarly, most of the discussants in his bedroom fall short of an informed judgment on topics of Church history. Even though Kernan and his friends parade their creed as a sign of their Irish partisanship, they already suffer from the “conflation of identity,” in Platt’s words, that becomes a trademark of Joyce’s writing (113).

In the same way, many of the characters at the retreat who presumably call themselves good Catholics and Irish patriots are, in fact, symbols of political corruption, nepotism, and fraud. Foster, who similarly evokes the image of a Dublin bogged down in fraud, corruption, and “[c]orporation jobbery,” attests to Joyce’s accurate depiction of the duplicitous nature of Irish politics evident in the backgrounds of all of Kernan’s friends (437). Jack Power works for the Royal Irish Constabulary and is, therefore, in a position to rescue Kernan from a charge of public drunkenness. Yet the Royal Irish Constabulary was a paramilitary force between 1822 and 1922 that ran an intelligence operation to secure British
interests in Ireland and avoid insurrection. Martin Cunningham, who also works at the Dublin Castle, is known to have access to “secret sources of information” (D 159), an indication for Mark Osteen that he is likely to resort to blackmail (81). M’Coy used to work as an advertising canvasser for the Irish Times, the main Unionist newspaper in Ireland, as well as for the pro-Home-Rule paper, the Freeman’s Journal (D 158). This group thus represents an implausible Irish patriotism imbued with split loyalties. With Irish identity a matter of sectarian religion and duplicitous politics, it comes as no surprise that an “Other” is needed to divert accusations of unpatriotic behavior. Thus, Jews were routinely excluded—and stigmatized as disloyal and hostile to the Irish cause, and the figure of the “Irish Jew” was dismissed as a paradox and thus excluded. The perceived separatism of the Jewish immigrant community was put forward as evidence that, while they established networks to help their own, they did not expend their “social capital” on gentiles. This separateness also shows itself in the unsociable abstemiousness of the Jews through which they alienate themselves from the community. Kernan’s “frequent intemperance” is thus “part of the climate” (D 156), whereas Harford acts out the ambivalence inherent in being an “Irish Jew” by going on drinking binges. His oxymoronic appellation is therefore an ironic comment on the false friendships exposed in the other characters.

Another aspect of a typically changeable Irish identity is portrayed in the difference between the country and the city. Irish nationalists often invoked romantic connections with rural life, the mythical West of Joyce’s final paragraphs in “The Dead.” In
contrast, Ó Gráda notes, Jews were perceived as predominantly urban and had settled accordingly in the three largest urban centers in Ireland: Dublin, Belfast, and Cork (History 11-12). Yet Joyce’s Dubliners are utterly urban. What is more, Cunningham’s derision of provincial constables rouses Kernan to heights of political impropriety: “—Is this what we pay rates for? he asked. To feed and clothe these ignorant bostoons . . . and they’re nothing else” (D 160). Kernan’s ellipsis demonstrates his indignation, which he is later able to voice: “—These yahoos coming up here, he said, think they can boss the people. I needn’t tell you, Martin, what kind of men they are” (D 161). This is the language frequently employed by anti-Semites against Jewish immigrants. As the configuration of an Irish identity changed through increased urbanization, political resurgence, and economic developments, so the configuration of its racial opposite changed with it, often undermining the composition of the original plain identity that was intended to function as an easy reference point. Because “the Jew” turned out to be such an unstable referent, it could be employed whichever way suited best.

Hence, at the core of the relationship between the Irish and the Jews also lie instances of correspondence and identification, which inform the idea of the “Irish Jew” in a positive way. Andrew Gibson points out how much the “Irish question,” tied as it was to specific concepts of race, religion, and culture, is counterbalanced by the “Jewish question”; he notes that it is remarkable how closely Protestant rhetoric identifies the Jewish with the Protestant cause and how simultaneously a long tradition of nationalist identification of the persecuted Jews with the persecuted Irish has
been in existence. As Louis Hyman observes, Irish nationalist leaders, from Theobald Wolfe Tone to Michael Davitt and John Redmond, utilized familiar tropes associating the Irish with the “chosen race” (114-16). He further notes that Irish struggles for emancipation, the fight against foreign oppression, and the dream of national self-determination were voiced in Biblical language, culminating in the theme of Exodus and in the image of Charles Stewart Parnell as the lawgiver and leader Moses as noted by Hyman (179). Such political rhetoric was rooted in so-called philological and scientific evidence from previous centuries, which emphasized the close link between the Irish and the Jews. The Milesians, the legendary founders of the Irish nation, were, for example, identified as a lost tribe of Israel in Geoffrey Keating’s History of Ireland. In 1773, Charles Vallancey wrote a study on the Semitic origin of Gaelic, which, Nadel observes, became influential in the late nineteenth century (49). Joyce subscribed to a similar sentiment in his 1907 lecture “Ireland, Island of Saint and Sages,” believing that Jewish and Irish destinies were irrevocably linked. Yet he also held a different concept of nationality that “must find its reason for being rooted in something that surpasses and transcends and informs changing things like blood and the human word” (CW 166). “Grace” exposes the Irish as a people whose identity is subsumed by anti-Semitic rhetoric, while they simultaneously borrow their mythology from the Jews. In the story, Joyce illustrates his opinion that “[n]ations have their ego, just like individuals” (CW 154), since the individual egotism and prejudice of
the characters are put in the context of their falsely patriotic civic pride and religion by the figure of the “Irish Jew.”

The Limerick boycott provides an excellent case study for the specific proclivities of Irish anti-Semitism in the context of economic decline, religious ideology, and national identity, thus presenting an inexcusable act of scapegoating on which Joyce could not fail to comment, according to Brian Schaffer (89). Even though “Grace” is not a direct comment on the Limerick incident, it clearly shows Joyce’s engagement with the irrational and dubious idea of an Irish race opposed to a Jewish one. He reveals the way common prejudices presented in Creagh’s sermon and replicated in “Grace” are used to conceal the advancing materialism of the Catholic Church, the deceitful nature of Irish nationalism, and the sorry state of the Irish economy. Ironically, Jews were frequently accused of the first, blamed for the second, and held responsible for the last.

The realism of Dubliners in opposition to what Platt calls “commonplace Celticist representations of the Irish identity,” which Joyce regarded as “deeply retrospective and politically reactionary,” is commonly emphasized (177, 178). Yet it has not been made explicit that this exposure of the corrupted myths of Irish spirituality and patriotism is revealed through the paradoxical figure of the “Irish Jew,” Harford, whose identity masks the failings of a community in flux. He does not merely represent not only a crude criticism of anti-Semitism but adds a subtle dimension to Joyce’s exploration of Dublin’s tattered moral makeup, which is carried over to his more substantial works. Anticipating its
companion piece, the “Cyclops” episode in Ulysses, “Grace” features a “parodic interpolator” who exposes the myth of “an archaic Ireland of prosperity, plenty, chivalry, hospitality” through a voice here that is still recognizably Joyce’s own. It should not detract from this interpretation that the Jewish community Joyce went on to describe is more imaginary than factual and that his “Jew” is an unlikely Israelite. I argue that verisimilitude is not a matter of factual correspondence in literary writing. Instead, the evidence of Harford points towards matters of identity that go beyond historical truth. The designation of Harford as an “Irish Jew” in “Grace” is thus a preliminary step towards Joyce’s modernist attempt to undermine the unified self and stable identity based on race, religion, and affiliation.
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21 Ó Gráda states that functioning social networks advancing interest-free credit gave newly arrived Jews the advantage over the natives (History, p. 53). He also stresses the fact that many Jews condemned usurious practices. See Joseph Edelstein’s The Moneylender (Dublin: Dollard, 1908), p. 67.

22 Psychological and medical studies, such as Otto Weininger’s Sex and Character (London: W. Heinemann, 1906), and Richard von Krafft–Ebing’s Psychopathia Sexualis: Mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung der Conträren Sexualiempfindung (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1892), were augmented by social studies, for example, by Cesare Lombroso and Max Simon Nordau.

See Reizbaum (p. 48). It is believed that the word “shyste” is a derivative of Shylock. In William Shakespeare’s play, Gratiano calls Shylock a “currish spirit” whose “desires/Are wolfish, bloody, starv’d, and ravenous”—Shakespeare, Merchant of Venice, The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), IV.1.133, 137-38).

“In a whisper Mr Cunningham drew Mr Kernan’s attention to Mr Harford, the moneylender, who sat some distance off” (D 172).


Grace and its connection with original sin were not only of personal interest to Joyce—see Stanislaus Joyce, My Brother’s Keeper, ed. Richard Ellmann (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), p. 224—but the term “grace” itself presented him with a mine of semantic variations into which he could delve in order to construct the complex networks of meaning on which his narratives are typically based. “Grace” has, first of all, a scriptural meaning, which then extends over financial, aesthetic, social, and legal semantic fields.


Consider the Celtic Twilight movement. Platt points out that Celtic spirituality is seen in opposition to the aggressive English Protestant material ethic (p. 43).

See, for instance, Exod. 34:6. The Psalms abound in expressions of hope for and confidence in divine grace. Such grace is found in conjunction with righteousness (Ps. 116:5), mercy (Ps. 103:8), and compassion (Ps. 111:4). See online <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/> (accessed 27 July 2010).


Pope Leo XIII, Immortale Die (01 November, 1885), Chap. 44. See online <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei_en.html> (accessed 22 August 2010). He also perpetuated the doctrine that Jews are eternally damned and unredeemable—see Davison (p. 18).


In “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages,” Joyce argues against such reductionism: “to deny the name of patriot to all those who are not of Irish stock would be to deny it to almost all the heroes of the modern movement” (CW 162).

Fanning is a registration agent who would have elected the councilor of the ward, while Dan Hosan’s nephew illustrates the practice of nepotism, and Hendrick, the journalist, is a representative of a craft that customarily subordinates honesty to personal gain.


In “The Shade of Parnell” and “Fenianism: The Last Fenian,” Joyce expands on his belief in the theme of Irish betrayal that pervades Irish history: “in Ireland, just at the right moment, an informer always appears” (*CW* 190).

Edward Raphael Lipsett (whose pen name was Halitvack) wrote in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 21 December 1906, p. 29 that the term “Irish Jew” is contradictory: “the two elements can never merge into one”—quoted in Louis Hyman, *The Jews of Ireland: from Earliest Times to the Year 1910* (Shannon: Irish Univ. Press, 1972), p. 176. Further references to the Hyman work will be cited parenthetically in the text.


See Daniel Fogel, “James Joyce, the Jews, and *Ulysses*,” *JJQ*, 16 (Summer 1979), 500; Fogel refers to Maurice Fishberg’s *The Jews: A Study of Race and Environment* (London: Walter Scott, 1911) as a source for Joyce’s portrayal of Bloom as a moderate drinker. Because of the textual evidence in “Grace,” I suggest that Joyce was already familiar with this stereotype in 1905. Ó Gráda similarly describes Jewish abstemiousness as a common trait (*History*, p. 176).

Brian Schaffer, in “Nationalism at the Bar: Anti-Semitism in *Ulysses* and *Under the Volcano*,” *Joyce/Lowry*, ed. Patrick A. McCarthy and Paul Thiessen (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1997), p. 84, suggests that Irish anti-Semitism is “a phenomenon inextricably bound up with bogus nationalism and heavy drinking.” Torchiana similarly explores this “unholy binding of drink, bad business and perfunctory though no less devout religious observances” in “Grace” (p. 195). Further references to the Schaffer work will be cited parenthetically in the text.


Joyce’s knowledge of Jewish history was closely entangled with the kind of Irish political mythology that eulogized Charles Stewart Parnell as a Moses-figure, an image he had absorbed in early childhood from his father and again encountered while at university in 1901 when he heard John F. Taylor gave a speech in defense of the Irish language (*JJI* 94–95). Joyce himself added to its replication in an essay written for *Il Piccolo della Sera* in 1912, “The Shade of Parnell”: “[Parnell], like another Moses, led a turbulent and unstable people from the house of shame to the verge of the Promised Land” (*CW* 225).

genealogical study is John O’Hart’s *Irish Pedigrees: or the Origin and Stem of the Irish Nation* (Dublin: McGlashan & Gill, 1876).


51 See Norris, “Fact, Fiction, and Anti-Semitism in the ‘Cyclops’ Episode of Joyce’s *Ulysses*,” *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 36 (Summer 2006), 187. I regard “Cyclops” as a companion piece to “Grace” because both are episodes in which drink, patriotism, and religion form an unholy bond against a “Jew.” Martin Cunningham and Jack Power also appear, and Cunningham gives a mock-blessing reminiscent of Father Purdon.

52 Ó Gráda, in particular, castigates Joyce for portraying a Jewish community that more likely existed in Trieste than Dublin (“Jerusalem,” p. 22). Furthermore, he writes, “Joyce’s portrait of Dublin Jewry was blighted by his own ignorance of these people” (*History*, p. 204).