

The Four Riders in the Funeral Carriage: Three Irelands and Bloom in Joyce's "Hades"*

Hye Ryoung Kil

I. Introduction

The Hades episode in Joyce's *Ulysses* presents a unique close-up of certain Dubliners. The funeral ride from Sandymount to Glasnevin cemetery, covering nearly half of the episode, gives an intimate glimpse into the atmosphere of the British-Irish community in the early twentieth century. Notably, three of the four passengers in the funeral carriage, Martin Cunningham, Jack Power, and Simon Dedalus, could symbolize the three intertwined yet conflicting faces of Ireland under British rule: Catholic Ireland, British Ireland, and nationalist Ireland, respectively. The fourth and last passenger, Leopold Bloom, a Jew of Hungarian descent, suggests a new Ireland with a progressive, inclusive vision.

The socio-political landscape of colonial Ireland is marked by internal

* This work was supported by the 2022 Yeungnam University Research Grant.

strife, a sentiment echoed by Stephen Dedalus when he describes himself as “a servant of two masters . . . an English and an Italian . . . and a third” in the very first episode of the book (*U* 1.638-41). The “third” master that Stephen alludes to as “a crazy queen, old and jealous”—who demands, “Kneel down before me,” and who “wants [him] for odd jobs” (1.640-41)—symbolizes nationalist Ireland. The iconic image of Ireland as a “poor old woman” (1.403) or “Old Gummy Granny” (15.4578), relying on the help of Irish youth, was popularized through the Irish Literary Revival, the cultural nationalist movement, notably via W. B. Yeats’s play *Cathleen Ni Houlihan*, which premiered in 1902 (Gifford and Seidman 21). The nationalist Ireland was in conflict with Catholic as well as British Irelands in Joyce’s time. The nationalist leader Charles S. Parnell, an advocate for Irish Home Rule, allied with the British Liberal leader William Gladstone in the 1880s. However, Gladstone eventually severed ties with Parnell and abandoned the home rule bill after Parnell’s affair with Katharine O’Shea was publicly denounced by the Catholic Church. Although the affair had long been acknowledged by Katharine’s estranged husband, Captain William O’Shea, who was already separated from her when she met Parnell in 1880, the Catholic Church seized the opportunity to condemn the Protestant leader. Joyce observes in “Home Rule Comes of Age” that “Gladstone . . . completed the moral assassination of Parnell with the help of the Irish bishops” (*CW* 193), who had always been wary of Parnell’s Protestant background. Thus, the funeral carriage, bearing its four symbolic passengers, epitomizes the confusion and hopelessness of colonial Ireland, seemingly descending into Hades in the first decade of the twentieth century.

This essay will delve into the interrelations of the three characters who symbolize the three respective Irelands. Their interactions will be analyzed to shed light on the symbolic downward trajectory Joyce paints for colonial

Ireland. Furthermore, the essay will explore their reactions to Bloom—the fourth passenger and son of a Hungarian-Jewish immigrant—and examine the new direction he signifies for colonial Ireland.

II. Martin Cunningham and Jack Power: Catholic Ireland and British Ireland

It seems obvious that Martin Cunningham, the first to enter the funeral carriage departing from Paddy Dignam's in Sandymount, represents Catholic Ireland, the most dominant of the three Irelands, as Joyce criticizes in "The Home Rule Comet": "For seven centuries she [Ireland] has never been a faithful subject of England. Neither, on the other hand, has she been faithful to herself. . . . She has served only one master well, the Roman Catholic Church" (*CW* 212-13). Cunningham seems to be a very influential figure in Catholic Dublin. He is the one who can help the poor children Dignam has left behind by "trying to get the youngster into Artane" or "one of the girls into Todd's" (*U* 6.537, 539). He is also "going to get up a whip for the youngsters," saying that "the youngsters will be all right" (6.564; 10.956). Cunningham "knows" Father Conmee, so he writes to the priest on behalf of the Dignam children (5.331, 10.964-65). Moreover, Bloom thinks, "Martin Cunningham could work a pass for the Gaiety" (6.187-88), or "Martin Cunningham frequently said he would work a pass through Egan" (16.504-5). Thus, Cunningham is portrayed as an authoritative character in the Catholic society, particularly because he is "an elder colleague of Mr Power" working in Dublin Castle, as described in the short story "Grace" (*D* 154). "Everyone ha[s] respect" for Cunningham as "a thoroughly sensible man, influential and intelligent" (155).

Remarkably, Cunningham's authority is almost absolute in religious matters as revealed in "Grace." Tom Kernan, originally "of Protestant stock," was "converted to the Catholic faith at the time of his marriage" but has "not been in the pale of the Church for twenty years"; furthermore, he often gives "side-thrusts at Catholicism" (*D* 154). Yet Cunningham is seen as "the very man for such a case," meaning his Catholic friends turn to Cunningham to help Kernan "turn over a new leaf," as Mrs. Kernan puts it, "I leave it all in your hands, Mr Cunningham" (153, 155). Cunningham's knowledge of the Church, especially "the Jesuits," is considered "a fact" and "history" (161). Even Kernan holds "a high opinion of Mr Cunningham," who persuades him to attend a Catholic retreat by convincing him "quietly and effectively" that "[Catholicism] is *the* religion, the old, original faith" (162, 163).

It is not surprising that such an authentic Catholic as Cunningham shows a condescending attitude towards those with differing beliefs. In "Hades," while riding in the funeral carriage and spotting the Jew Reuben J Dodd on the street, Cunningham mocks the old man, saying, "Of the tribe of Reuben," prompting Power and Dedalus to join in the mockery: the former says, "In all his pristine beauty," and the latter, "The devil break the hasp of your back!" (*U* 6.251, 256). When Bloom attempts to tell a story about "Reuben J and the son," either to join in or change the topic, Cunningham tells the story himself, "thwart[ing] [Bloom's] speech rudely" (6.264-65, 277). It is true that Cunningham shows sympathy to the Jewish Bloom when the other two Catholics unwittingly talk about suicide in front of Bloom whose father committed suicide. When Power declares "the man who takes his own life" as "the greatest disgrace to have in the family," Cunningham who knows about Bloom's father "decisively" says that it is "temporary insanity" so they "must take a charitable view of it" (6.335-40). To Dedalus who says, "They say a man who does it is a coward," Cunningham decides that "it is not for us to

judge,” which makes Dedalus, who is “about to speak, clos[e] his lips again” (6.341-43). Bloom thus regards Cunningham as “sympathetic human man” (6.344). However, Cunningham ridicules Kernan who has apparently failed to enter into the fold, even after the retreat which the former successfully persuaded the latter to join in “Grace.” Although “twirling the peak of his beard gently” and “more quickly” as he mimics Kernan’s pretentious words (6.109-110, 141), which reveals that the “sympathetic human” Cunningham feels uncomfortable or ashamed of his own behavior, the faithful Catholic Cunningham manages to make fun of the failed convert. In this light, as Bloom notices, “Martin laying down the law. Martin could wind a sappyhead like that [a Dublin solicitor] round his little finger, without his seeing it” (6.1028-30), Cunningham represents the authority of Catholic Ireland. His position as a “Castle official,” as the “chief clerk for the Crown Solicitor,” though “only during office hours” (*D* 154, 158), also hints at Catholic Ireland’s affinity with British rather than nationalist Ireland.

The next to “step in [the carriage] after [Cunningham]” (*U* 6.2), Jack Power symbolizes British Ireland. Also appearing in “Grace,” Power is employed by “the Royal Irish Constabulary” (RIC) in Dublin Castle (*D* 152). Unlike the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the RIC is an “armed police under the direct control of the (British) lord lieutenant of Ireland” and is “charged with the control and suppression of Irish dissidents,” effectively maintaining “British overlordship in Ireland” (Gifford 101-2). Moreover, his father was also “a G man” (*U* 8.420), a member of the “plainclothes intelligence division of the Dublin Metropolitan Police” (Gifford and Seidman 168), or more specifically “armed plainclothes officers in the G division of DMP who [later] infiltrated IRA networks” (“Jack Power”; emphasis added). Therefore, Power undoubtedly aligns with British Ireland, supporting British colonial rule and suppressing the Irish radical nationalist movement.

Interestingly, it is narrated that “the arc of [Power’s] social rise intersected the arc of his friend’s [Kernan’s] decline” (*D* 152). The shift in social standing between Power and Kernan symbolizes the gradual societal transition between Catholics and Protestants in nineteenth-century Ireland.¹⁾ Kernan, “of Protestant stock,” is in decline but remains “esteemed” by “those friends who ha[ve] known him at his highest point of success,” embodying the diminishing Protestant Ascendancy (152). On the other hand, Power, described as “a debonair young man” and “much younger” than Kernan (152), represents the Catholics whose prestige has risen due to acts or reforms enacted after the Catholic Emancipation, resulting in the decline of the Protestant Ascendancy in British Ireland. This dynamic might explain Power’s “inexplicable debts” to Kernan, which have become “a byword in his circle,” prompting him to assist with Kernan’s “domestic quarrels, as well as many small, but opportune loans” (152). From this perspective, Power represents British Ireland that leans pro-British or Unionist Catholic.

1) The Act of Union 1800, which abolished the Irish Parliament, weakened the Protestant Ascendancy that had monopolized it since the Penal Laws of 1695 against Catholics after the Irish war with William of Orange. Then, the Catholic Emancipation Act 1829, which removed most of the restrictions imposed on Catholics, contributed to the rise of the Catholic middle class and the liberal Catholic nationalism promoted by the “liberator” Daniel O’Connell. The liberal, non-sectarian spirit of Irish nationalism, pleading for the union of Protestant and Catholic in a common struggle against British oppression, led to the foundation of the Irish National Land League in 1879. The land-reform movement effected serious weakening of the Ascendancy, mostly landowners. See Veldeman, “The Rise of Liberal Catholic Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” and McCaffrey, “Irish Nationalism and Irish Catholicism.”

III. Simon Dedalus: Nationalist Ireland

The third to enter the carriage, following Cunningham and Power, Simon Dedalus epitomizes nationalist Ireland. This segment of Ireland supported the Home Rule movement in the 1880s and has “degenerated” since the fall of Parnell.²⁾ In the famous Christmas dinner scene in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Dedalus and his friend John Casey ardently defend Parnell against the Church. The Church’s denouncement of the Home Rule leader’s affair precipitated his downfall. While an emotional Casey cries out, “sob[ing] loudly and bitterly,” “Poor Parnell! . . . My dead king!” Dedalus is also visibly moved with his eyes “full of tears” (*P* 33). The nationalist Ireland that Dedalus embodies is distinctly anti-Catholic Catholic. This sentiment is evident in his rendition of an Irish street ballad: “*O, come all you Roman catholics/ That never went to mass*” (29). Dedalus despairs at the Church’s role in Parnell’s demise, lamenting: “We are an unfortunate priestridden race and always were and always will be till the end of the chapter. . . . A priestridden Godforsaken race!” (31)

Indeed, the anticlerical tradition of nationalist Ireland traces back to the time of the Union. Casey recalls historical betrayals, challenging the faithful

2) After the death of Parnell in 1890, Irish parliamentary movement for Home Rule “degenerated into three separate and warring factions” which were even more divided into “four fragments” by 1897. The party was particularly divided into Parnellites and anti-Parnellites, represented by John Redmond and T. M. Healy, respectively. The foundation of the United Irish League for land reform by William O’Brien in 1898 finally made possible the “reunion” of the parliamentary party in 1900. While the reunion laid the “foundation-stone” of the party to “represent the Irish nationalist interest at Westminster for the next eighteen years,” the principal leaders were opposed to reunion, ultimately leading O’Brien to leave the party in 1905. It was thus difficult for the parliamentary party to make a united and effective political movement (Bull 51-52).

Dante:

Didn't the bishops of Ireland betray us in the time of the union when bishop Lanigan presented an address of loyalty to the Marquess Cornwallis? Didn't the bishops and priests sell the aspirations of their country in 1829 in return for catholic emancipation? Didn't they denounce the fenian movement from the pulpit and in the confessionbox? And didn't they dishonour the ashes of Terrence Bellew MacManus? (*P* 31-32)

The British Government, which was determined to dissolve the Irish Parliament after the Rebellion of 1798, bargained for the Union with the Catholic bishops. In return, they offered the bishops "Catholic emancipation," which came almost three decades later. It is told that Bishop Lanigan's address to Lord Cornwallis, the Viceroy of Ireland, successfully "silenced" the "antagonism of the Catholic hierarchy and laity" by the "promises of prompt emancipation" (Gifford 147-48). The Catholic clergy was lukewarm at best in their support for O'Connell's "campaign for repeal of the Act of Union" after his campaign for emancipation succeeded (149). Furthermore, many condemned the "fenian" revolutionary movement during the 1860s. When the "Irish patriot and follower of O'Connell" Terence Bellew MacManus died in exile in 1860, "the archbishop of Dublin and other Church leaders" opposed the burial of his body in Prospect Cemetery, which became "the occasion for a large nationalist demonstration" (149).

It is rather natural, then, that Dedalus's grandfather who was "condemned to death as a whiteboy,"³⁾ with whom Dedalus's nationalist tradition may well have begun, used to say that "he would never let one of [the Catholic priests]

3) The "whiteboy" act began as agitation for land and tax reform, particularly "for reform of church taxes" in the late eighteenth century and continued against "landlords who raised land rents" and some peasants "willing to pay higher rents" in the first half of the nineteenth century (Gifford 147).

put his two feet under his mahogany” (*P* 31). As Casey adds, “O, by God . . . I forgot little old Paul Cullen!⁴ Another apple of God’s eye!” and Dante cries to him, “Right! Right! They were always right! God and morality and religion come first,” Casey finally decides: “No God for Ireland! . . . We have had too much God in Ireland. Away with God” (32). Likewise, Dedalus is critical of the Catholic Church as he remarks that “Father Coffey,” who performs the last rite for Dignam at the mortuary chapel, “will burst sideways like a sheep in clover” (*U* 6.597-98). When Power says, looking at Dedalus’s wife’s grave, “She’s better where she is,” Dedalus is not so certain: “I suppose she is in heaven if there is a heaven” (6.649-50). Yet the anti-Catholic nationalist Ireland remains intrinsically Catholic. Casey states, “I . . . am no renegade catholic. I am a catholic as my father was and his father before him and his father before him again when we gave up our lives rather than sell our faith,” and again, “I am no protestant,” affirming his faith and lineage (*P* 28, 29). Therefore, this nationalism Dedalus and Casey speak of belongs to Irish Catholics who, though faithful, are hostile towards the Catholic Church.

Importantly, the anti-Catholic nationalist Ireland represented by Dedalus signifies an Ireland that turned to drinking and singing after repeated failures and yet persevered through its tragedies. This is a poignant reflection of Joyce’s own father, John Stanislaus Joyce, on whom Dedalus is based; he was a gifted tenor and storyteller, but also a heavy drinker. Dedalus’s son Stephen says that his father used to be “a medical student, an oarsman, a tenor, an amateur actor, a shouting politician, a small landlord . . . somebody’s secretary . . . a taxgatherer” who finally went “bankrupt,” and that he is “at present a praiser of his own past” (203). Dedalus is thus the “famous father” of the

4) Paul Cullen (1803-78), archbishop of Dublin, condemned the Fenians and Home Rule movement and land reform, while seeking “favors from the British for himself and his friends” (Gifford 149).

“famous son” “Stephen, the youthful bard” (*U* 11.254, 257, 259). In the cabman’s shelter in *Ulysses*, a sailor asks Stephen his name and if he knows a “Simon Dedalus”; the sailor “bold affirm[s],” “[Simon Dedalus]’s Irish. . . . All Irish,” and Stephen responds, “All too Irish” (16.378-84). Stephen’s remark that his father is “all too Irish” as well as the sailor’s designation of Simon Dedalus as “all Irish”—regardless of whether the story about a sharpshooter Simon Dedalus working with “Hengler’s Royal Circus” is even partially true about Stephen’s father or just a “curious coincidence” (16.389-413)—evokes the nationalist Ireland that notoriously drinks and sings away despite its tragic failure. This portrayal of nationalist Ireland, broken yet enduring, is metaphorically represented by the “disorder, misrule, confusion of [Dedalus’s] house and the stagnation of vegetable life” (*P* 137).

Even “Ivy day,” the anniversary of Parnell’s death, is “dying out” (*U* 6.855). The story “Ivy Day in the Committee Room,” set on the 1902 Ivy Day, reveals a Nationalist Party during the Municipal Elections campaign that lacks a charismatic leader like Parnell. Richard Tierney, a publican who runs “on the Nationalist ticket” for Lord Mayor, is not genuinely respected by his canvassers, who dub him “Tricky Dicky Tierney” (*D* 119). They suspect that Tierney is sympathetic to the British, particularly regarding King Edward’s visit, while criticizing him for not paying them their campaign wages: “I wish he’s turn up with the spondulicks”; “Couldn’t he pay up like a man” (119, 121). On the other hand, the Parnellite Joe Hynes, who “didn’t renege [Parnell] . . . [but] stuck to him like man,” and who is not one of the canvassers, is criticized as well (130). John Henchy, one of Tierney’s men, referring to Hynes, says: “I can understand a fellow being hard up, but what I can’t understand is a fellow sponging. . . . Some of these hillsideers and fenians are a bit too clever if you ask me. . . . I believe half of them are in the pay of the Castle” (122). Mat O’Connor agrees: “There’s a lineal

descendant of Major Sirr for you if you like!⁵) O, the heart's blood of a patriot! That's a fellow now that'd sell his country for fourpence—ay—and go down on his bended knees and thank the Almighty Christ he had a country to sell” (122-23). The Parnellite “sponging”⁶ or “patriot” who would “sell his country for fourpence” insinuates a corrupt and bankrupt nationalist Ireland. Hynes's recitation of “The Death of Parnell” is valued merely as “a very fine piece of writing” (133). In “Hades” Hynes acknowledges: “Parnell will never come again” (*U* 6.926).

Dedalus, emblematic of a weakening nationalist or anti-Catholic Ireland, grapples with familial responsibilities. When his daughter Dilly asks him for money after he “s[old] off some old furniture” at auction, Dedalus deflects with “Where would I get money? . . . There is no-one in Dublin would lend me fourpence” (8.29; 10.669-70). As Dilly says, “You got some. . . . I know you did. . . . Were you in the Scotch house now?” he says with “his tongue in his cheek,” “I was not. . . . Was it the little nuns taught you to be so saucy?” and he “hand[s] her a shilling” (10.671-79). Finally, Dilly asks, “Can't you look for some money somewhere?” and he replies, “I will. . . . I looked all along the gutter in O'Connell street. I'll try this one now” (10.701-04). Instead of giving all the money he has for his children, Dedalus jokingly evades Dilly's request, keeping some for his drink, as he orders “a half glass of whiskey” at the Ormond Hotel bar (11.211), and even “for a shave for the funeral” (10.699); and he blames Dilly's persistence in asking for more on “the little nuns” at “St. Monica's Widow's Almshouse” (10.715-16; Gifford and Seidman 272). In truth, Dilly in her “shabby dress” wishes to rise above

5) Major Sirr, Henry Charles Sirr (1764-1841), was notorious for actively arresting the leaders of the 1798 Rebellion, including “Lord Edward Fitzgerald,” the Irish Nationalist (Gifford 93).

6) In fact, Hynes neglects or ignores his debt, the “three bob [Bloom] lent him” “three weeks” ago, even after Bloom gives him a “third hint” (*U* 7.119).

her circumstances, trying to “learn French” with a coverless “French primer” she just bought (10.855, 867-69). Yet the family’s financial plight is palpable when Stephen warns that her sister Maggy may “pawn [the book] on [her],” stating, “I suppose all my books are gone,” to which Dilly replies, “Some. . . . We had to” (10.872-74). The Dedalus children are “drowning” as Stephen is afraid that they “will drown [him] with [them]” if he tries to “save” them; they are in “Misery! Misery!” (10.875-80)

Simon Dedalus, symbolic of the degenerated nationalist, anti-Catholic Ireland, is not only incompetent with his own family’s subsistence but—perhaps because of that—detached from Dublin’s current affairs. Dedalus is unaware of or has not read “Dan Dawson’s speech” that Cunningham asks if he read right after Cunningham makes fun of Kernan (6.151-53). Dawson, a merchant-politician who was “lord mayor of Dublin” in 1882-83, gave a “speech [the] night” before about Ireland’s natural beauty which was printed “in the paper th[at] morning” (Gifford and Seidman 107; *U* 7.277). Dawson’s overblown phrases, like Kernan’s, are ridiculed by all men, including Dedalus, later in “Aeolus” when Ned Lambert reads them in the *Evening Telegraph* office. Dedalus’s ignorance of Dawson’s piece printed in the morning paper *Freeman’s Journal*, which was “Ireland’s first truly national paper” and whose circulation was “so large that it could claim . . . to be ‘the leading Irish newspaper’” in 1904 (“Freeman’s Journal”), insinuates either his apathy or inability to afford even a local newspaper.

Moreover, he remains oblivious to the widely circulated gossip concerning the Jewish solicitor Reuben J. Dodd and his son, a topic that Bloom broaches while in the carriage. Bloom attempts to escape the uncomfortable moment when he is suddenly equated with the moneylender Reuben J: Cunningham says, “We have all been there,” and then “his eyes [meeting] Bloom’s eyes,” he adds, “Well, nearly all of us” (*U* 6.259-61). The story “about the boatman”

who saved Dodd's son from drowning and received "a florin" from Dodd "for saving his son's life" is already familiar to both Cunningham and Power, and Cunningham actually starts to tell the story himself, "thwart[ing] Bloom's speech rudely" (6.266-87). The Dodd boy's near drowning or suicidal incident was witnessed by "half the town," yet it is news to Dedalus as he says, "What is that? . . . I didn't hear it" (6.284, 268). Dedalus, irresponsible and unconcerned, is just a "noisy selfwilled man" (6.74), drinking and singing away as he does in "Sirens." "All too Irish," he perfectly epitomizes the decaying Ireland that is anti-Catholic Catholic nationalist, which "win[s] the day in [Stephen's] soul" (*P* 137). Dedalus's nationalist Ireland represents "the cultural tradition out of which Stephen is shaped" (Collins 234), the self-professed artist of Ireland to "forge in the smith of [his] soul the uncreated conscience of [his] race" (*P* 213).

IV. Leopold Bloom: New Ireland

The fourth and last to enter the funeral carriage and sit "in the vacant place" is Leopold Bloom, following the Catholic, the British, and the nationalist Irelands (*U* 6.9). Bloom, of Hungarian Jewish descent, serves as an observer of the three Irelands, perhaps suggesting an alternative Ireland, rather than representing the Jewish Ireland or Jewish immigrants in Ireland. Indeed, it is challenging for Bloom or any Jew to represent Irish Jewry, whose population "exceeded two thousand by 1900," primarily residing in the area called "Little Jerusalem" (O'Grada 19). The Jewish community, mirroring the Irish, was divided into factions not only "about ritual and doctrine" but also between "the newcomers from the East" and "their co-religionists already in Dublin" (20). Furthermore, Bloom, who consumes unkosher "pork kidney" (*U*

4.46), is not even an authentic Jew or “non-Jewish Jew” as defined by Isaac Deutcher (qtd. in Davison 7).⁷⁾ Bloom’s late father, Rudolph, converted “from the Israelitic faith” to Protestantism upon arriving in Dublin in 1865, and Bloom himself “abjured” Protestantism “in favor of Roman Catholicism” at the time of “his matrimony in 1888” (*U* 17.1636-40). Bloom’s mother Ellen, “second daughter of Julius Higgins (born Karoly) and Fanny Higgins (born Hegarty)” (17.536-37), was from the Irish Catholic family, though “with more than an ounce of Hungarian blood” (Benstock 495).⁸⁾ In this context, Bloom, born to a Protestant father and Catholic mother, does not precisely represent the Jews in Ireland.

Instead, Bloom symbolizes an Ireland that, while unique, is as genuine as the other three versions. Bloom identifies as Irish and Catholic, albeit estranged from the Church. He asserts his nationality as “Ireland” when asked, “What is your nation if I may ask?” (*U* 12.1430-31), and he later assures Stephen that he is “as good an Irishman as that rude person [the citizen]” while discussing his own “patriotism” (16.1132-38). Bloom, in his distinct manner, is an Irish patriot, formerly a Parnellite. In 1885, he “publicly expressed his adherence to the collective and national economic programme . . . the agrarian policy of Michael Davitt, [and] the constitutional agitation of Charles Stewart Parnell” (17.1645-49). It is true that Bloom is perceived as a Jew by his fellow Dubliners who refer to him by his last name “Bloom” (6.212). As noted, Cunningham corrects his remark regarding the Jew Reuben J that “we have all been there” to “nearly all of us,” realizing Bloom’s presence in the carriage. Yet Bloom’s nationalist leanings do not align with the typical image of Jews, as expressed by Arthur Griffith in the *United*

7) Regarding Bloom’s apostacy, see Kil, “The ‘Non-Jewish’ Jewish ‘Anarchist’ Bloom in *Ulysses*.”

8) Regarding Bloom’s family background, see Kil, “The Heirless in *Ulysses* and *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*.”

Irishman in 1899: “The exclusion of Jews in Germany, Russia, and Austria has nothing to do with religious beliefs. It is rather a question of Patriotism. The Jew has at heart no country but the Promised Land. He forms a nation apart wherever he goes” (qtd. in Davison 69). The nationalist Bloom does not identify with the Irish Jews from eastern Europe who were rather “emphatically loyalists” in the early 1900s (O’Grada 23). He resonates more with the Jews in Trieste, described as “a center of Jewish assimilation” for two centuries where Joyce began writing *Ulysses* (Davison 130). The assimilated Jews of this former Italian city under Austro-Hungarian rule, which served as “a little Ireland” for Joyce (qtd. in Davison 132), were “Irredentists to the person” (Davison 131). From this perspective, the non-Jewish-Jewish nationalist Bloom is “as good an Irishman as” any Irishman as he claims, which qualifies him to represent an Ireland that is different and still in common with the three Irelands.

Bloom’s Ireland echoes that of Dedalus: both are nationalist yet also critical of the Catholic Church. Bloom, a converted then lapsed Catholic, is atheistic and skeptical of the Church. Observing a communion at All Hallows Church, he muses: “Rum idea: eating bits of a corpse. Why the cannibals cotton to it” (*U* 5.352). He also ponders upon seeing Dedalus’s daughter outside the auction house:

Must be selling off some old furniture. . . . Home always breaks up when the mother goes. Fifteen children he had. Birth every year almost. That’s in their theology or the priest won’t give the poor woman the confession, the absolution. Increase and multiply. Did you ever hear such an idea? Eat you out of house and home. No families themselves to feed. Living on the fat of the land. (8.31-35)

Bloom is aware of the difficulties posed by the Church’s literal interpretation

of the words “Increase and multiply” or “Be fruitful and multiply” from “Genesis.” The Church’s teaching leads the devout Catholic to “eat [themselves] out of house and home,” as demonstrated by the Dedalus family incrementally “selling off” their house when the mother dies after giving “birth every year almost,” while the priests have “no families themselves to feed.” In this sense, Bloom’s views align with those of Dedalus’s anti-clerical nationalist Ireland.

Significantly, Bloom’s criticism of the Church emphasizes “the economic . . . domain,” as he affirms that “the priest spells poverty” while the Jews are “practical and are proved to be so” (16.1127, 1125). Bloom, the non-Jewish Jew, is practical as Molly reflects that “[my husband] has sense enough not to squander every penny piece he earns down their gullets and looks after his wife and family” (18.1277-79). Bloom’s “patriotism” is thus concerned with the economic, rather than political, self-reliance of Ireland, which he declares is “the vital issue at stake”: “I want to see everyone . . . all creeds and classes *pro rata* having a comfortable tidysized income, in no niggard fashion either, something in the neighborhood of £ 300 per annum” (16.1133-38).

Here, Bloom’s practicality draws him closer to Cunningham, recognized by Father Conmee as a “good practical catholic: useful at mission time” (10.5-6). In fact, it is the two who practically help the bereaved Dignams. Cunningham not only tries to find a job for the children but takes up a collection, “a few bob a skull,” “just to keep them going till the insurance is cleared up” (6.564-66). Bloom, who holds a policy with the same insurance company “Scottish Widows” (13.1227; 17.1856), is busy seeing “about th[e] insurance of poor Dignam’s” (12.760-64), which in fact Cunningham specifically asks him to. Furthermore, Cunningham understands Bloom’s practical ideas: talking about Molly’s “concert tour,” Bloom emphatically says, “You see the idea is to tour the chief towns. What you lose on one you can make up on the other,”

and Cunningham agrees, “Quite so” (6.212, 217-19). Again, when Bloom shares his own innovative ideas about tramlines, Cunningham, unlike others, resonates with Bloom’s outlook:

–I can’t make out why the corporation doesn’t run a tramline from the parkgate to the quays, Mr Bloom said. All those animals could be taken in trucks down to the boats.

–Instead of blocking up the thoroughfare, Martin Cunningham said. Quite right. They ought to.

–Yes, Mr Bloom said, and another thing I often thought, is to have municipal funeral trams like they have in Milan, you know. Run the line out to the cemetery gates and have special trams, hearse and carriage and all. Don’t you see what I mean?

–O, that be damned for a story, Mr Dedalus said. Pullman car and saloon diningroom.

–A poor lookout for Corny, Mr Power added.

–Why? Mr Bloom asked, turning to Mr Dedalus. Wouldn’t it be more decent than galloping two abreast?

–Well, there’s something in that, Mr Dedalus granted.

–And, Martin Cunningham said, we wouldn’t have scenes like that when the hearse capsized round Dunphy’s and upset the coffin on the road. (6.400-16)

Cunningham who is “practical” understands and approves Bloom’s pragmatic ideas, whereas Dedalus and Power dismiss or joke about them. Therefore, Bloom, who shares with Dedalus’s anti-Catholic nationalist Ireland, also empathizes with Cunningham’s realistic Catholic Ireland.

Interestingly, Bloom’s pragmatism, which links him to Cunningham, makes him in turn identified with Arthur Griffith, the Catholic nationalist leader who founded the *United Irishman* in 1899, advocating the revival of Irish economy. Joyce was much interested in Griffith’s economic nationalism while he “[ook]

no interest in parliamentarism” after Parnell, as he wrote in a letter in 1906: “Griffith was the first person in Ireland to revive the separatist idea on modern lines nine years ago . . . at least [his programme] tries to inaugurate some commercial life for Ireland” (*SL* 101, 109-11). In fact, Joyce’s acquaintance with Griffith traces back to five years earlier when the latter “introduce[d] Joyce to the Irish public” (Jordan). When Joyce’s university’s literary magazine *St Stephen’s* refused to publish his essay “The Day of the Rabblement,” and he subsequently published it in pamphlet form, it was Griffith’s *United Irishman* that “recommended that people read [it]” (Kenny). Again in 1911 when Joyce, having difficulty publishing *Dubliners*, “sent a challenging letter to Irish newspapers about the historical ‘suppression’ of *Dubliners*” (Jordan), Griffith was the only editor to “risk libel action by publishing [the letter] in full” in *Sinn Féin*, previously the *United Irishman* (Ellmann 88). The following year when Joyce visited Ireland for the last time to deal with the continuing difficulties with *Dubliners*, he went to consult Griffith, who “received [Joyce] very kindly . . . gave [him] a note to a first-class solicitor . . . [and] asked [him] to send him copies of [his] articles in *Il Piccolo della Sera*,” the Irredentist Triestine newspaper (*Letters* II 315). It is not surprising then that Griffith is “the only contemporary politician” mentioned several times in *Ulysses*, along with “Sinn Fein” in “Cyclops” and “Penelope” (Jordan; *U* 5.71; 8.462; 12.1574; 15.4685; 18.386). Particularly, the allusions to the “coming man Griffiths” in the final episode are “more than coincidences” as Ellmann believes that Joyce “wished to salute Griffith’s at last successful efforts” to create the Irish Free State (88): Griffith was elected as the first president of Ireland in January 1922, almost at the same time as *Ulysses* was published.

From this perspective, the practical patriot Bloom who represents an alternative Ireland is associated with the economic nationalist leader Griffith,

“the coming man.” It is said in Kiernan’s pub that “it was Bloom gave the ideas for Sinn Fein to Griffith,” which Cunningham affirms by saying that “it was he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system. We know that in the castle” (*U* 12.1574, 1635-37). The son of Hungarian Jew Bloom is known to be behind “the plans according to the Hungarian system” for Ireland, which allude to Griffith’s book *Resurrection of Hungary* containing ideas for an Anglo-Irish dual monarchy similar to the Austro-Hungarian one, published in 1904. Molly also reflects that “[Bloom] is going about with some of them Sinner Fein lately or whatever they call themselves talking his usual trash and nonsense” (18.383-84). It is true that Griffith was anti-Semitic, as noted earlier, writing in his paper in 1904: “In all countries and in all Christian ages he, ‘the Jew’ has been a usurer and a grinder of the poor. . . . The Jew in Ireland is in every respect an economic evil” (qtd. in Davison 70). Joyce also criticized the paper for it: “What I object to most of all in [Griffith’s] paper is that it is educating the people of Ireland on the old pap of racial hatred” (*SL* 110). Yet, as discussed earlier, Bloom is a secular nationalist Jew who embodies a vision of pragmatic nationalist Ireland, which ironically renders him identifying with the brand of Irish nationalism Joyce supported and Griffith represented.

V. Conclusion

As examined so far, the funeral carriage carrying Cunningham, Power, Dedalus, and Bloom to Glasnevin cemetery symbolizes a colonial Ireland that is fractured and bound for Hades. In early twentieth-century British Ireland, this division is embodied by three conflicting representations showcased by the first three men. Cunningham represents the Catholic Ireland that is

authoritative yet practical. Power embodies the pro-British Catholic Ireland, while Dedalus stands for the nationalist Ireland that is deteriorated, anti-Catholic Catholic. The Catholic and British Irelands often align against the nationalist Ireland, which now seems all but defeated and hopeless. Thus, the carriage containing these three representatives metaphorically depicts a colonial Ireland doomed to descend into hell, with no hope for independence unless there is a fourth passenger, Bloom. As a secular Jew who is as Irish as the other three, Bloom stands for a new Ireland that aims for economic self-sufficiency. His practical patriotism, which echoes both Cunningham's practicality and Dedalus's nationalism, resonates with the economic nationalism championed by Griffith, who Joyce believed could guide "the separatist idea on modern lines."

Remarkably, Bloom's Ireland surpasses even Griffith's, let alone Cunningham's or Dedalus's. His Ireland is inclusive, transcending the common Catholic religious or racial intolerance. Bloom notes that such intolerance is "not life": "insult and hatred . . . it's the very opposite of that that is really life" (12.1481-83). It is no surprise then that Cunningham, either despite or because of his "sympathetic and human" nature, feels that "in the midst of life" they are "in death," whereas Bloom affirms life: "In the midst of death we are in life" (6.334, 759; Gifford and Seidman 111-12). In this respect, Bloom's practicality is synonymous with his humanitarianism or his concern about the living rather than the dead. He observes: "Extraordinary the interest they take in a corpse" or "More sensible to spend the money on some charity for the living" (6.14, 930-31). He not only "put[s] his name down for five shillings. . . . [but does] put down the five shillings" for the Dignam children, "without a second word either"; Cunningham finds Bloom's donation "strange," forced to admit that "there is much kindness in the jew" (10.974-80). Bloom's "kindness," evident in his helping the "blind stripling"

cross the street while careful to “not do the condescending” (8.1092), is an expression of his “love,” “the opposite of hatred,” which he equates with “life” (12.1485).

Interestingly, the life-affirming Bloom is the only one whose wife, Molly, responds affirmatively, repeatedly uttering “yes” to him. In contrast, the wives of the other three men are depicted as alcoholic, ill, or deceased. Cunningham’s wife is labeled an “awful drunkard,” burdening him with “the life of the damned” (6.349-51), while Power’s is “always sick or going to be sick or just getting better of it,” leading him to keep the “barmaid” whether or not the relationship is “no carnal” (18.1272-74; 6.245-46). Dedalus’s wife is already dead after giving “birth every year almost,” leaving the family in despair. These wives, grappling with issues ranging from alcoholism to illness or death, symbolize an Ireland tormented by Catholicism, imperialism, or nationalism. Yet Molly, despite thinking that “its all his own fault if [she is] an adulteress,” believes that Bloom understands that “a woman wants to be embraced 20 times a day . . . no matter by who so long as to be in love” (18.1516, 1408-09). She symbolizes an Ireland flourishing in love and economic independence, a vision only Bloom can actualize. Thus, even “in the midst of death”—losing an infant son, coping with his father’s suicide, handling his wife’s affair, and facing anti-Semitic bias from fellow Dubliners—Bloom is “in life.” Only his Ireland can return to life from Hades: “Plenty see and hear and feel yet. Feel live warm beings near you. . . . Warm fullblooded life”; “Thank you. How grand we are this morning!” (6.1003-05, 1033).

(Yeungnam University)

Works Cited

- Benstock, Shari. "Is He a Jew or a Gentile or a Holy Roman?" *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1979, pp. 493-97.
- Bull, Philip. "The United Irish League and the Reunion of the Irish Parliamentary Party, 1898-1900." *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 26, no. 101, 1988, pp. 51-78.
- Collins, R.G. "The Second Dedalus: Simon the Testifier." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1971, pp. 233-35.
- Davison, Neil. *James Joyce, Ulysses, and the Construction of Jewish Identity: Culture, Biography, and "The Jew" in Modernist Europe*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Ellmann, Richard. *The Consciousness of Joyce*. Oxford UP, 1977.
- "Freeman's Journal." *The Joyce Project*. m.joyceproject.com/info/sources.html. Accessed 3 July 2023.
- Gifford, Don. *Joyce Annotated: Notes for Dubliners and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. U of California, 1982.
- Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 1974. UP of Michigan, 1995.
- "Jack Power." *The Joyce Project*. m.joyceproject.com/info/sources.html. Accessed 21 June 2023.
- Jordan, Anthony J. "Why Joyce Put Griffith in *Ulysses*." *Independent.ie*. 01 Nov. 2014. www.independent.ie/entertainment/books/why-joyce-put-griffith-in-ulysses/30710502.html. Accessed 21 Jan. 2023.
- Joyce, James. *Critical Writings of James Joyce*. Edited by Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann, Faber and Faber, 1959.
- . *Dubliners*. Penguin, 1968.

- . *Letters of James Joyce*. Edited by Richard Ellmann, vol. 2, Viking, 1966.
- . *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Penguin, 1986.
- . *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. Edited by Richard Ellmann, Faber and Faber, 1975.
- . *Ulysses*. Random House, 1986.
- Kenny, Colum. "When Arthur Griffith Met James Joyce." *Irish Times*. 10 Feb. 2020. www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/when-arthur-griffith-met-james-joyce-1.4148073. Accessed 21 Jan. 2023.
- Kil, Hye Ryoung. "The Heirless in *Ulysses* and *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*: the Crisis of National Identity." *Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2022, pp. 599-622.
- . "The 'Non-Jewish' Jewish 'Anarchist' Bloom in *Ulysses*: the Ideal Irishman." *James Joyce Journal*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2021, pp. 137-66.
- McCaffrey, Lawrence J. "Irish Nationalism and Irish Catholicism: A Study in Cultural Identity." *Church History*, vol. 42, no. 4, 1973, pp. 524-34.
- O'Gráda, Cormac. "Lost in Little Jerusalem: Leopold Bloom and Irish Jewry." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2004, pp. 17-26.
- Veldeman, Marie-Christine. "The Rise of Liberal Catholic Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Ireland." *Équivalences*, vol. 31, no. 1-2, 2004, pp. 149-62.

Abstract

The Four Riders in the Funeral Carriage: Three Irelands and Bloom in Joyce's "Hades"

Hye Ryoung Kil

This essay examines the four men riding in the funeral carriage to Glasnevin Cemetery in "Hades," aiming to analyze the conflicting reality of colonial Ireland in the early twentieth century. The first three men to enter the carriage each represent a different facet of Ireland, with the first one holding the most influence. Martin Cunningham, the first to board the carriage, embodies Catholic Ireland, characterized by authority and practicality. Jack Power, the second, symbolizes British Ireland, aligning with pro-British Catholic sentiments. Simon Dedalus, the third, stands for nationalist Ireland, albeit degenerated and anti-Catholic in nature. These three versions of Ireland are marked by hopelessness in the context of Irish independence, as Catholic Ireland often aligns with British Ireland against nationalist Ireland. This alignment leads the carriage, with its three occupants, on a descent into Hades.

Leopold Bloom, the fourth and last person to enter the carriage, represents an alternative Ireland that is economically self-sufficient, though not politically. As the son of a Hungarian-Jewish immigrant, Bloom identifies as a secular and patriotic Jew, making him as authentically Irish as the other three passengers. In fact, Bloom's pragmatic patriotism aligns with Griffith's economic nationalism, an ideology endorsed by Joyce, except for its anti-Semitic sentiments. The new Ireland that Bloom symbolizes is therefore devoid of racial or religious animosity, setting it apart from Griffith's and the other three versions of Ireland. Bloom's Ireland embraces life "in the midst

of death” and is qualified to return from the underworld.

■ **Key words**: James Joyce, “Hades,” funeral carriage, Leopold Bloom, Marting Cunningham, Simon Dedalus, Jack Power
(제임스 조이스, 「하데스」, 장례 마차, 레오폴드 블룸, 마틴 커닝햄, 사이먼 디덜러스, 잭 파워)

논문접수: 2023년 11월 13일

논문심사: 2023년 11월 13일

게재확정: 2023년 12월 8일