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Over years, and from farther and nearer,
I had thought, I knew you—
in spirit—I am of Ireland.

Thomas MacGreevy, “Breton Oracles”
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Introduction: Considering Irish Poetic Modernisms

In the course of his interview of novelist and writer Mervyn Wall for the *Lace Curtain* in 1971, Michael Smith reflected:

I doubt if there was ever a generation of Irish writers so talented, with intelligence and sheer literary know-how, as that which emerged in the Thirties: and yet the ignorance of the reading public about that period is almost complete. Admittedly the work of such poets as Lyle Donaghy and Thomas MacGreevy isn’t easily available, nonetheless there has been incredibly little interest until now, and anyway, republication usually requires such a revival of interest...It has been suggested to me that the work of the period is not *Irish* enough for the scholars and critics of Anglo-Irish Literature… (Wall 77)

Smith’s supposition addresses his contemporaries’ neglect of and disinterest in the Irish “Thirties writers” such as MacGreevy, Wall, Donaghy, Brian Coffey, Denis Devlin and Charles Donnelly. As Smith has observed, these poets were largely overlooked until critical interest was developed by New Writers’ Press in the 1970s, then in the ‘80s and ‘90s by J.C.C. Mays, Stan Smith, Susan Schreibman, Terence Brown, Patricia Coughlan and Alex Davis. This thesis revisits the work of several of these poets with the aim of building upon this earlier research and criticism, helping to gain this material the prominence it deserves.

With these aims I explore the poetry of Joseph Campbell (1879-1944), Thomas MacGreevy (1893-1967), Denis Devlin (1908-1959) and Brian Coffey (1905-1995) in individual case-study chapters. I have also written interchapters that contextualise their work and examine connections between them and their
contemporaries and near-contemporaries. I begin my study with Joseph
Campbell (Seosamh MacCathmaoil) because of his omission from previous
discussions of Irish modernism focusing on MacGreevy, Devlin or Coffey.
Very little has been written about Campbell until the recent discussions by Alex
Davis and Helen Carr. Both critics have recognized him as making valuable
contributions to both the Irish Literary Revival and Ezra Pound’s and others’
early incarnation of the Imagist movement in London. Campbell has
undoubtedly been a neglected cultural figure. He played a key role in the Ulster
Literary Theatre and its accompanying journal *Uladh*; yet the Ulster literary and
cultural revivals have remained marginalized in criticism. With the notable
exceptions of FitzSimon and Murphy’s edited collection of essays, *The Irish
Revival Reappraised* (2004), Eugene McNulty’s *The Ulster Literary Theatre
and the Northern Revival* (2008) and Mark Phelan’s forthcoming research. In
current Irish studies, Campbell’s valuable contributions to the cultural
efflorescence in London and Dublin remain largely neglected. During the first
two decades of the twentieth century Campbell’s collections *The Rush-light* and
*The Earth of Cualann* were displayed at Dublin Arts and Crafts exhibitions as
examples of artisan books. *The Rush-light* was also one of the first publications
printed by the quintessential Irish literary revival press, Maunsel & Co.
However, now his most widely read texts are his translations of Patrick Pearse’s
short stories from Irish to English.¹

My analysis shows how Campbell’s stylistic experimentation reveals
links between Irish literary and cultural revivalism and pre-war modernism in

¹ See Markey.
London. His poetry also crucially makes the case that modernism in itself need not be seen as exclusively international but rather, with the incidence of diverse literary communities in pre-war London, as what we might now call transnational. Furthermore, Campbell’s early experimental poetry and simultaneous promotion of nationalist literature is a clear example of Davis and Jenkins’s assertion that modernism and nationalism need not be seen as irreconcilable (“Locating modernisms” 5). Campbell’s work is saturated with Celticist imagery and his use of Scots-Gaelic sources indicates a regional cultural modernism which deserves further exploration.

There are also critical connections between Campbell and the later poets discussed in this thesis. Daniel Corkery included both Campbell and MacGreevy in his list of “wild geese of the pen”—Irish writers who chose to work or write abroad—in his 1931 monograph *Synge and Anglo-Irish Literature: A Study* (4). However, despite personal connections through writer and scholar Stephen MacKenna and within Dublin’s visual arts community, the two writers appeared to have had little or no interest in each other’s work. This may be explained by MacGreevy’s open scorn for the Imagist movement with which Campbell had been tangentially aligned, with the one exception of Imagist poet Richard Aldington, a close friend of MacGreevy (*Aldington* 10). Campbell also shares a valuable thematic link with Brian Coffey, the subject of my final chapter, because of their mutual fascination with the idea of the “the poet-as-maker.” This craftsman is a figure who appears in Campbell’s writing and poetry as early in 1905, and that Campbell, in 1943 and Coffey, in 1978,
both identified as a creative identity which they took from Scottish poetry. “Maker” or “makar” is a term used to describe fifteenth and sixteenth century Scottish poets who used a hybrid of Scots-Gaelic and English in their poetry as well as vernacular Scots (“Makar”).

The first interchapter serves as a thematic and temporal link between the early regional modernism of Campbell and the later poets here studied. War poetry has been a neglected sub-genre within Irish poetry until very recently. Indeed, as I argue, the overwhelming reputation of Anglophone “War Poetry” as a purely British phenomenon created solely by soldier-poets of the Great War has tended to preclude the possibility of a broader definition. Furthermore the cultural amnesia in Ireland which until recently surrounded the subject of the Great War discouraged a broader academic discussion of the poetry written in reaction to this crisis. Within the past two decades, this body of work has been recognized as a sub-genre and continuing discussion will allow a greater understanding of how Irish poets explored, critiqued and commemorated wars and militarization. This interchapter discusses intersections between Irish modernism and Irish war poetry. I examine texts by both combatant and non-combatant poets, exploring various conflicts up to the 1960s. The plurality of multiple voices and possibilities within this sub-genre corresponds with the multiple voices and versions of Irish poetic modernisms which I address.

Thomas MacGreevy is the subject of my second chapter. MacGreevy, like Campbell, lived abroad during one of the most fruitful creative periods of his life and then voluntarily chose to return to Ireland. By contrast, his close
friends and near contemporaries Beckett, Devlin and Coffey did not return to Ireland. Nevertheless, MacGreevy was a mentor to all three and maintained long-term connections with Beckett and Coffey. Chronologically the Easter Rising and War of Independence corresponded with the end of Campbell’s poetic career while the War of Independence and Civil War coincided with MacGreevy’s return to Ireland and the beginning of his writing life. MacGreevy’s experience as a soldier in the final years of the Great War profoundly affected his outlook on his return to Ireland and his perspective on the budding Free State is clearly discernible in his writing. MacGreevy’s poetry shares Joyce’s view, in the words of his character Robert Hand in his 1913 play *Exiles*, that “If Ireland is to become a new Ireland she must first become European” (158). MacGreevy was a highly significant contributor to Irish modernism; he was a skilled experimental poet and his writing gives a powerful account of Irish politics and culture. His experience as both a British soldier and an Irish nationalist exemplifies the diversity in modernisms; both MacGreevy and Campbell were nationalists, whose expressions of national support as well as their poetic styles differ significantly, yet both are important figures in Irish poetic modernism.

My analysis of Devlin’s poetics centres on the gendering of his poetry. Anne Fogarty’s 1995 essay was the first to analyse gender and Irish modernist poetry via, in part, an exploration of Devlin’s depiction of the female muse as a metonymic extension of his poetic creativity. In an extended analysis of the imagining of gender in Devlin’s work, I build on the pioneering explorations of
this topic by Fogarty and Alex Davis in his monograph *A Broken Line: Denis Devlin and Irish Poetic Modernism* (2000). Vicki Bertram’s assertion that the “ongoing denial” of the importance of gender in poetry “facilitates the continuance of a critical tradition that prioritises and naturalises men’s writing and concerns” served as a helpful starting point from which to argue the necessity of revisiting Devlin’s often problematic depiction of his muses (Bertram vii). Certainly, as Cristanne Miller has argued, sexism was common in both modernist texts and creative communities, yet in Devlin’s work his struggle to reconcile his depiction of the “real woman” with his conceit of woman-as-creative-self was a life-long pursuit.

Devlin and Coffey have been frequently paired in criticism to date: my analysis challenges this now-conventional procedure. Beckett, although he was later to befriend both poets, mentions them in the same breath in his 1934 essay, “Recent Irish Poetry” and in several letters to MacGreevy. Their critical yoking together was sustained decades later by memories of their earlier friendship as well as their shared inclusion in the *Lace Curtain*, and significantly by Coffey’s dedication to posthumous publications of Devlin’s work. It is vital, however, to remember that studying these poets individually, rather than as an assumed pair, results in a richer critical outcome. As Benjamin Keatinge and Aengus Woods argue in the introduction to *Other Edens: The Life and Work of Brian Coffey* (2010), “whatever loose affiliation existed in Paris before the war, no sense of common purpose could be sustained after the war, even if Coffey may have wished it” (5). Thus in my thesis I have
examined the poets first separately, then comparatively in an interchapter with the aim of advancing the critical understanding of the work of each poet as an individual artist.

In the second Interchapter I explore depictions of masculinity in long poems by Devlin and Coffey. Studies of the significance of masculinity in poetry are rare, and two invaluable books, Ian Gregson’s *The Male Image* (1999) and Vicki Bertram’s *Gendering Poetry* (2005), examine only the work of poets born during the 1930s and later. Crucially, Miller has argued that sexism in early Anglo-American modernist and high modernist poetry stems from changes in gender roles at the turn of the century (70-71). The study of masculinity in Irish nationalism is a still-emerging field, often mentioned rather than afforded extensive analysis. Joseph Valente’s forthcoming book *The Myth of Manliness in Irish National Culture, 1880-1922*, will be the first monograph study of masculinity specific to Irish cultural studies. A 2010 Irish Masculinities conference and the organizers’ forthcoming collection of essays indicate that there is a growing interest in the subject.

Brian Coffey wrote and published poetry into the early 1990s. His sixty-plus years as a writer and artist resulted in a hugely diverse oeuvre. Coffey, along with Mervyn Wall, served as a link between the “1930s generation” of poets and the partly overlapping work of Smith and Joyce’s New Writers’ Press and critic J.C.C. Mays during the 1970s and 80s. Coffey’s enthusiasm to preserve and promote MacGreevy’s and Devlin’s poetry aided in Smith’s dissemination of information about the 1930s poets. He also had strong
objections to nationalist violence, a feature which differentiates Coffey sharply from the other poets I discuss. I argue that Coffey’s literary contribution is manifold. Like Campbell, Coffey was inspired by the figure of the makar. Also like Campbell, Coffey created several artisan books and experimented with text and image though his collaborations with the English printmaker S.W. Hayter, as well as making his own images. The result, however, is vastly different from Campbell’s volumes. A key part of my exploration of Coffey’s work is a discussion of his writing from both before and after the significant twenty-three year interruption in his publishing career. His neo-Thomist beliefs, encouraged during his tutelage by philosopher Jacques Maritain, had a profound impact on his poetry: Coffey struggled to reconcile his creative process with his religious philosophy. It is noteworthy that Coffey’s neo-Thomism also led to a connection with politician and former playwright and poet Desmond FitzGerald. Along with Campbell, FitzGerald was a member of the Tour Eiffel poets’ group, although the two parted ways after ending up on opposite sides of the Treaty crisis.

In this chapter I also explore Coffey’s role as editor of Devlin’s *Collected Poems* and *The Heavenly Foreigner* and the progenitor of Devlin’s posthumous reputation in Ireland. Certainly there were other modernist poets who edited the work of their peers, but I would argue that Coffey’s editing of Devlin can be productively linked to his ethos of poet-as-maker. During the 1970s Smith and Joyce’s New Writers’ Press and the *Lace Curtain* were largely responsible for a renewed awareness of the work of MacGreevy, Donaghy,
Devlin, Coffey, Wall, and Donnelly. With the exception of MacGreevy all of these poets had attended UCD and published their earliest writing during the 1930s. Since the 1970s there has been some growth in the critical and academic attention given to these poets, yet as Smith remarked, “republication usually requires such a revival of interest” and the availability of books by most of them has been—and for Donnelly and Coffey remains—an ongoing difficulty for academics, students and readers of poetry. In their 1995 collection of essays, *Modernism and Ireland*, Davis and Coughlan recognised the “insufficient exploration of the fate of modernism in Irish literature after the first modernist generation” and “[set] out to reassert the importance in Irish literary history of these writers, and to further study them within their social, literary and cultural contexts” (1-2). Owing to the work of Mays, Davis, Coughlan, Dawe and Schreibman, criticism of Irish poetic modernism has advanced from the need to “reassert” the importance of these poets and has shifted towards that “area of further study.” However, despite the increased awareness of these writers not all critics have viewed their work as valuable. Edna Longley’s essay “‘Modernism’, Poetry, and Ireland” (2003) contests Davis and Coughlan’s classification of MacGreevy, Devlin and Coffey as modernist poets. Alan Gillis’s *Irish Poetry and the 1930s* (2005) and Justin Quinn’s *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern Irish Poetry, 1800-2000* (2008) include discussions of Coffey and Devlin’s poetry, yet they both also tend to downgrade their achievements. Furthermore, these poets have been ignored in at least two other relevant recent publications. In *Outrageous Fortune* (2007) Joe Cleary limits
Ireland’s literary modernists to a short list: “Wilde, Synge, Yeats, O’Casey, Joyce, Beckett and Ó Cadhain” (Cleary 93-94). Most recently Wes Davis’s *An Anthology of Modern Irish Poetry* (2010) omits MacGreevy, Coffey and Devlin; however, Philip Coleman’s assessment of this anthology as a “guide book with many gaps” encouragingly reveals that such exclusions no longer go unnoticed (Coleman 12).²

On the credit side, there is good recent published scholarship about the 1930s generation which has examined the work of each poet individually, such as Dónal Moriarty’s *The Art of Brian Coffey* (2000) and Alex Davis’s *A Broken Line: Denis Devlin and Irish Poetic Modernism* (2000). Keatinge and Woods’s *Other Edens* discusses Coffey’s experimental prose, poetry, visual art and philosophical work. Keown and Taaffe’s *Irish Modernism: Origins, Contexts, Publics* (2010), a collection of essays from a 2006 Trinity College Dublin Irish Modernism conference, includes two essays on MacGreevy and one on Devlin. Carr’s “Imagism and Empire” (2000) and Davis’s “Whoops from the peat-bog?: Joseph Campbell and the London avant-garde” (2004) are both pioneering essays which provide a critical framework within which Campbell can be discussed as a participant in both early Irish modernism and the Irish literary revival. While these previous monographs and collections of essays are invaluable in furthering scholarship on the work of all four poets, here I concentrate on revealing and exploring previously undiscovered connections.

---

Because Campbell, MacGreevy, Devlin and Coffey have been viewed piecemeal in preceding studies many of these connections have not been noted nor their relevance understood. Campbell’s collections of poetry, all published before 1917—before MacGreevy, Devlin or Coffey started to write their own poetry—make him an important early instance of the combination of modernism and Irish national projects.

Within each case-study chapter I have recognized creative features of each poet as an individual figure but I have also aimed to draw out those critical connections through close readings and particularly consideration of primary texts that have been previously overlooked or only briefly touched on in preceding critical discussion. Examples are MacGreevy’s unpublished articles on the Censorship Act of 1927 and cultural nationalism and Coffey’s unpublished chapbook, *The Old Gravois Road*, the antecedent to his best-known long poem “Missouri Sequence.” My attention to these documents brings into play broader cultural and literary contexts in which this poetry may in future be read and understood.

There have been relatively recent developments in the available information about these writers. In 1999 Devlin’s sisters donated a second bequest of personal papers to the Denis Devlin collection in the National Library of Ireland, which were only made available after the publication of Davis’s monograph in 2000. My discussion will be the first to avail of some of these additional materials such as previously unpublished poetry and invaluable personal documents. The MacGreevy papers are extensive, as MacGreevy was
a prolific correspondent throughout his adult life, but have been most frequently used as a source for information on other writers, poets and cultural figures. Indeed, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett: 1929-1940* (2009) is largely comprised of Beckett’s letters to MacGreevy, yet even so this impressive book does not include their complete correspondence. The MacGreevy papers are also valuable in researching the work and writing lives of both Devlin and Coffey; it is known that at least some of Devlin’s letters were destroyed at his request shortly before his death and the MacGreevy papers contain some of the few remaining letters and personal papers from Devlin (Coffey, “Heavenly Foreigner”). Perhaps more importantly, the MacGreevy papers include a complete draft of Coffey’s unpublished collection, *Image at the Cinema*, the only known copy of the book outside of the Coffey papers housed in the University of Delaware Library.

To my knowledge, I am the first scholar to discuss *Image at the Cinema*, its contents and its significance to Coffey’s writing life. Other papers of Coffey’s are also a rich resource and provide biographical and textual information not available through any published source. My discussion of *The Old Gravois Road* is taken from the only chapbook version of the poem (at Delaware). My discussion of Coffey’s role as editor of the Devlin estate and his account of the process are also based on my new primary research.

Peter Nicholls’s use of the term “modernisms” as the title of his 1995 monograph is a valuable identification of modernism as “a matter of traces rather than of clearly defined historical moments”, stretching from French
Symbolism through High Modernism and Surrealism and, arguably, beyond in postcolonial literatures (1). In his 1996 article Davis called for a “reappraisal” of Irish poetic modernisms in order to constructively examine and compare the poetry of the Irish Literary Revival, represented by Yeats, with that of modernist writers, specifically Beckett, Coffey and MacGreevy (186). Davis’s exploration of links between “paleo-modernism”—a term coined by Frank Kermode—and “neo-modernism” clarifies his use of the plural, “modernisms” and allows for “a modest revisionary approach to Irish poetry in the aftermath of the revival” (Davis, “Irish modernisms” 186, 195; Kermode 59). In this thesis the conception of modernism as a plural entity allows a discourse of Irish modernist studies which thus includes the paleo-modernism of Campbell, the nationalist modernism of MacGreevy, Devlin’s pursuit of the modernist muse and Coffey’s neo-Thomist and visual-art-inspired poetics. In discussing these poets it is also necessary to challenge still-prevailing depictions of Ireland’s literary community:

Literature in Ireland often seems like an inordinately claustrophobic affair of family squabbles, with their assured intimacies of knowing who’s who and what’s what. Part of this energy accounts, after all, for some of the great interest shown abroad in Irish literature. From the young Joyce looking down his nose at the patrician Yeats to O’Casey squaring up to the Old Man himself; Beckett falling out of Ireland to the marauding figure of Behan or Kavanagh’s castigation of Dublin, and so forth. These caricatures can get in the way though, and not only with the foreign reader or writer or student. (Dawe, "European Modernists" 36)

Certainly these false impressions of literary Ireland limit who is and is not included under the umbrella of Irish studies. More recently other critics
have elaborated on the need for a broader definition of Irish studies and indeed, “Irishness.” Nicholas Andrew Miller’s *Modernism, Ireland and the Erotics of Memory* (2002) argues for “ex-centric[sic] perspectives on Irishness” which “attempt to reveal those functions of memory that operate within Irish culture, but remain occluded, or even deliberately disallowed, when the question is framed in the register of Ireland’s isolation and right to self-possession” (12). Miller constructively asserts that it is necessary to acknowledge these often hidden or denied versions of Irishness in the interest of achieving a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of Irish literary history:

> Ex-centric perspectives are necessary because without them, scholarship about Ireland continues to barter in tautologies without apprehending the actual historical complexity and elasticity of cultural identity. To seek a discretely and authentically Irish discourse of Irishness is…not only intellectually reductive but historically inaccurate. (N.Miller 12)

Similarly, French historian Pierre Nora has argued for multiple perspectives within national memory: “…there are as many memories as there are groups, memory is by nature multiple and yet specific; collective, plural, and yet individual” (Nora 9). In exploring multiple modernisms it is also necessary to discuss the plurality of Irish memory and the different perspectives from which each of these modernist poets wrote. As argued above there are still sweeping and conventional assumptions made about these poets which need to be challenged and their contribution to the “collective, plural, and yet individual” memory of Irish history redressed.
This thesis is by no means an exhaustive study of its subject. Certainly, as indicated by the growth, noted above, in conferences and publications addressing the various aspects of this topic, there are myriads of further possibilities for increasing our knowledge and refining and changing our understanding. Given the scope of this thesis I have not been able to discuss the work of every poet in equal depth. The war interchapter has, however, enabled brief readings of several other poets, such as Mary Devenport O’Neill, Blanaid Salkeld, Sheila Wingfield, George Reavey and Charles Donnelly, Irish poets who have also been seriously neglected by Irish literary historians. Certainly the work of all of these poets deserves more careful examination. However, one of the most pressing issues at hand is the difficulty of obtaining their poetry and relevant biographical information, as even less has been published about these poets than about the main subjects of this thesis.

In spite of the sheer difficulty in acquiring their poetry several scholars have undertaken recovery projects. Sandra O’Connell has worked to promote the importance of Reavey’s poetry and publishing house, Europa Press, to Irish and more generally European modernist poetry. Her efforts have resulted in a symposium in honour of Reavey’s centenary and a forthcoming collection of essays, *George Reavey: A Centenary Celebration* (2010). Kathy D’Arcy has undertaken a recovery project of the poetry of Irish woman writers of the 1930s, ‘40s and ‘50’s as the subject of her doctoral thesis.
As indicated earlier, in Chapter One I assert the significance of Joseph Campbell’s early regional modernism to later Irish modernist poetry. By exploring Campbell’s periodical publications and the stylistic changes that occur in his poetry from 1905 to 1917 it becomes apparent that Campbell’s poetry makes a significant contribution to Ireland’s poetic modernisms. Through close examination of his collections leading up to and published during Campbell’s residence in London it is possible to examine his links between the Irish Literary revival and the proto-Imagist movement in London, emphasizing the significance of Campbell to the inception of Irish modernisms.

In the first Interchapter I address the complex sub-genre of Irish war poetry and the previously under-recognised intersections with Irish modernist poetry and poetry written during conflicts and wars from the Easter Rising through the Cold War. The unexamined assumption of “war poetry” as primarily British demands further enquiry and this chapter asserts the need for a re-examination of the Irish poetic canon in this connection. Drawing on Gerald Dawe’s anthology, *Earth Voices Whispering: An Anthology of Irish War Poetry 1914-1945* (2008) and primary source research material I explore alternative poetic narratives from both soldiers and civilians. As each of the main poets discussed in this thesis contributes to the sub-genre of war poetry, this interchapter is intimately linked to the main chapters. However I do not discuss work by Campbell, MacGreevy, Devlin or Coffey in this section. Instead, the argument
is conveyed through close readings of poems by Salkeld, Yeats, Donnelly, Reavey, Wingfield, Devenport O’Neill and Eugene Watters.

In Chapter Two I focus on Thomas MacGreevy. Many of MacGreevy’s poems are influenced by his memories of his participation in the Great War and of living in Dublin during the War of Independence and Civil War. MacGreevy’s writing reveals his multiple allegiances: he both elegizes and challenges the increasing cultural inhibitions of Free State Ireland. These close readings reveal that MacGreevy shared the hybrid identity of both experimental poet and devoted nationalist. This noteworthy position makes a relevant contribution to the discourse of Irish modernist studies.

Chapter Three is a detailed discussion of Devlin’s poetic portrayals of Ireland and his rejection both of the Literary Revival’s fascination with Celticism and of Dublin’s literary community. As mentioned earlier, my main focus in the chapter is his portrayal of women as objects of desire. Throughout his writing career Devlin struggled to find a way to depict what he described in a letter to MacGreevy as the “real” woman, yet, as I argue, his sustained fear of women and the female body results in his inability to portray women as autonomous beings. Instead, the female muses in Devlin’s poems are either worshiped or reviled and the speaker often describes his lovers in metonymic parts very much as in earlier traditions of lyric poetry. This chapter also discusses
Devlin’s poetic portrayals of Ireland, his rejection of Literary Revival’s fascination with Celticism and of Dublin’s literary community.

The second Interchapter adopts a comparative approach: I explore representations of masculinity and Irish politics, including heroic masculine imagery, in the long poems of Devlin and Coffey. Both writers produced some of their most skilled poetic experimentation within long poems, yet also some of their most scathing accounts of Free State government policy.

In Chapter Four I discuss the creative philosophy of Brian Coffey. Understanding his conception of the poet-as-maker is indispensable to grasping his artistic priorities. Through exploration of Coffey’s published and unpublished poetry I approach the motivation behind his twenty-three year hiatus in publishing. Furthermore I discuss Coffey’s relationship with Ireland, his poetic depictions of nationalism and his friendships with his contemporaries MacGreevy and Devlin. I conclude with a discussion of his role as the editor of Devlin’s posthumous publications and the way in which his religious philosophy affected his fulfilment of this editorial role.

Please note that pages 25 - 346 are currently unavailable due to a restriction requested by the author.
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