CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Theorising Ireland
Authors	Connolly, Claire
Publication date	2001
Original Citation	Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, Irish Studies Review, 9:3, 301-315 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1080/09670880120091991
Rights	©2001 Taylor & Francis Ltd. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Routledge in Irish Studies Review on 2001, available online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991
Download date	2026-11-01 15:04:46
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/1565



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Theorising Ireland

CLAIRE CONNOLLY

What difference has theory made to the study of Irish culture? A turn towards theory, initially the product of the vigorous efforts of dedicated individuals and groups like Seamus Deane and Field Day has now, more quietly, settled into something like critical orthodoxy [1]. This essay seeks to embed the turn towards theory within the wider cultural and political changes which it has witnessed and, in some instances, propelled. In the process I hope to draw attention to those aspects of Irish culture and society which are currently unseen by theory: issues such as asylum and the adoption scandal themselves stand questions in relation to Irish cultural criticism, awaiting the emergence of new critical practices.

W. J. McCormack, no fan of what he calls 'Weetabix Theory'—'incredibly dense and regular in structure, but lighter than its box' [2]—suggests that Irish culture is curiously resilient in the face of critical questioning. He contends that theoretical engagements with such concepts as 'Anglo-Irish literature', 'Protestant Ascendancy' and 'tradition' have a way of twisting back on themselves. 'If all the books ever written on the subject were laid end-to-end in a straight line they would on the instant curl into the shape of a question mark' [3]. But is Irish culture really so impervious to critical argument? In this essay I offer a focus on recent criticism—'the books… written on the subject', rather the subject itself—and, bearing McCormack's strictures in mind, try to map the contours and dimensions of that question mark as it has recently taken shape within readings of Irish culture informed by postcolonial, feminist and Marxist theories.

For Seamus Deane, writing in the 1983, the situation in the North of Ireland demands a 'dissolution of that mystique' perpetuated by the writings of Yeats and Joyce. Yeats here is taken to represent an essentially Romantic relation to Ireland, and Joyce a forward-looking

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

cosmopolitan one, with neither approach judged adequate. These twin poles, memorably described by Deane as 'hot' and 'cold' rhetorics [4], are recast by Richard Kearney as the cultural modes of revivalism and modernism, and rejected by him in favour of a 'transitional paradigm' which, he says, best describes contemporary Ireland in the late 1980s [5]. At the time, an invocation of 'transition' stood in marked contrast to the calls all around to 'tradition', which, with 'identity' and 'community' had come to stand as monuments to the impossibility of change. The seeming unavailability of any answer to the protracted violence in the North propelled many critics into a search for new kinds of question; and towards the discovery that, in cultural theory, the shibboleths of the Irish debate were being held up for analysis, read as strategically deployed terms and discussed as constructs rather than truths.

Equally, however, this sense of present urgency is to blame for a tendency to 'crisis talk' in Irish criticism. John Wilson Foster has remarked on 'the shared etymology of "crisis" and "critic"', and this linkage undoubtedly underwrites much of what has gone on since the 1980s [6]. Declan Kiberd provides a more materialist explanation for the tendency to open endings in Irish critical writing. Reversing the famous Wildean aphorism, Kiberd claims that the Britain of the 1980s was all too fond of its history, at least in the shape of tradition and Victorian values, whereas the builders of the new Ireland (or, as Kiberd presents them, the destroyers of Wood Quay, the Viking site which was sacrificed to Dublin Corporation's urban 'development' in the 1980s) wished only to kick over the traces of the past and move swiftly into a financially secure future—what Deane calls the 'escape from history into prosperity' [7].

Kiberd has been one of the most powerful critics of the callow amnesia of the twenty-six-county Irish state. His 1991 essay 'The Elephant of Revolutionary Forgetfulness' calls the Republic to account for its failure to properly commemorate the seventy-fifth anniversary of the 1916 Rising [8]. Kiberd remarks on the contrast with 1966, the fiftieth anniversary, which

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

from a present perspective seems like ‘a last, over-the-top purgation of a debt to the past’, a final pay-off designed to secure Ireland’s freedom as it ‘embarked on a headlong rush to modernity’ [9]. Yet Kiberd also (in an earlier Field Day essay) helps to explain the phenomenon he excoriates, which he connects to the sense of history as nightmare, making the Irish ‘futurologists of necessity’. ‘For them history is a form of science fiction, by which their scribes must discover in the endlessly malleable past whatever it is they are hoping for in an ideal future’ [10].

Deane embarks upon his project of ‘Remembering the Irish Future’ with the following thoughts on tradition:

> There is a story about Beckett in which he gives us an example of the way in which traditions may be but should not be made. When it was announced that he was suffering from glaucoma, he was besieged by reporters, one of whom, remembering Joyce and O’Casey, asked ‘Is blindness a tradition in major Irish writers?’ Beckett’s silence on the point is eloquent. [11]

Something more than disgust at the literary heritage industry fuels Deane’s ironic invocation of ‘a tradition of glaucoma in Irish letters’. There is an urgently felt need to dismantle disabling stereotypes of Irishness of all kinds. That this is a response to the demands of the present moment can be seen in Deane’s further warning: ‘we have still to beware the tradition of blindness, for it extends to English letters too’. He goes on to cite an example of contemporary myopia from a novel called Vote to Kill (1975), ‘in which we are proffered this kind of insight into the Irish problem’:

> grandmothers were at the root of the trouble in Ireland… They kept them at home, the Catholics, I mean. No question of old people’s homes. So they sit there by the fire, night after night, telling all the old stories,

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

> spreading all the old lies. That's why the different kinds of Irish go on hating each other. [12]

This author of this somewhat short-sighted view of the Irish is no less a figure than Douglas Hurd, previously Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, and Home Secretary in Margaret Thatcher's Cabinet at the time of Deane's writing.

The assault on tradition, then, initially took aim against outside (predominantly British) representations of Ireland. The Field Day directors, 'northerners' all, believed 'that Field Day could and should contribute to the solution of the present crisis by producing analyses of the established opinions, myths and stereotypes which had become both a symptom and a cause of the current situation' [13]. These myth-busting ambitions found concrete manifestation in the *Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*, which set out 'to re-present a series of representations concerning the island of Ireland over a period of 1,500 years' [14]. The connections between myth and literature, as with those between politics and popular culture, were to be scrutinised.

Looking back, the anthology seems a curiously nineteenth-century idea: three handsome, well-bound volumes, containing choice selections of prose and verse, destined to settle comfortably onto the shelves of libraries and middle-class homes. Published in 1991, it was oddly out of touch with emerging technologies for arranging and retrieving data, and even more radically estranged from the feminist sensibilities of many of its readers. Yet its somewhat Victorian aspect makes sense in the light of Field Day's and especially Seamus Deane's desire to animate a move away from nineteenth-century conceptions of the Irish [15]. The number of texts involved, however, and the sheer scale of the project (soon to be completed with the publication of a supplementary volume devoted to gender and sexuality) meant that the *Anthology* inevitably exceeded the intentions of its editors. It continues to fuel

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

debate. One of the major successes of the *Anthology*, admitted by even its detractors, is its contribution in making little known or difficult-to-access texts available within an authoritative and scholarly framework. Most recently, Stephen Howe's harshly critical survey of Irish postcolonial criticism pays its respects to the *Anthology* as resource and guide [16].

Luke Gibbons's section within the *Anthology* marks an important move in Irish Studies towards a new interest in criticism itself as a form of Irish cultural production. Critics have disputed Gibbons's choice of texts and, above all, his bias in favour of writers who adopt a nationalist perspective, but it remains the case that in according space to 'Irish cultural criticism' as a phenomenon in itself Gibbons helped close the door on what McCormack has called the 'quote-and-dote' approach to Irish writing [17]. Elsewhere, Gibbons has drawn an analogy with African-American culture and W. E. B. Du Bois's comment that while 'it is one thing for a race to produce artistic material, it is quite another thing for it to produce the ability to interpret and criticize this material' [18]. As this tone of self-reflection might suggest, twenty odd years from the introduction of certain kinds of theoretical thinking about culture and politics into Irish thought, writers have begun to take stock. A growing body of recent books and essays looks back over the late twentieth century and registers a new critical moment in Irish Studies—although, happily, it has yet to be called a tradition [19].

For some, though, Irish criticism still has to fully address its own history in the context of its present conditions of possibility. Richard Kirkland diagnoses a tendency in Irish critical thought to conceive of 'the institution as monolith', an unchanging and implacably hostile 'monument to its own permanence' which serves as a straw man in current debates [20]. Kirkland's call for a more dynamic engagement with 'the institution' does have potential to recast the turn to theory. Field Day now operates within a university press and its

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Critical Conditions series sits quite comfortably within the academy it has in part created [21]. Its origins, however, are in the pamphlets and also theatre, especially touring productions [22]. Some of the liveliest feminist contributions in the 1980s and 1990s appeared in pamphlet form also, in the LIP series published by Attic Press. There is a performative aspect to these interventions which should not be overlooked. John Frow follows Georg Lukcás and Theodor Adorno in claiming for the genre of the essay a special ability to match tentative analytic procedures to troubled times. The essay, Frow argues, is concerned 'with forms, understood as a central constituent of reality'. Furthermore, according to Frow, an essay involves writer and reader in 'the analysis of structuring processes' rather than simply replicating the order and pattern of 'structured substances' [23]. These oppositions are, of course, open to question but serve as a useful reminder that the material shapes assumed by Irish theoretical discussions bear on their content.

Such an analysis of material institutions must bear in mind the still powerful appeal to a 'fifth province', a call first heard in the pages of the journal *The Crane Bag*, a forum for some of the earliest theoretical debates in Ireland. The fifth province is described by Mark Patrick Hederman, one of the journal's founders, as 'the secret centre… a place where all oppositions are resolved' [24]. This place, or rather no-place, exists in some versions of the critical imagination as something between a fifth column and the four green fields popularly taken (at least since Yeats) to symbolise Ireland. David Lloyd pointed out as early as 1987 the significant continuities between 'the provision of a cultural "fifth province"' and the project of Irish cultural nationalism and in doing so called for a new kind of reading of the relationship between aesthetic issues and 'the question of Irish identity' [25]. Lloyd's own project on this occasion (a book on James Clarence Mangan) produced a historically and philosophically nuanced account of the aesthetics of cultural nationalism, but his wider call has yet to be taken up.

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

It is a testament to the success of many of these interventions that they have significantly moved the debate along while seeming merely to survey. Deane, for example, writes in 1984 of how 'In a culture like ours, "tradition" is not taken to be an established reality'. Yet many did (and do) take tradition to be reality; Deane's distinctive contribution is to adjust audience expectations even as he addresses them, skilfully putting into practice his own injunctions concerning style and, in the process, interpellating a new constituency of cultural critics.

As this might suggest, the language in which these debates have been conducted itself bears closer scrutiny. What Deane diagnosed in 1984 as a 'stylistic crisis' involved, among other things, a search for a new style. The languages of theory proved attractive to many critics of Ireland who were all too well aware of the redundancy of the existing languages of political commentary. Deane's suspicion of 'the magic words "tradition" or "culture"' [26] belongs to a wider weariness with the narrow discursive possibilities afforded at a time of political crisis. Edna Longley has commented on how 'in Ulster', 'there seem to be no staunch Catholics or devout Protestants' [27]. Writing from the Republic, Declan Kiberd borrowed Brendan Kennelly's coinage of the terms 'Protholics and Cathestants' in another attempt to break out of the linguistic impasse [28].

Witness too Tom Paulin's broadside against existing stylistic practices in his Field Day pamphlet, 'A New Look at the Language Question' (1983). In a witty attack on practitioners of prose who fail to give proper printed form to 'the careless richness of speech' in Ireland, Paulin finds evidence of only 'a slack and blathery manner' on one side of the border (Irish Times) and 'rasping business man's prose' on the other (*Belfast Newsletter*). He further condemns poor standards of copy-editing and the failure to lend any kind of

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

institutional support to either 'Hiberno-English' or 'Ulster English', arguing that 'because no scholar has as yet compiled a *Dictionary of Irish English* many words are literally homeless' [29].

Deane's 'Civilians and Barbarians' (1983) complains of how 'the language of politics in Ireland and England, especially when the subject is Northern Ireland, is still dominated by the putative division between barbarism and civilization'. Deane finds the languages in which solutions are offered equally problematic: the moral 'mode' or 'idiom' changes nothing, he argues, religious language serving merely to reiterate the political problems it purports to solve. After the hunger strikes of the early 1980s, Deane says, all that remained was a sense that 'both sides had played out their self-appointed roles to such a literal end, that there was nothing left but the sense of exhaustion' [30].

Denis Donoghue, perhaps the leading voice of an earlier generation of Irish critics, wrote a review of the first three Field Day pamphlets (later reproduced as part of his Afterword to the first collection) in which he explains his sense that critical theory is at least in part responsible for giving a particular shape to Seamus Deane's 'real anger', bolstering his 'anxious', 'angry' and 'brisk' expose´ of the myths of civilising Englishness. 'I infer that Deane has been reading Foucault', comments Donoghue,

> and especially his attacks on ideological systems—of prisons, the treatment of the insane, the definition of sexuality—which coerce the individual without even telling him that he is to be constrained. Ideology in that sense is a force of society which pretends to be a force of nature and therefore doesn't need to be justified. [31]

Donoghue is correct and even prescient in seeing the attraction of post-1968 accounts of ideology to Irish critics. Althusser is not as often quoted as Adorno, but it is at this meeting

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

point of Marxism, psychoanalysis and poststructuralism where I would position the general understanding of culture that now occupies the centre ground in Irish Studies. 'Ideology' in the Althusserian sense does not characterise a faith-ridden position or the political position of your enemy, but instead describes the interpellation (or hailing) of subjects in and for culture—an undeniably attractive formulation for critics keen to spring free from ancient political oppositions. Furthermore, the linguistic and grammatical category of the subject is central to Althusser's account, and the sense that subjectivity is both scripted by and itself constitutive of ideology finds many echoes in Irish culture.

The feeling that language was faded and worn thin with use was not, of course, new to 1980s Ireland. Writing in the 1940s in the aftermath of the foundation of the Free State and situated securely amidst its new institutions and structures, a civil servant living in Dublin compiled 'Myles na gCopaleen's Catechism of Cliche´' for daily publication in the *Irish Times*. Flann O'Brien's acerbic observations on the banalities of Irish speech are generally amusing (as in, for example, 'What is the only thing you have which you can plight? / Your troth') but are more often aimed squarely at the political banalities of the day. The death of a patriot gives rise to the following catalogue of cant:

> At what time did he speak Irish?
>
> At a time when it was neither profitable or popular.
>
> With what cause did he never disguise the fact that his sympathies lay?
>
> The cause of national independence.
>
> And at what time?
>
> At a time when lesser men were content with the role of time-server and sycophant.
>
> […]

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Whom did he marry in 1879?

A Leitrim Lady. [32]

Like Gustave Flaubert's *Dictionary of Received Ideas* before it, Flann O'Brien's catechism paid homage to the vacuous vocabulary which seemed so well fitted to the rapidly congealing orthodoxies which surrounded it. As with Paulin, O'Brien is concerned to give printed expression not only to the sporadic fullness but also the symptomatic hollowness of Irish speech.

It may seem an odd move from here to theory, so often accused of semantic excess and stylistic poverty, and dismissed as 'jargon'. Yet in the Irish context, theory has served to mobilise a search for a fresh style, first witnessed, perhaps, in a new-found fondness for inverted commas, testament to a desire to fence off concepts that had once sat squarely on the page, unchallenged. Writing in 1991, Chris Morash summed up his sense of the need for change in terms of the problem of language, asserting that 'if Irish cultural debate is to move forward, a new vocabulary must be found' [33]. Shaun Richards concurs, but in endorsing Morash's position embeds the search for a critical vocabulary within a wider cultural quest: 'and that vocabulary, and the critical texts through which it finds articulation, must be in touch with all the voices, past and present, whose reality has too often been denied in monological national narratives' [34].

Richards here points to what is perhaps the key difference between the criticism of the 1980s and 1990s and that of previous decades. Unlike the misgivings of an earlier critic of Ireland such as Sean O'Faola´ in, described by Terence Brown as 'deeply sceptical about the prospect of reviving anything of real worth from the Gaelic past' [35], or the mockery of Flann O'Brien, quoted above [36], recent theorists have actively sought to reconnect Ireland's

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

present to its past. Richards sees this in terms of shift from anti-essentialism to strategic essentialism, a concept he borrows from Gayatri Spivak [37]. An insistence on the value of cultural memory is central to this argument.

What was new then in the 1980s and 1990s was the move to revalue and reclaim the past, a desire which in significant ways took shape within, and was formed by, the prevailing cynicism. From the outset, theory has been in the forefront of the effort to dislodge the centrality of the mythology of modernisation, and to search out a more commodious space in which to conceptualise Irish society. Modernisation and its social correlative, liberal pluralism, was widely put forward by commentators on Irish life as the only escape from the mire of the past. But in 1991 Deane complained of liberal ideologies and especially their failure to address history: 'Pluralism has only one time—the present' [38]. Luke Gibbons's analysis of modernisation expressed a new tone of decisive opposition to attempts by bodies such as the Irish Development Authority to present Ireland 'as a high tech whose past was a purchasable commodity' [39].

The sense of modernisation as itself a mythology (as opposed to an escape from one) derived from a powerful sense that something was lost with the leap into the future. This went in parallel with the movement in historical writing about Ireland known as revisionism, essentially the writings of a body of historians concerned to combat narrowly nationalistic (which often meant popular) understandings of Ireland's past. Revisionism and theory might be expected to be allies, and in some instances were. Among Irish historians, Tom Dunne, for instance, has repeatedly called for a more textually aware historiographical practice, while his own research into Irish-language material continues to pose a challenge to cultural theory [40].

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Both revisionism and nationalism remain locked, however, in a debate which essentially concerns high politics—the history of rulers and administrations [41]. Other aspects of the past are either neglected or actively repudiated, and a sneaking suspicion of popular thematisations of the past (songs, stories, games) continues to inform the writing of Irish history. It is also possible to see how the seeds of another problem begin to germinate in this moment of dissatisfaction with modernisation. Pluralism has become problematically represented by women, gay rights and especially sexual politics in the thinking of some critics [42]. Irish feminists tend not to share the postcolonial desire to revalue the non-modern, and wish instead to concentrate on making good their escape from the not-so-distant past of Irish patriarchy. This is undoubtedly because feminism cannot but welcome such manifestations of 'modern Ireland' as equal pay, but also because of what remains to be delivered in terms of legislative change and social justice. In terms of finding a route through these oppositions, Angela Bourke's work now leads the way in rereading the rich detail of Irish social and cultural life (which includes sexuality) through the medium of documents in both languages, as well as within oral traditions [43].

Seeking a vocabulary in which to express a distrust of the seemingly all-prevailing ideology of modernisation, it is no surprise that many Irish critics turned to postcolonial theory. Its capacity to relativise such concepts as progress and modernity as well as to revalue older forms of social behaviour met an urgent need in Ireland to find a way out of a debate which threatened to ossify into a distinction between tradition and modernity. Those who see postcolonialism as nationalism in modern dress ignore the extent to which it offered a release from stock sociological formulae.

This confluence of content and form—the pursuit of change voiced in what was itself a new language—can be witnessed in Richard Kearney's description of the demythologising tendency of post-Revival Irish literature. 'As Beckett put it', reports Kearney, 'language

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

ceased to be *about* something and *became that something itself*' [44]. As the invocation of Samuel Beckett would suggest, the turn to theories originating outside Ireland has gone in tandem with a movement to read (and even redeem) as Irish those cultural figures who chose exile over home. Beckett notoriously preferred France at war to Ireland at peace, and James Joyce's long residence on continental Europe licensed a reading of his texts too as alienated from the land in which the author was born.

The turn to theory itself made possible what Marjorie Howes and Derek Attridge have called an 'Irish turn' in Joyce studies [45]; reconnecting Irish criticism with avant-garde readings of sophisticated Irish writers, while at the same time enriching the sometimes attenuated sense of context and intertext found in mainstream theoretical writing. This dilemma was discussed by Emer Nolan in her book on *James Joyce and Nationalism* (1995), where she uncovered a complicated set of connections between celebrations of Joyce the cosmopolitan, pluralist calls to forget history and revisionist suspicions of popular modes of knowing the past. Evidence that the problematic she outlined is now receiving the kind of close attention Nolan pioneered is found in a new collection of essays edited by Attridge and Howes. Taking its title from *Finnegans Wake* ('Gentes and laitymen, fullstoppers and semicolonials, hybreds and lubberds!) [46], *Semicolonial Joyce* reconnects Joyce's texts to Ireland via postcolonial theory while also opening up the role of issues such as race, sexuality and masculinity in that conjunction. The grammatical inflection on 'semicolonial' itself serves to situate Irish debates firmly within wider discussions of linguistic and cultural constructivism.

Theoretically inspired or informed readings of Irish writers originating outside Ireland have not always been welcome. Edna Longley has been the most stringent critic of 'intellectual holiday romances in a post-colonial never never land', her suspicion directed chiefly at Field Day's sponsoring of the initial contributions of Edward Said, Fredric Jameson

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

and Terry Eagleton to the Irish debate [47]. But this has not been just a matter of training the critical antennae of some admittedly clever individuals onto Ireland—as Longley seems to suggest in her attack on 'those who throw theory at Ireland, hoping bits of it will stick' [48]—so much as a desire to mobilise wider conceptual frameworks. This is an important distinction, for if those early contributions by Said, Jameson and Eagleton can seem blind to some specificities of the overlapping and competing senses of Irishness found on the island, they are part of a concerted effort to 'dislocate' Ireland (to borrow a term from Joe Cleary). It is also worth considering what such theoretically astute critics as Maud Ellman and Slavoj Žižek have had to say about Ireland and Irish texts in recent years, although again readers may bemoan the want of a deep knowledge of the Irish scene [49].

This back-and-forth movement between inside and outside, Ireland and elsewhere, texts and theory, has yet to come to rest. A good example of the continuing debate is the evident disappointment felt by Colin Graham in his response to Declan Kiberd's landmark book, *Inventing Ireland* (1995). In what is essentially a call for more attention to work by poststructuralist-leaning postcolonial critics such as Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak and Robert Young, Graham chides Kiberd for his application of the principles of postcolonial literary criticism and invocation of 'post-colonial analogies' in the absence of a commitment to more recent postcolonial theory [50]. Graham's sense that it is postcolonial theory which may possess the power to alter received patterns of thought is connected to his belief that 'contemporary postcoloniality has the potential to shatter the self-image of nationalism rather than to radicalise it' [51]. Along with David Lloyd, Colin Graham remains unusual in trying to conceptualise a postcolonial Ireland which does not have the singular and indivisible Irish nation as its terminus; a possibility both imagine in terms of their readings in Subaltern Studies [52].

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Yet it may not be possible for theory to detach itself from local conditions or to ascend to the critical position John Wilson Foster characterises as 'Olympian' [53]. Introducing a discussion of 'Ideologies of the Postcolonial', Robert Young reminds readers that 'postcolonialism offers a politics rather than a coherent theoretical methodology'. Indeed', says Young, 'you could go so far as to argue that strictly speaking there is no such thing as postcolonial theory as such' [54]. In one sense this unmasking of global pretensions is unnecessary in the Irish context where so little effort is made to disguise political positioning; in another, however, it is an important and timely reminder that even those critical theories which seem to offer the promise of a release from our 'worn oppositions' carry with them the traces of their own times and places. It is in something of this spirit that Edna Longley is so keen to point to 'the powerful sense of Palestinian dispossession' which suffuses Edward Said's thought, and which she sees as in turn infecting the Field Day project [55]. But a further critical step needs to be taken, in the direction of a detailed and extensive analysis of the use of particular theories in certain contexts [56]. David Lloyd opens his most recent book by remarking on how 'I find myself returning again and again to the insights Walter Benjamin gathered in his essay, "Theses on the Philosophy of History"' [57]. Similarly, Shaun Richards's review of *Inventing Ireland* implicitly opposes Colin Graham's strictures against Kiberd and uncovers a network of allusions to the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, filtered for Kiberd through his reading of Fredric Jameson's work [58]. A more sustained version of such reflections would be welcome.

Read alongside the other essays gathered in this Reader, the impact of Deane's ringing call to rewrite and reread 'everything, including our politics and our literature' now seems clear. Terence Brown spotted the ground-clearing potential of Deane's thought as early as 1988 in his essay 'Yeats, Joyce and the Irish Critical Debate' [59]. Equally, however, and in the same essay, Brown saw how the changing cultural landscape of 'our politics and our

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

literature' might itself constitute a challenge to the 'new readings' then getting underway. He reminds readers how 'until very recent times, the achievements of Yeats, and then increasingly of Joyce, dominated the critical field', leading to a great silence on such areas as Irish Victorianism or 'the new imaginative territory' of twentieth-century Ulster [60].

The challenge Brown lays down is to read earlier periods as something more than 'germinating soil' of the Republic. For this task to be carried out, however, those earlier periods have to be made accessible for study, the texts made available and the scholarly frameworks put in place. Brown himself points to the massive scholarly and editorial enterprise that is the publication of W. B. Yeats's correspondence, at that time just beginning to appear. He nominated the publication of the first volume of the Yeats letters as a 'liberating occasion' in Irish criticism [61]. A similar sense of liberation ought to attend the recent (and also ongoing) publication of a new and extensively annotated edition of the writings of Maria Edgeworth [62]; particularly because, as prime proponent of the nineteenth-century 'tradition' of Irish writing against which Deane continues to fulminate [63], a rereading of her work has the potential to radically refigure the relation between past and present cultural politics. This is the more so because her nineteenth-century status as an intellectually serious and politically important woman writer has suffered some severe knocks in late twentieth-century Irish criticism of a postcolonial bent [64].

It is worth remembering too that the work of rereading and the conceptualisation of acts of recovery can proceed side by side. David Lloyd's rigorous application of Deleuze and Guattari's conception of minor literature to James Clarence Mangan set a high standard for theoretically astute and historically aware readings of nineteenth-century Irish culture. W. J. McCormack's complex and difficult discussions of literary history continue to challenge, and Margaret Kelleher's recent work on women's literary history supplies a distinctively feminist aspect to these concerns. Her joining of concepts found in theories of cultural production

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

(such as those of Pierre Bourdieu and Richard Broadhead) to the material conditions of nineteenth-century Ireland seems to point a way ahead [65].

Irish feminist criticism has, as Geraldine Meaney puts it, 'largely understood itself as a demythologizing critique' [66]. It has launched its own attacks on debilitating stereotypes, well illustrated by Patricia Coughlan's pioneering essay on representations of women in the poetry of Seamus Heaney and John Montague [67]. Coughlan identifies a mystification of sexual politics in the name of Irishness (and with it such reified concepts as land, territory and the nation) and observes how concern to revise the myths of Irishness does not preclude—and may even in some instances rely on—a further idealising move. It is within this desire to demystify that I would locate the important distinction Emer Nolan draws (writing of Molly Ivors in Joyce's 'The Dead') between representations of woman as nation and 'woman as nationalist' [68].

Yet feminists on both sides of the border might well envy the postcolonial debate's ferocity and verve. It has, after all, stepped into ground already made sacred by centuries of history, the hallowed turf of 'the National Question'. Feminist theory exists in uneasy relation to postcolonial criticism, both in terms of close readings of contested texts, and institutionally within Irish intellectual life. There remains an almost reflex sense that, when 'Ireland' is at issue, feminism is a tangential of subsidiary concern. Taking Ireland as the main strand of inquiry can lead to silence on other subjects, as if it casts a dark shadow over critical thought. In the case of nationalism and feminism, Francis Mulhern convincingly reads the Field Day editors' notoriously poor headcount of women writers and editors as less 'a local instance of universal "prejudice"' and more the 'spontaneous' 'negative' and probably 'unconscious' effect of a positive emphasis on Irishness [69]. This translates into practical terms as a problem of place (one I have myself encountered in framing this essay), experienced by the

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

women's movement in Irish history as the injunction to wait patiently until such time as independence was achieved.

This is complicated by what is by now a routine turn to feminism as an example or exemplar in the course of writings on Ireland which seek to query existing patterns; a strategy deployed equally by revisionist and postcolonial critics. In his first Field Day pamphlet, for example, and in the course of an argument which seeks to establish the need for a concept of nationality, Terry Eagleton compares the situation of 'the Irish' with that of 'women'. However great the desire of women to subvert the very concept of sexual identity, he insists, they cannot escape 'the grim truth' that they are 'oppressed as *women'* [70]. The comparison between the 'oppressed Irish' and 'women' edits out the reality of Irish women. Such an alarmingly neat analogy elides a whole set of troubled alliances, conflicts and separations: sexual and other kinds of politics appear to inhabit different arena.

This analogy creates an odd temporal effect, which might be understood in terms of the 'chronobabble' or vacuous time-speak of which Francis Mulhern complains in his discussion of modernisation [71]. It suggests on the one hand that feminism is in the forefront of change, but on the other that its problems are behind it. Neither proposition is quite accurate. Furthermore, the gestural nod to feminism can become a dissatisfied turn away from its assumed failure to fill the role allotted to it in transforming 'Ireland'. John Wilson Foster's survey of 'The Critical Condition of Ulster' calls for the Northern Irish intellectual to follow 'the pattern in the women's movement' in discovering 'a mutual recognition, initiated by members of the oppressed group, that the two groups are equal and mutually dependent because *different'* [72]. The same critic, however, berated Irish feminism some ten years later for its failure 'to transcend the division between unionism and nationalism' [73]. Having awarded Irish feminism the unlooked for responsibility of leading the way in changing

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

existing patterns, Foster can then legitimately express disappointment at what he sees as its failure to introduce new paradigms into cross-border debates.

For Moynagh Sullivan, attempts to ground Irishness in the category of 'woman' perform a defensive move on behalf of the discipline of Irish Studies. She cites the conclusion to *Inventing Ireland* which produces a final image of 'multivalent Irishness' in the all-too-familiar shape of Cathleen Ni Houlihan, whose 'seamless garment once wrapped like a green flag round' her 'had given way to a quilt of many colours'. Sullivan is stringently suspicious not only of this particular metaphor but of all such efforts to capture the complexity of Irish experience within the rhetorical figure of 'woman' [74]. Above all, such identifications bracket the complexity of Irish feminism. Ireland may be made intelligible, but it is at the considerable cost of quarantining women's experience. There is, moreover, a structural weakness in the analogy: compare, for example, the different valencies of post-feminism and post-nationalism. It is broadly true that both seek to repudiate old ideologies; yet the first simply assumes an end to inequality while the second still strives to cope with the legacy of dependence by fostering new identifications [75].

What is to happen, then, in the place where feminism intersects with Irish Studies? The answer is surely to be found in closely focused and historically engaged readings of gender and sexuality, such as that provided by Anne Fogarty who writes of how Kate O'Brien uses 'the problem of sexual identity … as a point of leverage from which to question the conservatism of the Irish Free State' [76]. Eve Kofosky Sedgwick's writings on Oscar Wilde suggest another way forward. Her work on *Dorian Gray* invokes the multiple borders imagined within Wilde's text (between the sensuous body and the material world, the West and East Ends of London, the Occident and the Orient) and shows how each is broached at strategic points (by drugs, desire, the mobile figure of Dorian himself) [77]. Similar sets of oppositions are established and co-ordinated in the life and writings of Roger Casement, who

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

further stands as an exemplary instance of where textual scholarship has the power to transform 'our politics and our literature'.

In many respects Irish cultural production has gone in advance of theory in setting a queer agenda. Emma Donoghue's novels *Stir Fry* (1994) and *Hood* (1995) represent determined efforts to integrate lesbian life into the fictional mainstream, the very ordinariness of the depiction itself part of her agenda [78]. Joe Comerford's film *Reefer and the Model*, Neil Jordan's *The Crying Game* and Patrick McCabe's novel *Breakfast on Pluto* are exemplary instances of texts which actively enmesh plots of sexuality and nationality. In Jordan's preface to the script of *The Crying Game* he offers that film as an intervention at the point at which national meet sexual politics, an attempt to queer Irish nationalism by exploring the 'erotic possibility' of men's desire for men [79].

The Crying Game is self-consciously intertextual, scripted in knowing relation to the representations of male bonding found in Frank O'Connor's 1920s short story *Guests of the Nation* and in Brendan Behan's play *The Hostage*, first performed in 1958. *The Hostage* itself poses many of the key questions, as a play whose queer characters, in Elizabeth Butler Cullingford's words, 'symbolically affirm the power of homoerotic desire to breach national boundaries' [80]. This comment might be equally well applied to Patrick McCabe's *Breakfast on Pluto*, which itself stands in intertextual relation to *The Crying Game*. In the novel, a young Irishman is arrested in error, suspected of planting a bomb in a London pub and held under the Prevention of Terrorism Act. So far, so familiar. But in casting as his hero a day-dreaming cross-dresser from an Irish border town, McCabe multiplies the meanings of identity mix-ups and decisively queers the political pitch.

All this suggests that critical reflection on Ireland's culture is taking place in places other than the academy. There is a dynamic interaction between theory and creative writing,

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

especially in the works of writers such as Brian Friel, Paul Muldoon, Medbh McGuckian and Eavan Boland. One important development in this regard has been the development of a sophisticated and self-aware museum practice. The 1991 collection *Revising the Rising* contained a number of attacks on the failures to house or institutionalise the memory of Ireland's past, perceived as under threat from the amnesiac present. Since then the Famine Museum at Strokestown House in County Roscommon has led the way in exhibiting some of the most traumatic aspects of that past. In explicitly relating the nineteenth-century Irish famine to contemporary Third World hunger, the Irish Famine Museum puts into practice a central tenet of postcolonial theory, and advances a politics of cross-cultural solidarity [81].

It is in the area of official memory too where some strains in contemporary Ireland are at their most visible. Dublin Corporation notably failed to agree on an appropriate new public monument for O'Connell Street which would mark the millennium. In the North, while it is clearly too soon to begin to erect monuments to the victims of the Troubles, many commentators have noted the absence of public spaces within which to mark the changing circumstances of recent years. There is no Truth and Reconciliation Committee to mirror that established in South Africa, nor any effort to revise the meanings of official institutions that might parallel the reopening of Robben Island as a museum. The Republic, on the other hand, has perhaps been too hasty in its discovery of a usable past, as seen in the current rage for commemoration. In recent years the Famine, 1798, and now (more tentatively) the 1801 Act of Union are not only commemorated but commodified as part of a new national self-image. As Edna Longley, discussing the 'selective' nature of commemorations, comments: 'They honour *our* dead, not your dead' [82].

As the subject of theory, postcolonial and otherwise, 'Ireland' must be understood as both the twenty-six-county nation-state and the six-county statelet, and, furthermore, in terms of the connections and affiliations not reducible to these relatively new political creations.

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

Postcolonial theory has to process the relation between these two units which share the same land mass, the actual or wished-for connections with other places (ties with the EU, analogies with India, continuing connections with Britain, diasporic ties to the USA and Canada), and the dreams of those who see the two units as one. That this dream has the power to assume the role of nightmare in some versions of the political imagination must also be acknowledged.

There is a strong strain of anti-Britishness (or sometimes just anti-Englishness) in the early Field Day and Crane Bag debates. Hands are occasionally outstretched towards Unionism or Protestantism, but the frame remains that of the smaller island. Terence Brown puts it mildly when he says that 'the concern to establish that Ireland is a postcolonial society … has tended to write Britain out of the equation' [83]. Writing it back in means engaging with Britain's rapidly shifting and in some ways disintegrating sense of itself. Elizabeth Butler Cullingford's tracking of changing conceptions of Englishness in Irish theatre and film may be a good place to begin this process. Facing up to Britain as a theoretical challenge also means taking account of what Declan Kiberd describes as 'the rather large self-aware community of Irish in Britain, which has produced its own literature and body of writers' [84].

It is undoubtedly the case that changing material and political circumstances are motivating a reappraisal of past and present cultural forms, North and South, in theory and in practice. The search continues for a critical idiom capable of comprehending and maybe even changing Irish culture.

NOTES

[1] This has not been without challenge, of course. Stephen Howe's recent *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture* (Oxford University Press, 2000) delivers stinging criticism of postcolonial

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

theory as applied by Irish critics. However, Richard Kirkland argues in his review of Howe that such a view has come to seem 'slightly paranoid' and 'isolationalist': *Irish Studies Review* vol. 9, no. 1 (2001), pp. 99–100.
[2] W. J. McCormack, *Dissolute Characters: Irish Literary History Through Balzac, Sheridan Le Fanu, W.B. Yeats and Elizabeth Bowen* (Manchester University Press, 1993), p. v.
[3] W. J. McCormack, *From Burke to Beckett: Ascendancy, Tradition and Betrayal in Literary History* (Cork University Press, 1994), p. 2.
[4] Seamus Deane, 'Heroic Styles: The Tradition of an Idea', in *Ireland's Field Day*, ed. Seamus Deane *et al.* (Hutchinson, 1985), pp. 45–58 (pp. 45–46).
[5] Richard Kearney, 'Introduction: The Transitional Paradigm', in *Transitions: Narratives in Modern Irish Culture* (Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 9–18.
[6] John Wilson Foster, Introduction, in *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture* (Lilliput Press, 1991), p. 6.
[7] Seamus Deane, 'Remembering the Irish Future', RTE/UCD Lectures; 'Ireland: Dependence and Independence', *The Crane Bag* vol. 8, no. 1 (1984), pp. 81–92 (p. 82).
[8] Declan Kiberd, 'The Elephant of Revolutionary Forgetfulness', in *Revising the Rising*, ed. Theo Dorgan and Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha (Field Day, 1991), pp. 1–20.
[9] Declan Kiberd, 'The Elephant of Revolutionary Forgetfulness', p. 6.

[10] Declan Kiberd, 'Anglo-Irish Attitudes', *Ireland's Field Day*, pp. 83–105 (p. 95).
[11] Deane, 'Remembering the Irish Future', p. 81.
[12] Deane, 'Remembering the Irish Future', p. 92.
[13] Field Day Theatre Company, Preface, *Ireland's Field Day*, pp. vii–viii (p. vii).
[14] Seamus Deane (ed.), 'General Introduction', in *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*, 3 vols (Field Day and Faber, 1991), vol. 1, p. xxii.
[15] See Seamus Deane, 'Irish National Character, 1790–1900', in *The Writer as Witness: Literature as Historical Evidence*, ed. Tom Dunne (Cork University Press, 1987), pp. 90–113.
[16] Howe, *Ireland and Empire*, p. 5.
[17] McCormack, *From Burke to Beckett*, p. 1.
[18] Luke Gibbons, 'Alternative Enlightenments: The United Irishmen, Cultural Diversity and the Republic of Letters', in *1798. 200 Years of Resonance: Essays and Contributions on the History and Relevance of the United Irishmen and the 1798 Revolution*, ed. Mary Cullen (Irish Reporter Publications, 1998), pp. 119–127 (p. 119).
[19] See Gerry Smyth, *Decolonisation and Criticism: The Construction of Irish Literature* (Pluto, 1988); Howe, *Ireland and Empire*; Conor McCarthy, *Modernisation, Crisis and Culture in Ireland, 1969– 1992* (Four Courts, 2000); Colin Graham, "'Pillars of Cloud and of Fire": Irish Criticism in the Twentieth Century', in *Irish Literature and Culture 1900–2000*, ed. James McElroy (University of California Press, forthcoming 2001).
[20] Richard Kirkland, 'Questioning the Frame: Hybridity, Ireland and the Institution', in *Ireland and Cultural Theory: The Mechanics of Authenticity*, ed. Colin Graham and Richard Kirkland (Macmillan, 2000), pp. 210–228 (p. 211). See also Kirkland, 'Introduction: The Interregnum, the Institution and the Critic', *Literature and Culture in Northern Ireland since 1965. Moments of Danger*, ed. Richard Kirkland (Longman, 1996), pp. 1–18.
[21] The Field Day's Critical Conditions series is published by Cork University Press under the general editorship of Seamus Deane.
[22] See Martine Pehletier, 'Field Day and "The English–Irish Collision"', *European Journal of English Studies* vol. 3, no. 3 (1999), pp. 327–341 (p. 335).
[23] John Frow, *Time and Commodity Culture. Essays in Cultural Theory and Postmodernity* (Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 11–12.
[24] Mark Patrick Hederman, 'Poetry and the Fifth Province', *The Crane Bag* vol. 9, no. 1 (1985), p. 110: quoted in Shaun Richards, 'Field Day's Fifth Province: Avenue or Impasse', in C*ulture and Politics in Northern Ireland, 1960–1990*, ed. Eamonn Hughes (Open University Press, 1991), pp. 139–150 (p. 140).
[25] David Lloyd, *Nationalism and Minor Literature. James Clarence Mangan and the Emergence of Irish Cultural Nationalism* (University of California Press, 1987), p. xiii.
[26] Deane, 'Remembering the Irish Future', p. 84.
[27] Edna Longley, 'The Rising, the Somme and Irish Memory', in *The Living Stream: Literature and Revisionism in Ireland* (Bloodaxe Books, 1994), p. 77.
[28] Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation* (Hutchinson, 1995), p. 424.
[29] Tom Paulin, 'A New Look at the Language Question', *Ireland's Field Day*, pp. 3–18 (p. 11).
[30] Seamus Deane, 'Civilians and Barbarians', *Ireland's Field Day*, pp. 33–42 (p. 42).
[31] Denis Donoghue, 'Afterword', *lreland's Field Day*, pp. 107–120 (p. 111).
[32] Flann O'Brien, *The Best of Myles* (Flamingo, 1993), p. 203.

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

[33] Chris Morash, 'Workshop Report on Irish-Ireland', in *Culture in Ireland: Division or Diversity?*, ed. Edna Longley (Institute for Irish Studies, 1991), p. 122: quoted in Shaun Richards, Foreword to *Ireland in Proximity: History, Gender, Space*, ed. Scott Brewster, Virginia Crossman, Fiona Becket and David Alderson (Routledge, 1999), pp. xi–xv (p. xiv).
[34] Richards, Foreword to *Ireland in Proximity*, p. xiv.
[35] Terence Brown, 'After the Revival: Sean O'Faola´in and Patrick Kavanagh', in *Ireland's Literature: Selected Essays* (Lilliput Press, 1988), pp. 91–116 (p. 97).
[36] Sean O'Faoláin's desire to overturn Yeatsian mythologies in favour of new realities was mocked by Flann O'Brien's creation of a composite character called 'the plain people of Ireland'.
[37] Shaun Richards, 'Breaking the "Cracked Mirror": Binary Oppositions in the Culture of Contemporary Ireland', in *Ireland and Cultural Theory*, pp. 99–118.
[38] Seamus Deane, 'Wherever Green is Read', in *Revising the Rising*, pp. 91–105 (p. 97).
[39] Luke Gibbons, 'Coming out of Hibernation? The Myth of Modernization in Irish Culture', in *Transformations in Irish Culture* (Cork University Press in association with Field Day, 1996), pp. 82–86.
[40] See Dunne (ed.), *The Writer as Witness*; Tom Dunne, 'Ta Gaedhil Bhocht Cráidhte: Memory, Tradition and the Politics of the Poor in Gaelic Poetry and Song', in *Rebellion and Remembrance in Modern Ireland*, ed. Laurence Geary (Four Courts, 2000), pp. 93–111.
[41] See Kevin Whelan, 'Come all you Staunch Revisionists: Towards a Post-Revisionist Agenda for Irish History', *Irish Reporter* vol. 2 (1991), pp. 23–26 (p. 24).
[42] See Claire Connolly's review of Francis Mulhern's *The Present Lasts a Long Time: Essays in Cultural Politics*, in *Irish Studies Review* vol. 7, no. 3 (1999), pp. 395–397.
[43] Angela Bourke, *The Burning of Bridged Cleary: A True Story* (Pimlico, 1999).
[44] Richard Kearney, 'Myth and Motherland', *Ireland's Field Day*, pp. 61–80 (p. 70).
[45] Marjorie Howes and Derek Attridge, Introduction, in S*emicolonial Joyce*, ed. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes (Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 13.
[46] Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (Faber and Faber, 1939), p. 152: quoted in Howes and Attridge, *Semicolonial Joyce*, p. 1.
[47] Longley, 'Introduction: Revising Irish Literature', in *The Living Stream*, p. 28.
[48] Longley, *The Living Stream*, p. 28.
[49] See Maud Ellmann, *The Hunger Artists. Starving Writing and Imprisonment* (Virago, 1993) which discusses the 1980s hunger strikes. See also Slavoj Žižek's essay on *The Crying Game*, 'Courtly Love, or Woman as Thing', in *The Metastases of Enjoyment*, ed. Slavoj Žižek (Verso, 1994), pp. 89–112.
[50] Colin Graham, 'Postcolonial Theory and Kiberd's "Ireland"', *Irish Review* vol. 19 (1996), pp. 62–67.
[51] See his "'Liminal Spaces": Post-colonial Theories and Irish Culture', *Irish Review* vol. 16 (1994), pp. 29–43.
[52] Graham, 'Liminal Spaces', p. 35; David Lloyd, 'Nationalisms against the State', *Ireland After History*, pp. 19–36.
[53] John Wilson Foster applies this description and the notion of 'history as aerial photography' to 'Irish historiography written by Anglo-Irish historians from Lecky through Curtis, Beckett, Moody and Lyons to Roy Foster'. See his 'Strains in Irish Intellectual Life', in *On Intellectuals and Intellectual Life in Ireland*, ed. Liam O'Dowd (Institute of Irish Studies, Queens University of Belfast and the Royal Irish Academy, 1996), pp. 71–97 (p. 78).
[54] Robert J. C. Young, 'Ideologies of the Postcolonial', *Interventions* vol. 1 (1998), pp. 4–8 (p. 5).
[55] Longley, 'From Cathleen to Anorexia: The Breakdown of Irelands', in *The Living Stream*, pp. 173–195 (p. 183).
[56] See Shaun Richards's review of Kiberd's *Inventing Ireland*, in *Bullán* vol. 3 (1997), pp. 93–96.
[57] David Lloyd, Introduction, *Ireland After History* (Cork University Press in association with Field Day, 1999), p. 1.
[58] Richards, review of *Inventing Ireland*, pp. 93–96.
[59] Terence Brown, 'Yeats, Joyce and the Irish Critical Debate', in *Ireland's Literature*, pp. 77–90.
[60] Brown, Preface to *Ireland's Literature*, p. viii.
[61] Brown, 'Yeats, Joyce and the Irish Critical Debate', p. 88.
[62] Marilyn Butler, Mitzi Myers and W. J. McCormack (eds), *The Novels and Selected Works of Maria Edgeworth* (Pickering and Chatto, 1999).
[63] See Seamus Deane, *Strange Country: Modernity and Nationhood in Irish Writing since 1790* (Clarendon Press, 1997).
[64] See Deane, *Strange Country*, p. 31; Kevin Whelan, 'Writing Ireland: Reading England', in *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century. Regional Identity*, ed. Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (Four Courts, 2000), pp. 185–198 (pp. 191–192).

To cite this article: Claire Connolly (2001): Theorising Ireland, *Irish Studies Review*, 9:3, 301-315
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880120091991

[65] Margaret Kelleher, 'Writing Irish Women's Literary History', *Irish Studies Review* vol. 9, no. 1 (2001), pp. 5–14. See also Kelleher's essay, 'Charlotte Riddell's *A Struggle for Fame*: The Field of Women's Literary Production', *Colby Quarterly* vol. xxxvi, no. 2 (2000), pp. 117–131.
[66] Geraldine Meaney, 'Landscapes of Desire: Women and Ireland on Film', *Women: A Cultural Review* vol. 9 (1998), pp. 237–251 (p. 237).
[67] Patricia Coughlan, "'Bog Queens": The Representation of Women in the Poetry of John Montague and Seamus Heaney', in *Gender in Irish Writing*, ed. Toni O'Brien Johnson and David Cairns (Open University Press, 1991), pp. 88–111.
[68] Emer Nolan, *James Joyce and Nationalism* (Routledge, 1995), p. 170.
[69] Francis Mulhern, *The Present Lasts a Long Time. Essays in Cultural Politics* (Cork University Press in association with Field Day, 1998), p. 151.
[70] Terry Eagleton, 'Nationalism, Irony and Commitment', in *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*, ed. Seamus Deane (University of Minnesota Press, 1990), pp. 23–39 (p. 24).
[71] Mulhern, *The Present Lasts a Long Time*, p. 26.
[72] Foster, 'The Critical Condition of Ulster', *Colonial Consequences*, pp. 215–247 (p. 225). See also his essay 'Culture and Colonization' in the same volume in which he draws on Simone de Beauvoir to facilitate a comparison between 'woman' and 'The Ulster Protestant'.
[73] Foster, 'Strains in Irish Intellectual Life', pp. 71–97 (p. 88).
[74] Moynagh Sullivan, 'Feminism, Postmodernism and the Subjects of Irish and Women's Studies', in *New Voices in Irish Criticism*, ed. P. J. Mathews (Four Courts, 2000), pp. 243–251 (pp. 250–251).
[75] See Richard Kearney, 'Postscript: Towards a Postnationalist Ireland', in *Postnationalist Ireland: Politics, Culture, Philosophy* (Routledge, 1997), pp. 178–188 (p. 188).
[76] Anne Fogarty, 'Other Spaces: Postcolonialism and the Politics of Truth in Kate O'Brien's *That Lady*', in *Postcolonial Ireland?*, ed. Connolly, p. 344.
[77] See Eve Kofosky Sedgwick, 'Some Binarisms (II): Wilde, Nietzsche, and the Sentimental Relations of the Male Body', *Epistemology of the Closet* (Penguin, 1994), pp. 131–181; 'Nationalisms and Sexualities in the Age of Wilde', in *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, ed. Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer and Patricia Yaeger (Routledge, 1992), pp. 235–245.
[78] See Antoinette Quinn, 'New Noises from the Woodshed: The Novels of Emma Donoghue', in *Contemporary Irish Fiction: Themes, Tropes, Theories*, ed. Liam Harte and Michael Parker (Macmillan, 2000), pp. 145–167.
[79] Jordan, Introduction, in *The Crying Game* (Vintage, 1993), p. viii.
[80] Elizabeth Butler Cullingford, 'Gender, Sexuality and Englishness', in *Gender and Sexuality in Modern Ireland*, ed. Anthony Bradley and Maryann Gialanella Valiulis (University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), pp. 159–186 (p. 173). Cullingford is here drawing on Eve Kofosky Sedgwick's work.
[81] Stephen J. Campbell, *The Great Irish Famine: Words and Images from the Famine Museum, Strokestown Park, County Roscommon* (Stokestown Famine Museum, 1994).
[82] Longley, 'The Rising, the Somme and Irish Memory', p. 69.
[83] Terence Brown, Response to Questionnaire on 'Celtic Nationality and Postcoloniality', *SPAN* vol. 41 (1995), pp. 17–20 (p. 18).
[84] Declan Kiberd, Response to Questionnaire on 'Celtic Nationality and Postcoloniality', *SPAN* vol.41 (1995), pp. 36–41 (p. 41). See also Aidan Arrowsmith, 'Plastic Paddy: Negotiating Identity in Second-generation "Irish-English" Writing', *Irish Studies Review* vol. 8, no. 1 (2000), pp. 35–43.