“Wandering Rocks” as Subversive Map: Colonized Dublin and Cartographic Discourse

Why is there no map?

Why did Joyce not include a map in *Ulysses*? Among the curious printed matter that he sprinkled through the text are the headlines of Aeolus, a tabulated list of Bloom’s expenditures and an imposing black dot in Ithaca, and an antiquated musical staff in Scylla and Charybdis. A map of Dublin would hardly have been unreasonable from the standpoint of either eccentric visual content or publishing capabilities. In particular, it would seem an entirely logical interpretive aid for the most topographical of the episodes, “Wandering Rocks.”

But for those readers unfamiliar with Dublin proper, Joyce scholar Clive Hart began analyzing the episode in 1974 and ’75 with two intensive works of information design: a chart that cross-references the interpolated action with the locations of characters in the city and the time of day, and a set of maps—made in collaboration with Leo Knuth—depicting the streets and landmarks through which and around which the characters move. The chart, and in particular the maps, are intriguing not just for the assistance they provide in following the action of the episode. The maps remind us that there are many ways of representing the urban space of Dublin, and just as readers can critically interpret the text of “Wandering Rocks,” the practices of mapmaking and map reading are themselves critical discourses running parallel to traditional text-based interpretation.

The maps open a discussion of “Wandering Rocks” that demands as much attention to the *method* of interpretation as to the *conclusions* of that critical inquiry. Several questions arise: What kind of arguments can a critic make using a map as an interpretive device? What consequence does the abstraction of a map have on interpretation? What sort of Dublin are the critics mapping; and what sort of Dublin did Joyce map? These sorts of questions force us to think about the mapping of “Wandering Rocks” as a discursive field. I want to implicate the project of mapping the episode in a historical understanding of maps as instruments of power. “The social history of maps,” writes geographer J.B. Harley, “unlike that of literature, art, music, appears to have a few genuinely popular, alternative, or subversive modes of expression. Maps are preeminently a language of power, not of protest” (301).
The episode is itself an interpretation of the map of Dublin that Joyce had spread on a table in front of him while he wrote. “Wandering Rocks” is thus an intervention in the social history of mapping Dublin. Moreover, it is a “subversive mode of expression,” a textual remapping that we can read with and against Hart’s reordering of the fictional documentary of the city.

Harley does not provide a definition of what subversive maps are, what they would look like, or how they would operate discursively. I therefore propose a loose definition, beginning with the assumption that because there exists no concrete definition of what a subversive map is, it need not assume the standard graphic form of an authoritative map. It could be an alteration of an existing map. It could be a redrawn chart emphasizing un- or underrepresented areas, populations, or landmarks. Or, because the map can subvert the form and well as informational content of existing representations, it might take a radically different form—a detailed description of characters moving through a cityscape, for instance. “Wandering Rocks” is from one perspective a God-like view above the city at work, but it also a view from street level—a representation from the vantage point of the everyday and ordinary. The episode is a subversion of traditional urban mechanics and posits Joyce’s Dublin as a contested space within a colonial history.

My argument is not that Hart’s painstaking work to produce the maps of Joyce’s Dublin was in error or that his method of interpretation through visual understanding is flawed. On the contrary, literary scholars rarely even consider visual methods of interpretation. Hart’s methods are inventive and refreshingly creative, even if they are unnerving in their exhaustiveness. Joyce made liberal use of Thom’s Official Directory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in populating Ulysses with actual people and places catalogued in the institutional record of the citizens of the empire. Hart remarks sardonically on the “meticulosity bordering if not in the insane then certainly on the obsessive-compulsive” that went into the construction of Thom’s. And while I respect Hart’s dedication in hobbling around Dublin with a crutch in order to verify the foot speed of the one-legged sailor (which apparently “aroused the suspicious attention of a garda” [Hart 215]), employing such a method in the service of literary interpretation is obsessive-compulsion incarnate.
Rather, this project examines some of the questions that Hart’s work, including his mapmaking, raises about using visual methods to interpret literary sources. I first consider three texts together: Hart’s 1974 essay on “Wandering Rocks,” the Topographical Guide to James Joyce’s Ulysses (the first edition appeared in 1975, though I work from the 1981 edition), and the 2004 revision of that project, James Joyce’s Dublin. My argument will also deal with cartographic historian J.B. Harley’s theorization of mapmaking as a discourse of power. Following that, I will explore Len Platt’s understanding of the Dublin of “Wandering Rocks” not as an archetypical modern metropolis, but as a colonized city with the history of Anglo-Irish struggle literary written onto its streets and statues. Linking this understanding of cartographic discourse with a postcolonial vantage point shifts the interpretive perspective of the chapter from the God-like, omnipresent, modernist narrator Hart describes to a mapping of the historical city from below—from the perspective of the citizens of a colonized Dublin (Hart 190). Hart and his cohorts—Leo Knuth in the 70s and 80s and Ian Gunn and Harald Beck in the 00s—insist upon a visual realist approach to understanding the action of the book. My interest is not in questioning the validity of this approach but in teasing out what it reveals and what it conceals as an interpretive mode.

Hart; Hart and Knuth; Hart, Gunn and Beck: scholars and amateur cartographers

“There is a deliberate blurring of the distinction between fiction and reality,” Hart writes in his 1974 essay, “and the wider the reader’s knowledge of the latter, the more meaningful the former becomes” (186). His method maps the fictional events of the chapter onto the real Dublin and interprets the episode based on the differences between the two. Because the characters are moving in what is a “real” physical space, a Dublin that actually exists, visually understanding their movements through the city is crucial to an understanding of the interplay between the fictional characters and the living city. Essentially, visualization is interpretation because it allows the reader to access the fictional characters’ experiences of the city. “In so far as it is merely a conglomeration of discrete physical phenomena, Dublin belongs to Bloom as much as to any man; in so far as those phenomena cohere in a greater unity, Bloom belongs to it” (186). Hart’s project suggests that reading the episode requires a simultaneous reading of the city because the characters have agency within the urban space even as the mechanics of the urban space move
the people of Dublin in a modernist clockwork. The dual act of reading the episode and Hart’s visualizations of the episode produces a reading that understands the city itself as a text. The text of the episode and the maps each mediate the text of city in different ways. The maps are a static representation, whereas the episode presents a dynamic text composed of the interaction of city and citizens.

“The strength of his [Joyce’s] desire to mentally posses the city can hardly be over-estimated,” wrote Hart in 1974 (182). But whatever subtleties there were to Joyce’s intentions in “containing the city” in this episode, Hart’s maps are an overt attempt to wrestle the Dublin of “Wandering Rocks” into a tangible, interpretable form. The intention of my initial rhetorical question as to why Joyce did not include a map was to highlight the tension between the confusing, labyrinthine nature of the episode and the orderly rationality of the maps. This tension is simultaneously written into the fabric of the episode. On one hand, there is the all-seeing perspective of the narrator across the nineteen geographically dispersed sections and in the omniscience of the interpolations. On the other hand, the action of the episode happens at ground level, almost exclusively in commercial or public spaces and in the streets, as seen through the eyes of nearly thirty citizens (and a piece of garbage in the river) who navigate the arteries of the polis.

In many respects, Hart’s work is a process of reverse engineering, working through Ulysses back to the sources that Joyce used while writing the novel. He points out that Joyce “asked his friends and relatives to send him tram tickers, newspapers, portable scraps of urban life” (182). He looks also to Frank Budgen’s canonical stories: “Joyce had said, with allowable hyperbole, that he wanted Ulysses to be a documentary source from which Dublin, if destroyed, might be recreated” (182-183). “Joyce wrote Wandering Rocks with a map of Dublin before him on which were traced in red ink the paths of the Earl of Dudley and of Father Conmee. He calculated to a minute the time necessary for his characters to cover a given distance of the city” (199). Hart checks Thom’s for every business and character in to sort the real from the invented. Hart, Knuth and Gunn almost certainly produced more maps than Joyce worked from, and Hart himself hit the pavement with a stopwatch to verify the travel times.

In his 1974 essay, Hart pays close attention to the physical space the characters inhabit, but arcs that exterior attention back into the internal concerns of Stephen and Bloom and assesses their
involvements with the outside world. An alternative approach would be to examine the historical and political contexts of the urban space. Hart hints at this: “the outmost of the chapter’s nineteen sections present, in Conmee and the Viceroy, personifications of ‘a Roman and a British flag,’ hoisted in uneasy peace over Ireland. Joyce’s mockery of their twin domination, while both biting and amusing, is a relatively simple piece of social commentary” (186). Hart, however, places more emphasis on the apolitical meanderings of the two main characters. Bloom, he argues, navigates the inanimate world while Stephen encounters other people—a simple piece of literary commentary. Platt’s reading of the chapter, discussed in depth below, is precisely the opposite. For Platt, the historiographic knowledge of the peripheral characters—Conmee, for instance, and in particular Hugh C. Love—and the politically contentious locations they travel past are central to understanding the colonized city. And as Richard Brown points out, the text is the city and the city a text; interpreting the chapter demands a particular reading of the city (59). I defer to Platt’s approach not because I believe it is the “correct” interpretation of the chapter, but because it provides a richer portrait of the episode as a historical document open to investigations that expose power discourses in cartography and city planning.

For Hart, the labyrinth of the episode is strewn with narrative traps that can potentially lead a reader into a false or confounded comprehension of the action. Interpretation means carefully avoiding these pitfalls. “Diligent scrutiny enables him [the reader] to emerge unscathed, or almost so” (188). He refers to the apparent objectivity of the narration and the repetition of details rendered as if each were encountered for the first time. Hart again puts his engineer’s cap on backwards and recounts the Budgen story of Joyce playing a board game called “Labyrinth” with his daughter. Repeated playing allowed Joyce to determine six primary logical errors that would spell defeat in the game. Hart admits (perhaps begrudgingly) that he has “been unable to reconstruct Joyce’s ‘six main errors of judgement’” (189). Even without access to the materials of Joyce’s trap-making, Hart’s system for avoiding the logical pitfalls of the chapter adopts the “art” of the episode Joyce recorded in the schema: mechanics. Two appendices accompany Hart’s 1974 essay. The first is an annotated listing of the thirty-one interpolations he counts. The second (redrawn at a larger scale and with a more legible design in James Joyce’s Dublin) is a chart cross-referencing the locations and interactions of each character through all sixty-five minutes of the
episode. His interpretive methods each respond directly to the schematic features of the episode: the
determinism of charts is a mechanistic intervention, and the maps drawn with Knuth and later with Gunn
are a technique for navigating the labyrinth.

Despite the extensive work behind these innovative methods, neither is self-reflexive criticism.
The chart demonstrating the sequence of action and the maps of 1975 and 2004 essentially reorganize the
information found in the episode. Granted, such reorganization allows a reader to cut through narrative
fog of the city. With reasonable precision, the chart lets us read large swaths of simultaneous action in a
single glance: at 3.16 pm, Conmee boards the tram, Corny Kelleher chats with the constable, the one-
legged sailor is at 7 Eccles Street, Molly throws a coin in charity, and Lenehan and M’Coy are at
Merchant’s Arch. It also provides a visual plot of each character through the hour: we see Boylan at six
intervals between 3.05 and 3.50, while all action involving Katey and Booty is compressed in the twelve
minutes between 3.14 and 3.26. But the characters become little more than entries on a train schedule.
The 2004 maps include a useful diagram tracing the cavalcade through the city. But it marks only the start
point, the end point, and streets traveled—there is no representation of the reactions of Dubliners, which
indelibly color the cavalcade of the text. These reorganizations allow a different reading of the episode, but
gloss the assumptions of their reorganization. [See the The Cavalcade map in the Appendix.]

Hart laments in the 1981 A Topographical Guide to James Joyce’s Ulysses that it was too expensive
to print the maps in color, and without color the route lines tracing the paths of the characters become
too jumbled in black ink to discern. Therefore, only the routes of Conmee and the cavalcade appear. To
understand Hart’s concern, we need only look at the map spread at the opening of the chapter on
“Wandering Rocks” in Don Gifford’s Ulysses Annotated. It attempts on a single black and white map with
an inset to plot the whereabouts and movements of some twenty characters and locations. Broken by a
wide gutter and without any indication of time with regard to movement, the chart is serviceable but
necessarily undetailed and crude.
Gifford’s rather unhelpful map for the episode.

Efficiently tracing the movements of the characters through the 1975–81 maps presents some initial difficulties. The simple act of attempting to follow the descriptions of the action through the fifteen corresponding maps is problematic because it demands reorienting oneself to a different section of the city drawn at a different scale and at a different level of detail for each section. Gunn’s maps of 2004 solve many of these problems by using soft green tones to differentiate character routes and landmarks from the background information of unimportant streets and buildings. Moreover, the large-format spreads of *James Joyce’s Dublin* offer two crucial advantages over their loose-leaf predecessors. First, the maps appear immediately adjacent to the descriptions of the action, precluding the continuous cross-referencing between the summary, the map index, and maps themselves. Second, the profusion of additional maps rendered in high detail allows one map to depict the movement of one character in one section, rather than serve as a single reference for multiple chronologically disparate translations.
But the exercise of trying to follow the summary of movements through the cruder early maps is actually quite instructive because the level of detail and interconnection between the maps necessary to facilitate the smoothest reading would require an ever-increasing level of detail. “Since Joyce’s use of place is so extensive and so intensive, it is not practicable to attempt to draw fully detailed maps of everything relevant to the book,” Hart writes in the *James Joyce’s Dublin*. “Due to the changing focus and range of action in *Ulysses* it is not possible to maintain a consistent map scale throughout the book” (89). Rather than attempt a large-scale map with many details, Hart and Knuth and Hart and Gunn took the more manageable approach of drawing many small maps with only the necessary details. In order to legibly follow all movements of all characters—noting street names, landmarks, and individual addresses—one single image would require at the very least a map several feet across by several feet high. This is not merely impractical from a publishing standpoint; it brings us asymptotically closer to the realization that a realistic map of adequate size and detail would have a scale of one inch to one inch. It would be the actual size of the city of Dublin.

For this reason, one useful way of understanding “Wandering Rocks” as a subversive map is to think of it as a demonstration of the difficulty of using maps, which are abstractions of the city space, to understand the concrete mechanics of Dublin. A miniscule map of the city spread across two pages of *Ulysses* would have done little more than mock the reader, offering perhaps a glimmer of help in comprehending the movements of the episode that would fade as Father Conmee approached the illegible smudge that would be Mountjoy Square.
J.B. Harley and the discursive power of cartography

Mapmaking is a discourse, and Harley cites Foucault in claiming that as a discourse, it is implicated in a hierarchy of discursive power. “Cartography,” he writes, “can be ‘a form of knowledge and a form of power’” (279). There is always a power dynamic in the construction of a map. Governments produce maps that depict the natural environment overlaid with political boundaries. Maps, Harley points out, are instruments of war, propaganda, and surveillance. He goes on to quote Anthony Giddens, who theorizes maps as “authoritative resources…controlled by the state: ‘storage of authoritative resources involves above all the retention and control of information or knowledge’” (279). That is, maps are one component of a centralizing system dictating what subjects can and see and know about the world.
The institutions that produce knowledge through maps influence how people think about the space they inhabit and how they can make use of that space.

With this theoretical groundwork, Harley describes how, beginning in the fifteenth century, the geometric division of territory on maps embedded a rationalist logic of power within those representations. This rationalism abstracted maps from the social and political realities of the spaces in question. “The graphic nature of the map gave its imperial users an arbitrary power that was easily divorced from the social responsibilities and consequences of its exercise. The world could be carved up on paper” (282). Physical space abstracted and visualized in a rationalist image is space to which authoritative forces can lay claim. The reality of owning the image can then become the reality of owning the space it represents. “Maps as an impersonal type of knowledge tend to ‘desocialize’ the territory they represent,” Harley writes. “They foster the notion of a socially empty space” (303). Hart and Gunn’s maps are an interesting exception, because they are deliberate attempts to socialize the impersonal maps of Dublin by populating them with the inhabitants of “Wandering Rocks.” Their maps represents a bridge from the “desocialized” Dublin of a bare political map to the Dublin of the episode that exists through the social interactions of its inhabitants.

But the God-like power to “carve the world up on paper” depends in part on the acceptance of cartographic information by political subjects. The discourse of maps influences real perceptions of the world because the aesthetics of cartography imbue maps with a rationalist objectivity. Maps operate not as arguments about the world open to discussion, but as incontrovertible authoritative statements. “That maps can produce a truly ‘scientific’ image of the world, in which factual information is represented without favour, is a view well embedded in our cultural mythology,” explains Harley (287).

Hart, Knuth, and Gunn’s project—the making up maps—relies upon that objective discourse. The aim is to produce a realist visual understanding of Dublin—but as Hart makes clear, this realism is simultaneously historical and contemporary. “The maps reproduced here,” Hart writes of the 1981 images, “are to some extent a compromise between the old Dublin and the new, and are designed to help the reader to find his bearings most easily” (Hart and Knuth 38). That is, realism depends not just what was real in 1904, but on what was real in 1981. The two collapse in order that the reader can undertake
what Hart calls “practical criticism”—tracing the routes of the characters on foot through the streets. The maps of each edition and the photographs of the 2004 edition can thus function as a sort of self-guided tourist manual. Hart, Gunn and their collaborator Beck are explicit in the introduction to the 2004 edition that the objectivity of the maps is part of an academic agenda. “Scholarly endeavor has largely turned aside from a focus on the realist aspects of Ulysses. In this new edition we hope to regenerate interest in that attention to sticks and stones without which we believe the book cannot be adequately understood” (9). But plotting sticks and stones as a realist enterprise—filling in the images of Dublin that Joyce did not include in “Wandering Rocks”—elides the subtleties of the chapter that construct a subversive portrait of the city.

The clean green and black maps of the 2004 project are computer generated and contain details as small as the footprints of individual houses because they are based on Irish Ordinance Survey maps from the turn of the century. Ordinance Surveys are precisely the sort of institutional, authoritative maps on which Harley’s critique of cartographic discourse focuses; they from an integral tool of the imperial apparatus that managed colonized Ireland.

Basing the interpretive maps on those of the Irish Ordinance Survey adds another layer of rationalism that the more schematic maps of 1981 lacked. But the use of such an “authoritative resource” in the apparatus of interpretation sets up a radical contrast with Platt’s 2002 critique of Hart’s original essay.

Platt’s historiography

Platt argues that “Wandering Rocks” presents Dublin as a city ragged with the wounds and scars of its conflict-ridden history. His concern is the preoccupation of the narrator and the characters with the history of the city and the contested significance of streets, bridges and landmarks. “In Hart’s analysis,” Platt claims, “‘Wandering Rocks’ becomes not just representative of Dublin; it somehow reconstructs the character of modern urban life” (142). The determinism of Hart’s chart of “Times and Places” is a symbol of this clockwork city, in which characters move like tiny machines, and city life consists of the anonymity, quotidian transactions, and chance encounters representative of any western metropolis. Platt
counters this tendency to cast Dublin as the “Everycity.” “This episode does undoubtedly deal in a
dynamics of modern urbanism, but the Dublin reproduced here is not just any city…This city is
individuated as a city of Empire, for instance, not just as a modern metropolis” (143). This specificity
subverts the notion of anonymity. This is not the Everycity with Bloom, the Everyman, at the center of the
episode. This is Dublin, 1904.

This insistence on seeing Joyce’s Dublin as a city of empire “places Dubliners on the streets of a
famous colonial design. The design evokes pre-twentieth-century authority systems. This is old-fashioned
Church and Empire as opposed to modern nation state” (Platt 143). In contrast to the static authority of
maps, which are materialist constructions of the ruling power, the city becomes a living rhetorical space
where its inhabitants grapple with their history within in the context of everyday, ordinary life. If the city
is a text of indeterminate meaning, then the citizens have the agency to adapt it to their own conceptions
of history. “‘Wandering Rocks,’ the construction of Dublin’s streets under the rule of Empire, takes the
debate about cultural politics into the streets” (Platt 144).

Platt claims that the episode constructs the city through a “roll-call” of historical figures and
through a catalogue of places significant to—or named after figures of—imperial history. His list includes
Great Charles Street, William Street, George’s Quay and James’s Street, all named for English kings. St.
Mary’s Abbey, according to Lambert, is “the most historic spot in all Dublin” (Joyce 230). There is the
controversial O’Connell Bridge, Kildare Street, London Bridge Rd, Castleyard Gate, Parliament Street,
Bloody Bridge, Queen’s Bridge, “and the statue of King Billy’s horse” (Platt 145). While the names
reproduced here do not exhaust Platt’s list, they are sufficient to underscore his point that “these
personages and street names commemorate something quite other than a vibrant national culture. They
are the markers of an imperial history which has had it presence stamped very firmly over the old stones
of a modern urban landscape” (146).

For Platt, rendering a textual Dublin with so many references to colonized space constructs an
anglicized city whose history rests in the hands of the oppressors. His conclusions echo Harley’s, deeming
it a “topological delineation of the ‘plantation’” authenticating “ownership, not just of material things, but
of the historical process itself” (Platt 146). And while Platt nods to the possibility of reading “dissent and
resistance...in the street names and historical personages,” he finds the resistance unconvincing in the face of the overwhelming Anglo-Irish presence. In the assimilated city, place naming turns history into ritual, sanitizing it, rendering it safe. Moreover, the episode declines to invoke locations that the English authority would rather not commemorate—cartographically or otherwise. “Some kinds of history are completely invisible. There is no Whiteboy Square or Fenian Arcade of Famine Avenue in ‘Wandering Rocks’” (Platt 146). Among all possible representations, the episode is merely one calculated mapping of the city. Harley saliently reminds us that “Maps—just as much as examples of literature or the spoken word—exert social influence through their omissions as much as by the features they depict and emphasize” (290).

But city streets are still a site of contestation because Nationalist history refuses erasure and the colonized space remains a negotiated space. “The colonized consciousness,” Platt explains, “is generated in a maze of detail, in divided loyalties, ambiguous gestures, and in subtle deferences” (153). Andrew Gibson traces one of the prime examples of divided loyalties written on contested space in “Wandering Rocks.” The narrator twice mentions O’Connell Bridge (Joyce 235, 240), while Kernan refers to it as “Carlisle bridge” (Joyce 240). “The latter appellation,” Gibson points out, “being indicative of Kernan’s political sympathies” as a loyalist—Carlisle was viceroy when the bridge was erected. Under the influence of Parnell, he continues, “The struggle over street names...began in December 1884 when...the [Dublin] Corporation decided to rename certain Dublin streets after Nationalist patriots...For the first time, it was possible for ordinary Dubliners to feel that they had a share in political power” (46). The difference in nomenclature is an indication of the city’s own “divided loyalty,” and the inclusion of such a detail suggests that the fabric of the episode is not an “authoritative resource”—it is not a record of fixity, but a record of contention.

Thus, we can read Platt’s understanding of the Anglicized history written into so many streets and landmarks in reverse. The assimilated, sanitized space is a backdrop against which we can discern elements of contested history, which are gestures subverting a static reading of Dublin history. O’Connell Bridge is one such gesture among many.
Further urban dissent

In section seven, “Five tall white-hatted sandwichmen between Monypeny’s corner and the slab where Wolfe Tone’s statue was not” interpolate themselves in the midst of Miss Dunne typing the date (Joyce 229). Gifford summarizes the significance of the slab: it was laid in 1898 in preparation for a statue of Theobald Wolfe Tone, an eighteenth century patriot who’s Society of United Irishmen “envisioned the union of Protestant and Catholic Ireland to work toward constitutional independence as a republic on the model of the United States and Revolutionary France.” Wolfe grew more radical and sought aid from France in order to instigate a rebellion against English rule. This ploy failed; he was captured and sentenced to death, committing suicide in prison (Gifford 267). Tone, Gifford notes, “is outside the mainstream of the Irish revolutionary tradition, since his republicanism would have appeared to Catholics (and in part to Protestants) as atheism.” In this case, it is not the presence of the statue that marks a subversive historical discourse at street level. Rather, the absence of the incomplete statute signifies the contested nature of even the rebellious narratives. Presumably, the ambivalence of Tone’s legacy delayed the erection of his monument. Subversions of hegemonic history are themselves rife with contention.

In section twelve, Kernan approaches Island street and it occurs to him that “Somewhere here Lord Edward Fitzgerald escaped from major SIR. Stables behind Moria house” (Joyce 214). Fitzgerald was also involved with the Society of United Irishmen as president of the military committee. He was “regarded as the master spirit behind the plans for the Rebellion of 1798.” Denounced by the authorities, he went into hiding in March of 1798 with a £1000 price on his head. Henry Charles SIR, the ruthless town major of Dublin, traced him two months later and Fitzgerald was mortally wounded when finally arrested. While in hiding, he surreptitiously visited his wife, Pamela, at the back of the stables at Moria house. The house belonged to Francis Rowden, earl of Moria, who gave Pamela sanctuary during the manhunt (Gifford 275). For Kernan, the historical significance is trivial. “Damn good gin that was,” is his next thought (Joyce 241). But from the perspective of reader and narrator, this is the conflict-ridden history of the city lurking in the alleyways.

John Howard Parnell, city marshal, is shirking his duties. Rather than maintaining order in the day’s meeting of the Dublin Corporation, he is playing chess at the Dublin Bread Company. Jimmy Henry
complains of his absence in section fifteen, wanting to know “Where was the marshall,” and Mulligan identifies Parnell quietly translating his white bishop in section sixteen (Joyce 247, 248). This dislocation is of little political consequence compared to the absent markers of Tone and Fitzgerald. What is significant is the playful subversion of civil procedure. According to Henry, the meeting was riotous. In ironic contrast, the narrator maps Parnell in the somber D.B.C. His place in space is a thumb at the nose of the bureaucracy.

When the cavalcade finally barrels through the city center, the narrator proclaims with scathing irony: “The viceroy was most cordially greeted on his way through the metropolis” (Joyce 252). Kernan, who would indeed offer genuine respects, is an inaudible spec on the wrong side of the river. The cavalcade goes “unsaluted” by Mr Dudley White; Richie Goulding merely “saw him with surprise”; the elderly female “smiled credulously”; Simon Dedalus lowers his hat to avoid looking; Lenehan and M’Coy merely “watched the carriage go by”; John Wise Nolan “smiled with unseen coldness”; Haines gazes down “gravely” from the D.B.C. Many onlookers are unimpressed or incredulous, but the city itself is perturbed. “From its sluice in Wood quay wall under Tom Devan’s office Poddle river hung out in fealty a tongue of liquid sewage” (252). While the unimpressed citizens remain civil, the physical underbelly of the city vents its displeasure at the colonial magistrate. The explicitness of this gesture is all the more emphatic given that the Poddle river has been moved several hundred yards west “for the convenience of fiction” (Gifford 285).

The tongue of sewage is a subversive gesture from the city itself, but further along on the cavalcade route, the horses of the viceroy’s entourage and an equestrian statute recognizing the repressive history of the crown seem in consort. “Where the foreleg of King Billy’s horse pawed the air Mrs Breen plucked her hastening husband back from under the hoofs of the outriders” (253). The statue of King William III commemorates the monarch who crushed an Irish rebellion in 1690 and turned the country into a penal colony. Gifford notes that the landmark, situated outside Trinity College at one of the busiest intersections of the city, was “much-vilified and frequently vandalized” before it was finally removed in 1929 (285-286). If not for Mrs Breen’s reflexes, the cavalcade would have crushed another Irishman like William two centuries prior.
Considered together, this handful of subversive instances peppering the episode presents the image of a Dublin that will not submit to an authoritative representation. The Dublin of the episode will not recognize the authority of the viceroy; it will not run its own government in an orderly manner; and it will not forget the struggle between the crown and the Nationalists. Conflict is the fabric of the city, and maps constructed in the service of hegemonic power do not represent conflict. In representing these conflicts, the episode is an alternative to the traditional understanding of a city map. Dublin is not an authoritative statement—it is an ongoing argument.

[See the Subversive Map in the Appendix.]
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The Cavalcade
From James Joyce’s Dublin
The beginnings of a Subversive Map of Dublin.

The route of the viceroy. Fealty, unnecessary.

O’Connell Bridge. (Not Carlisle Bridge.)

Moria House, where Fitzgerald hid from Major Sirr.

Where King Billy and the cavalcade almost trampled Mr Breen.

Wolfe Tone’s memorial slab.

“The Poddle river hung out in fealty a tongue of liquid sewage.”

City Hall. John Howard Parnell is supposed to be here. Instead, he is here, at the Dublin Bread Company.