LITERARY GEOGRAPHIES

Buried Dublin: Redeeming Urban History and Collective Memory in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

Maxwell Woods

Adolfo Ibáñez University

Abstract:

In *Ulysses*, Joyce represents modern Dublin as an urban space composed of the sedimentation of its pasts upon one another. Indeed, Dublin's landscape is represented in *Ulysses* as a cemetery of past events, buildings, and monuments. Although the apparent significance of this representation of Dublin for the concept of buried cities is rather banal—the past of an urban area participates in the formation of the present cultural, social, and material landscape of that area—*Ulysses* reframes and expands upon this representation of urban spatio-temporality through its appeal to the concept of redemption. Although Joyce makes visible the history of Dublin's buried city, it will be noted that this history is represented throughout *Ulysses* as a nightmare: the buried events, buildings, and monuments of the novel testify to an urban history of defeats, dispossession, and missed opportunities combined with the need for redemption. Yet while Joyce illuminates this need for the redemption of Dublin's buried city, the novel concludes that the city's history is irreparable: the resurrection and 'fixing' of the catastrophes of the past is never accomplished and, in the end, is represented as impossible. Joyce's *Ulysses* therefore presents a foundational problem for the logic of the buried city, even if it does not have an answer for this problem: if the examination of buried cities allows for the revelation of past failures, ruins, catastrophes, and horrors in urban history, is it possible to redeem them in the present?

Keywords: Collective memory; history; Joyce; Dublin; decolonization.

Author contact: maxwell.woods@uai.cl

Introduction

The story of *Ulysses* is well-known: over the course of eighteen episodes that correlate to Homer's *Odyssey*, James Joyce follows the everyday events of 16 June 1904 in Dublin in the lives of Stephen Dedalus, Molly Bloom, Leopold Bloom, and many others. In addition to this narrative, Joyce paints a vivid image of the city of Dublin, describing the mission of *Ulysses* to Frank Budgen, 'I want to give a picture of Dublin so complete that if the city one day suddenly disappeared from the earth it could be reconstructed out of my book' (Budgen 1972: 69). If this testimony makes it appear that Joyce was interested in a synchronic snapshot of Dublin, recent research has demonstrated Joyce's keen interest in memory, with many pointing to another of Joyce's comments to Budgen, '[i]magination is memory,' which seems to confirm the centrality of memory in Joyce's creative process. In many of these discussions, Joyce is held up as an example of how some modernist texts embrace a relationship with the past and memory, with *Ulysses* specifically representing Dublin as the embodiment of a historical nightmare.[1] The buried events, buildings, and monuments of the novel – long-since destroyed, or never even erected, and therefore only existing in the collective memory of *Ulysses*'s characters – testify to an urban past of defeats, dispossession, and missed opportunities combined with a need for redemption.[2]

What these discussions often fail to recognise is the careful distinctions Joyce draws between individual memory, collective memory, historical memory, and history. For instance, the urban experience of Dublin for many Irish colonised subjects in *Ulysses* is marked by a colonialist history attempting to erase Irish collective memory (Cheng 2014; Jones 2014; Duffy 2000). In addition, as I will argue in the body of this article, these colonised subjects have integrated that history into a historical memory that emphasises a past of Irish defeats and that strengthens their collective memory in order to imagine a utopian future via the redemption of their shared past. Despite this powerful decolonial function of collective memory, Joyce resists such a memorial relationship with the past, illustrating how a particular mode of national Irish collective memory is linked to an exclusive community formation that was, in some instances in early twentieth-century Dublin, anti-Semitic.[3] These diverse relationships with the past in *Ulysses*, I will argue, demonstrate how collective memory persists even after 'historical breaks' that should, according to popular memory theory, erase such collective memory. Buried Dublin, in other words, is characterised by the persistence of collective memory or history despite the absence of a proper urban space for that memory or history.

Memory, History, and the City

Since at least the 1970s, a debate has emerged between history and memory over which has the authority to represent the past in the present, with many authors appealing to memory as an antidote to what has come to be perceived as the cold, calculating method of the historian (Klein 2000). For if memory 'is of the past' (Aristotle) or is 'the present of past things' (Augustine), history also makes a claim on having the right to represent the past (Ricoeur 2004). Of particular importance to this debate has been the work of Maurice Halbwachs and his theorisation of collective memory. This term seems contradictory at

first sight. How can one speak of a *collective* memory? Is not memory, as Ricoeur notes, radically singular insofar as 'my memories are not yours'? How can Halbwachs speak of a collective memory and a coherent plural first-person subject with an assured identity based on the temporal continuity of that subject and capable of retaining a memory? (96) Moreover, how does Halbwachs differentiate between collective memory and history, for does history not act precisely in its capacity to form a record of a collective past?

Halbwachs's basic thesis, as Ricoeur (2004: 120) summarises, is simple: 'to remember, we need others'. By sharing common memories within a group one not only reminds oneself that one is part of a group and remembers 'by situating [oneself] within the viewpoint of one or several groups and one or several currents of collective thought' (Halbwachs 1980: 33), but a collective memory and community is formed around this remembering-in-common. As a result, there are multiple collective memories based around multiple communities, and any given individual participates in more than one. History, on the other hand, is singular for Halbwachs, 'history is unitary, and it can be said that there is only one history' (83). This history begins as the memorisation of an external set of information pertaining to the nation: dates, facts, people, founding events, etc. Halbwachs thereby contrasts the persistence of a *living* memory with the construction of a *dead* history. The rest of Halbwachs's project theorises the creation of a historical memory, in which the individual integrates this history into their own subjective framework. As Ricoeur summarises, 'from history taught in school, external to the child's memory, we move to a historical memory that, ideally, melts into the collective memory which, by the exchange, is augmented, and we end *in fine* with a universal history concerned with differences between periods and encompassing differences of *mentalité* under a gaze directed from nowhere' (Ricoeur 2004: 397). Through Halbwachs's work, one can distinguish individual memory, collective memory, historical memory, and history.

If memory and history interpenetrate in Halbwachs's theory, some scholarship since the 1970s has argued that living memory is being dissolved under the threatening presence of an overbearing history. Most notably, Pierre Nora's 1984 article, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*,' claims that 'Memory and history, far from being synonymous, appear now to be in fundamental opposition. Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name...History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is a perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past' (1984: 8). Furthermore, invoking Halbwachs's claim that collective memory binds communities together, Nora differentiates between the 'collective, plural, and yet individual' function of collective memory and history's 'claim to universal authority' (1984: 9). Within Nora's distinction between a dominating and singular history versus multiple and disappearing collective memories, the political function of collective memory comes to the fore: the decolonisation of the past. If colonialist history has always taught the set of information tied to its imperial imagination—ignoring the significant dates, facts, people, etc. of the colonised—collective memory has played the role of binding together the colonised into a community and using the past as a site for resistance against the singular history of the coloniser. This colonial function of history is demonstrated in nineteenth-century history education in Ireland where, as Irish nationalist John Mitchel

(1882) notes, the British official in charge of education in Ireland 'took care to keep out of [school-books] any, even the remotest, allusion to the history of the country [Ireland], and even such extracts from well-known authors as illustrate or celebrate the virtue of patriotism in *any* country' (1882: 19).

In the fields of urbanism, architecture, and geography, Halbwachs's theory would come to be embraced by Aldo Rossi (1982). Indeed, Rossi's debt to Halbwachs is made clear in his argument that, 'One can say that the city itself is the collective memory of its people, and like memory it is associated with objects and places. The city is the *locus* of the collective memory' (130). Rossi takes Halbwachs's conceptualisation of collective memory and theorises the formation of urban space around this central idea. This theory of the city and its relationship with memory can be summarised through Rossi's idea of permanence:

> the past is partly being experienced now, and this may be the meaning to give permanences: they are a past that we are still experiencing […] These persistences are revealed through monuments, the physical signs of the past, as well as through the persistence of a city's basic layout and plans. […] Sometimes these artefacts persist virtually unchanged, endowed with a continuous vitality; other times they exhaust themselves, and then only the permanence of their form, their physical sign, their *locus* remains. (Rossi 1982: 57-59)

It is particularly this final thesis—that urban forms have permanence even when they are not endowed with a continuous vitality—that is of significance for our investigation into buried cities, for he notes that many buildings and monuments gain new functions that are entirely independent of their form, thereby decoupling form and function. This leads him to the surprising conclusion that 'Monuments and architecture have no reason to exist; they do not "say" anything to us' (Rossi 1982: 48). Although they have no function, monuments are the embodiment of a city's collective memory. For Rossi, the city *is* its collective memory, and urban artefacts' permanence testifies to how the past is still being experienced in the present.

The Challenge of Buried Cities

The concept of the buried city challenges Rossi's framework. He implies that the erasure of the city effects the erasure of collective memory, 'a city may change its face even in the course of one man's life …We look upon the houses of our childhood as unbelievably old, and often *the city erases our memories as it changes*' [emphasis mine] (Rossi 1982: 61). Recent investigations of the relationship between memory and the city, however, have demonstrated how, even when a city has erased the urban artefacts tied to a particular memory, collective or individual, those memories persist and continue affecting how an urban space is experienced. That is, if, following Mark Crinson (2005), we regard urban memory as referring to 'the city as a physical landscape and collection of objects and practices that enable recollections of the past and that embody the past through traces of the city's sequential building and rebuilding' (xii), then such objects do not need to be present to aid in forming collective memory. In other words, Crinson and Rossi's

framework – that a set of urban artefacts or forms is necessary to embody a collective memory – is challenged by the concept of the buried city: the collective memory of an absent urban space persists despite that urban space's non-permanence and can play just as significant a role in shaping the present experience of the city. The ghosts of a city, just as much as its permanent physical landscape, participate in structuring urban life.

Laimonas Briedis's (2016) discussion of the various transformations of Vilnius, the current capital of Lithuania that was part of Poland between the First and Second World Wars (then called Wilno), demonstrates the problem with strictly adhering to Rossi's position. Noting its cosmopolitan character during the interwar period (a predominantly Polish Catholic city with a large Jewish population led to multiple languages propagating within the city-limits) and the persistence of a Jewish collective memory in the city via cemeteries (Briedis quotes an author who notes that the Jewish community 'knew their history not much from reading books as from visiting the two Jewish cemeteries, where their history was literally entombed') (38-39), he traces how the Jewish community of Vilnius was wiped out by National Socialism during World War II. Following the war, Vilnius became part of the USSR and the sites of Jewish urban memory were razed, with cemetery headstones even being subsequently used as building materials. A Soviet-era travel guide quoted by Briedis summarizes this attitude of erasure, 'The dismal days of fascist brutality cannot be wiped out of the people's memory although today there is nothing left to recall them. The buildings of the new factories and dwelling-houses erected along Paneriai Street are a pleasure to behold' (42). If Rossi is reacting against this brutal erasure by imagining an architecture that embraces collective memory, his theory misses what Briedis then points out: although Vilnius as a cosmopolitan city with a large Jewish population has been erased by the vicissitudes of history, it persists in the memory of writers like Cseslaw Milosz, who recommend that the 'lack of readable (Jewish) relics in particular makes Vilnius a place of runaway translations', in which the landscape of the city 'can no longer use the grammar' of this collective Jewish memory despite the persistence of this memory (44). The experience of an (older) contemporary Jewish inhabitant of Vilnius who lived in the city before World War II speaks to a disjunction between the collective memory of the Vilnius of which they are a participant and the current form of city which no longer embodies that collective memory.

Following Briedis, the concept of the buried city allows for a critical reevaluation of the relationship between history, memory, and the city, in which a buried city of collective memory persists and continues to affect urban life even when urban artefacts are present only in their absence. That is, the concept of the buried city of collective memory continues within the lineage of Rossi by placing collective memory and the city into dialogue, but departs from his strict definition of the city as the *locus* of collective memory. Joyce's novel, as we will see, reveals three problems in Rossi's theory: 1.) it cannot account for discontinuity, 2.) collective memory is often false 3.) collective memory is exclusive of those citizens who are not included within its community. If these are the limitations of Rossi's city of collective memory, Joyce is just as insistent that the erasure of these memories by history is, just as Briedis notes, never complete. The question thereby posed by the concept of the buried city is the following: How do we resolve the persistence of

collective memory in the city, even when the urban circumstances of that collective memory are absent?

History, Collective Memory, and Buried Dublin in *Ulysses*

Joyce's *Ulysses* exemplifies the theoretical benefits of Halbwachs's distinction between various types of memory as well as Nora's politicisation of the distinction between memory and history. In the 'Nestor' episode, for instance, we find Stephen Dedalus teaching history. Reflecting on this work, Dedalus thinks to himself, 'For them too history was a tale like any other too often heard, their land a pawnshop' (2.46-47). Indeed, after learning about Pyrrhus, Stephen's students ask for 'a story' from their teacher; the students easily transition from learning history to listening to a fictional tale (2.54). Stephen's theorisation of the reception of Irish history as an external story is also highlighted in the 'Telemachus' episode when the wealthy English Oxford student, Haines, reflecting on the effect of British imperialism on Irish soil, argues, 'It seems history is to blame' (1.649). In both of these examples, history is comprehended by colonising subjects as an external and alienated representation of the colonial past of Ireland.

Against this alienated relationship with history, Stephen claims in the 'Nestor' episode that 'History...is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake' (2.377). History is an internalised condition of horror for Stephen, in contrast to the colonising subject's externalisation of history. As Vincent Cheng summarises, 'for Stephen and his fellow Irishmen imperial history is very much an oppressive nightmare of the present from which it is hard to awake—if for no other reason than its oppressive presence and hegemonic, discursive terminology is written all over the face of Ireland and of its cultural constructions, and thus forms the [unavoidable] hour-by-hour subtext and context of all their thought and experiences' (1995: 169). Unlike his students and Haines, Stephen cannot externalise history; it forms an intimate part of his lived experience as a colonised subject. Indeed, when looking at the history Stephen teaches and remembers—for instance, Pyrrhus (2.18-9), the death of Julius Caesar (2.48), and the fall of the Spanish Armada (3.149)—a consistent theme emerges of defeats, dispossession, and missed opportunities combined with the need for redemption. Instead of writing a history, Stephen forms a historical memory: the acculturation of his lived experience as a colonised subject in Ireland to a set of external facts, dates, and events.

This conflict between history and the lived experience of the colonised subject is manifested directly in the cultural geography of Dublin. On the one hand, the city of Dublin becomes the site where British imperialism attempts to install its history onto the urban form of Dublin. In the 'Hades' episode, Dublin is represented as a site wherein Irish residents are forced to confront the history of their colonialist rulers side-by-side with monuments dedicated to the Irish nation's past defeats (Cheng 2014: 12). The effect of this memorialisation on the urban life of Irish residents of Dublin is to reinforce constantly the experience of the imposition of British colonial rule within the formation of the city's cultural landscape. This inscription of British colonialist history on the cultural geography of Dublin is experienced as a present domination by Irish colonised subjects. In the 'Wandering Rocks' episode, for instance, as the viceregal cavalcade passes by the equestrian

statue of King William, Denis Breen, unaware of the advancing carriage, is put in danger, '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' (10.1231-2). In effect, Joyce is collapsing 'the distinction between the monument's hoof and the hooves of the cavalcade's outriders, [thereby signalling] the continuum of power the monument and cavalcade symbolise and enforce' (Jones 2014: 130). The physical domination of the Irish population of Dublin by British colonialism, embodied in this passage by the hooves of the viceregal cavalcade almost trampling Denis Breen, is metaphorically extended through the erection of monuments dedicated to the history of British colonial rule that symbolically mirror this domination. The cultural geography of Dublin emphasising a history of British colonial rule participates in the formation of the historical memory of its Irish residents based on 'a constant reminder of…continued colonial subservience' (Cheng 2014: 12).

On the other hand, and just as significant as this colonialist history and its integration into a historical memory of Irish Dublin, collective memory plays a fundamental role in shaping the experience of Dublin for its Irish residents. If Dublin in *Ulysses* is populated by a series of monuments dedicated to the presence of colonialist history, there is also a Dublin experienced only through an Irish collective memory of various facts, events, and places that British history refuses to acknowledge. The 'Hades' episode, for instance, can be framed in terms of the sharing of common memories of Dublin that explain the current form of places throughout the city. This includes remembering how a certain Dublin house remained 'shuttered, tenantless, [with an] unweeded garden. Whole place gone to hell.' The cause of this urban form is, according to shared memories, due to a murderer having once lived there, even though 'the crown had no evidence…only circumstantial' (6.472-477). Over and above British history—there is no evidence of a murderer having lived there—collective memory has a determinative effect on Dublin.

Collective memory has another effect, however, beyond merely creating alternative, subaltern experiences of Dublin's cultural geography. In 'Wandering Rocks,' Ned Lambert shares the past of St. Mary's Abbey: 'We are standing in the historic council chamber of saint Mary's abbey where silken Thomas proclaimed himself a rebel in 1534. This is the most historic spot in all Dublin' (10.407-9). As Jeri Johnson (1998: 869) notes, Silken Thomas had 'summoned the Council to St. Mary's Abbey' in 1534 to 'renounc[e] his allegiance to Henry VIII,' but in 1904 its remains had been repurposed as 'storerooms for seed merchants.' Enabled by the physical landscape of Dublin, Lambert shares a common memory of decolonial resistance by Irish rebels, thereby redefining 'the most historic spot in all Dublin' according to its significance for the Irish nation and reinforcing the stability of that community through a shared past. Through this sharing, the function of Irish collective memory in Dublin appears: the coherence of an Irish national identity around a shared past. That is, following Crinson's analysis of Halbwachs, 'Memory…[binds] groups of people together, recharging their commonality by reference to physical spaces and previous instances, often a founding moment of that collective identity' (2005: xiii). In the case of St. Mary's Abbey, collective memory referencing a founding moment of Irish nationality shared by Ned Lambert and tied to the permanence

of Dublin's cultural geography binds together the collective identity of an Irish nation in Dublin.

In each of these scenarios, however, there is a permanent urban artefact to which this collective memory can attach itself. The limitations to this theorisation of the relationship between collective memory and the city based on the permanence of urban artefacts are illuminated by Joyce's representation of 'the slab where Wolfe Tone's statue was not' (10.378). Ellen Carol Jones has recounted the (non-)creation of this monument and its relationship to both *Ulysses* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (2014: 136-38). As she indicates, 'the planned 1898 monument to the Irish national hero Theobald Wolfe Tone was [to be] positioned in Unionist territory…the northwest corner of St. Stephen's Green,' as a direct political challenge to Union sympathisers, as is demonstrated by the slab's inscription, '1798. Tribute to Wolfe Tone, Patriot, Belfast Nationalists '98 Centenary Association. 1898'. 'The foundation stone was quarried… outside of Belfast,' paraded through Belfast, and then placed in Dublin following a symbolic procession along the same route as the 1861 funeral march for the 1848 Irish nationalist rebel, Terence Bellew MacManus. As a result, at the ceremonial laying of the stone, the Fenian John O'Leary was able to say that the day 'represented a living link between the present and the rebels of 1867, 1848, and, by implication, 1798'. As of 1904, this statue had not been built. Instead, the presence at that site of an absence was maintained through the collective Irish memory in Dublin.

In contrast to the dyad of collective memory and urban artefact, exemplified in moments like Lambert sharing the past of St. Mary's Abbey, a disjunction emerges at the present absence of Wolfe Tone's statue regarding the persistence of collective memory and the absence of urban artefacts that would embody that collective memory. This persistence of collective memory testifies to what Enda Duffy identifies as its potential political power:

> When a subaltern text is in question, then the unsaid may exist as the unarticulated possibility of a utopia...This eloquent subaltern unsaid marks, therefore, the trace of *ressentiment*, where the abject refused to acknowledge the monuments, and scars, of the master's dominance [...] It suggests that spaces, as yet undiscerned, exist in the city for any community that may come into being. (Duffy 2000: 143)

Duffy's analysis is initially divorced from this discussion of buried cities due to its focus on the realisation of a future utopia. Yet this utopian drive could just as easily be reframed as the redemption of the buried Dublin of Irish collective memory. For instance, within this theorisation the erection of Wolfe Tone's statue would mark the utopian arrival of a decolonised Irish Dublin. The buried Dublin of collective memory acts as a conceptual force of decolonisation keeping alive the Irish past so that it might be redeemed in the future. The buried Dublin of collective memory in *Ulysses* is therefore the persistence of a collective memory that is not embodied by any urban artefact, but the redemption of which and the embodiment of which in urban form would represent the arrival of utopian decolonisation.

Limits to Collective Memory

The embrace of collective memory in the formation of urban life, however, does not receive resounding support by Joyce. Most notably, in *Portrait* Stephen Dedalus refers to the Wolfe Tone procession through Dublin as 'that scene of tawdry tribute,' since, as Stephen ponders, '[t]he Ireland of Tone and Parnell seemed to have receded in space' (Joyce 1992: 184). In this passage, Stephen is pointing towards a conclusion that emphasises discontinuity. As Halbwachs explains, collective memory is based on a strict continuity, for collective memory 'is a current of continuous thought whose continuity is not at all artificial, for it retains from the past only what still lives or is capable of living in the consciousness of the groups keeping the memory alive' (Halbwachs 1980: 80). Stephen is claiming the collective memory of Wolfe Tone is not alive within his everyday life and is therefore no longer part of such a 'current of continuous thought.' The discontinuity Stephen experiences leads him to the conclusion that the redemption of Wolfe Tone no longer pertains to his reality. This position of Stephen is then reflected in *Ulysses* when, haunted by the memory of refusing to pray at the bedside of his dying mother, he claims, 'No, mother! Let me be and let me live' (1.279). Stephen, wanting a new life that breaks with the past, refuses to live in a Dublin formed by the force of collective memory. We have already seen in the 'Nestor' episode how Stephen rejects alienated history, but here he also rejects the structuration of life by collective memory since it fails to confront this question of discontinuity.

In addition to this issue of discontinuity, there is also a much more basic problem: the collective Irish memory in Dublin is often false. After Ned Lambert calls St. Mary's Abbey the 'most historic spot in Dublin,' for instance, he continues to claim that, 'The old bank of Ireland was over the way till the time of the union and the original jews' temple was here too before they built their synagogue over in Adelaide road…He [Thomas Silken] rode down through Dame walk…if my memory serves me' (10.411-3). Lambert is doubly wrong in this instance: Silken never took this route and the first Jewish temple was not erected at that site (Johnson 1998: 869). If the former serves to reinforce the group identity of an Irish nation via the collective memory of a fictional event involving a national hero – a fictionalisation of the past is carried out in order to embody this collective memory in an urban form – the latter makes that group cohere by distinguishing it from a Jewish 'other.' More precisely, Lambert's fictional cultural geography, in which the Dublin Jewish community is associated with banking—'the original jews' temple' is placed immediately next to 'the old bank of Ireland'—participates in an anti-Semitism that perceives Jews as greedy and exploiting the riches of Ireland.

This anti-Semitism within Irish collective memory is not limited to Lambert, reappearing in the 'Cyclops' episode wherein a group of nationalists, led by a character referred to as 'the citizen,' hold a discussion about nationality and race in a pub. Bloom, identified as a Jew by the nationalists and resistant to their nationalist discourse, is eventually chased out of the bar violently after being falsely accused of secretly withholding money from the group after winning a bet on a horse race. This accusation, as Margot Norris notes, is ideologically supported by 'negative stereotypes that Dubliners already harbor about Jews' (2006: 164).[4] Central to this conflict between the Irish nationalists and

Bloom is a conflict between epistemological frameworks. When the citizen reads a story about an execution and others in the bar discuss how a hanged man allegedly maintains an erection after death, Bloom responds, 'That can be explained by science' (12.464). The citizen, however, interrupts Bloom by listing various executions that lie at the foundation of the Irish collective memory, concluding by saying, 'The memory of the dead,' and making a toast (12.519). In other words, there is a conflict between Bloom's science and the citizen's appeal to a particular Irish collective memory.

This collective memory to which the citizen appeals is one that does not include Bloom. Throughout the episode, Bloom is excluded from this group and its collective memory because of his Jewish identity. As Ulin (2011: 51) concludes, 'Bloom is excluded by the company at the bar from Irish history because of his identification as a Jew; the citizen regards Jews and Englishmen as rapacious consumers and exploiters of Ireland'. Indeed, as Donald Morse (1996: 180) has recorded, the idea of an 'Irish Jew' during Joyce's time was an oxymoron. This distinction is made clear in Corny Kelleher's comment, '[The Jewish people are] still waiting for their redeemer...For that matter so are we' (12.1544-5). Even when creating a connection between the two groups, Kelleher strictly distinguishes between an Irish 'we' and a Jewish 'other.'[5] The exclusion of Bloom from this particular mode of Irish collective memory is then manifested spatially through the Irish nationalists violently excluding Bloom from the public space of the tavern. Consequently, this utopian (nationalist) redemption of the buried Dublin of Irish collective memory does not make space for Jewish residents.

Rethinking Historical Dublin

The critique of an urbanism of collective memory that is embedded in *Ulysses*'s representation of Dublin leads to a conclusion by Bloom regarding the past: 'Jews, he [Bloom] softly imparted in an aside in Stephen's ear, are accused of ruining. Not a vestige of truth in it, I can safely say. *History*,—would you be surprised to learn?—proves up to the hilt Spain decayed when the Inquisition hounded the jews out and England prospered when Cromwell, an uncommonly able ruffian, who, in other respects has much to answer for, imported them. Why? Because they are practical and are proved to be so' [emphasis mine] (16.1119-1124). In contrast to Stephen's criticism of a historical relationship with the past, Bloom appeals to history as a means to counteract collective memory's exclusive community formations. By referencing multiple nations and periods beyond the limits of modern Ireland, Bloom is able to imagine an alternative relationship between Jews and various national communities. If history turns Irish citizens' lived experience of British colonialism into an externalised story to be repeated and memorised, it also acts as a means for Bloom to create more inclusive collectivities.

Bloom's very identity formation speaks to just such an inter-collective relationship. As Cormac Ó Gráda (2006: 204) notes, Bloom was 'the son of a Hungarian Jewish father and an Irish Protestant mother, married a Roman Catholic and befriended [practicing orthodox Jewish] Litvak immigrants.' Yet this inter-collective subjectivity built around multiplicity, in addition to making Bloom a 'historically implausible character' (204), signifies that Bloom would have been given the cold shoulder not only from his nationalist

Irish neighbours, but from the small but thriving Jewish community of Dublin located in what was referred to as Little Jerusalem. In short, although identified as Jewish by the citizen, Bloom would likely not have been identified as Jewish by the Dublin Jewish community (Keogh 1998: 57). While this leads Ó Gráda (2006: 204) to claim that 'the multicultural Bloom had a foot in four camps', it might be more accurate to say that it led him to have a historical relation with each camp (i.e., he would have received information regarding each of these various communities), but he would have been excluded from each of the communities themselves (i.e., would not have been accepted as a participant in the community's collective memory).

Yet what is the form of Bloom's vision of history? What differentiates this history referenced by Bloom, someone dedicated to objective 'practicality' and 'science', from Ned Lambert's personalised oral sharing of past events within a community? We see such a historical representation of the past in the question/answer form of the 'Ithaca' episode. This claim—'Ithaca' uses a historical rather than memorial discourse—is a central thesis of Frederic Jameson's 1982 examination of history in *Ulysses*. In his article, Jameson claims that the fragmentation of the communities proper to collective memory and 'which, with the penetration of the money and market system, are systematically dissolved into relations of equivalent individuals...living side by side in a merely additive way within those great agglomerations which are the modern cities' (Jameson 1982: 130-31), is translated into the question and answer format of 'Ithaca'. Through this, according to Jameson, Joyce constructs 'a form of discourse from which the subject...is radically excluded: a form of discourse, in other words, that would be somehow radically objective' (139).[6] Bloom's dedication to practicality and scientific inquiry, in other words, is matched by the attempt in 'Ithaca' 'to translate human events into the clinical language of mathematical precision' (McCarthy 1984: 616). Furthermore, according to Jameson's analysis, historical discourse in 'Ithaca' embodies the problem of history outlined by Nora: its depersonalised analysis dissolves collective memory as well as the communities built around this relationship to the past.

Yet if history in 'Ithaca' dissolves collective memory and its attendant communities, it also points the way forward for a new, cross-cultural, and urban collective. For instance, the episode's historical discourse allows the narrator to simultaneously note the differences between Bloom and Stephen—'Name, age, race, creed' (17.403)—and outline the 'points of contact [that] existed between these languages [ancient Hebrew and ancient Irish] and between the peoples who spoke them' (17.745-6), including their common pasts characterised by 'dispersal, persecution, survival and revival' (17.755-6). Apparently resolving the problem illuminated by Bloom's interaction with Irish nationalists in 'Cyclops,' the externalised history criticised by Stephen in 'Nestor' seems to provide a discourse in 'Ithaca' with which to form cross-community points of contact. Nonetheless, the question implied by Stephen in 'Nestor' still arises: How do we make this history immanent rather than external and alienated? Stephen resolves this dilemma by forming a historical memory, by melting history into collective memory. This, of course, merely reignites Bloom's problem—this historical memory is one from which he is again excluded. The question posited by Stephen in 'Nestor' can therefore be refined in the light of

Bloom's position: How do we make history immanent without transforming it into historical memory?

The answer for Jameson lies in another type of buried city: the history of the collective praxis of constructing urban public works buried beneath the earth. Namely, Jameson cites the question, 'Did it flow?', as well as the answer to this question, in which the construction of Dublin's water system is outlined in detail, as an example of 'the transformation of Nature by human and collective praxis deconcealed' (Jameson 1982: 140-41). As Winston (2014) argues, Joyce imagines Dublin's buried water system in this passage as a 'catalyst for social accord and cohesion'", connecting various places, communities, and people. Even further, the intercultural bond between Bloom and Stephen, although we will shortly see how this bond fails, 'is supported from start to finish by the public resource' of the buried water system via their sharing cocoa made from water from that system (Winston 2014: 156). For Jameson, the representation of Dublin's water system in the historical discourse of 'Ithaca' excavates this literal buried city and thereby makes Dublin's history immanent. In other words, to draw a simple comparison, if following Rossi the city of collective memory is embodied most clearly in monuments, then following Jameson's reading of *Ulysses* the city of history is embodied most clearly in buried public works. Through its historical discourse, 'Ithaca' is able to represent buried Dublin in terms of its multiplicity and points of intercultural contact, thereby seemingly resolving the problem of making history immanent while recognising a diversity of community positions within a united urban collectivity.

Michael Rubenstein has pointed out that this interpretation ignores the end of the 'Did it flow?' passage, which notes the alienation of 'the public, self-supporting taxpayers, solvent, sound' from 'paupers' and the South Dublin Guardians, a Dublin charity organisation that was criticised by the wealthy in Joyce's time for consuming too much water (2010: 54-55). Moreover, Jameson largely ignores the colonial character of Dublin during this period and how this distinction between 'taxpayers' and 'paupers' was additionally a distinction between colonizers and colonized (Brady 2001; Prunty 1998; Kincaid 2006). Indeed, Winston (2014: 153) further argues that the specific water system Joyce represents was marked by an inequitable 'control and distribution of water.' Although the historical excavation of this buried city disalienates historical Dublin, to use Jameson's (1982) language, through a representation of its public works, it does not disalienate the 'solvent taxpayers' from the 'paupers,' much less colonizer from colonized. Historical discourse may illuminate points of inter-community contact, but this does not translate into the actual formation of a new, united urban collectivity. More precisely, an excavated historical buried Dublin provides points of contact between the multiple alienated communities of an urban space, but this history can never directly represent that urban space as a singular geography. In other words, the singular buried city of Dublin's public works is only visible through its fragmented effects: the segregation of that space into the Dublin of the 'paupers' versus the Dublin of the 'solvent taxpayers.' This failure to create a united urban space is seen in a basic event noted by Jameson: despite the unification of Dublin through its public works, any attempt to form a new inter-community grouping based on this historical situation, most notably between Bloom and Stephen who part ways at the end of 'Ithaca,' fails.

The question therefore becomes why the formation of an inter-community urban space based on a historical buried Dublin fails. What one discovers is the conflict between historical universality and memorial plurality as identified by Halbwachs and Nora: the singularity of historical urban space cannot take into account the multiple memories that inhabit that space. For instance, two reasons that Stephen and Bloom's relationship fails in 'Ithaca' are that, firstly, Bloom offends Stephen by advising him to return to his father's house, ignoring the strained past between the two, and, secondly, that Stephen responds to Bloom's invitation to stay the night by singing an anti-Semitic song about a Jewish girl trapping and killing a young boy in a house under the auspices of friendship (17.801-828). In other words, Bloom offends Stephen by ignoring the persistent effect of memory, and Stephen rejects Bloom's offer based on the anti-Semitic othering of his host. If Bloom, embracing a historical relationship with the past, ignores the persistence of memory, Stephen, trapped in a memorial relationship with the past, rejects the possibility of an inter-collective historicity. The centripetal force of history, embodied in the inter-community public works unifying Dublin into a single urban space, cannot overcome the centrifugal force of the permanence of multiple collective memories in a city.

This failure for history's centripetal force to overcome collective memory's centrifugal force in the formation of a unified urban space is made clear in the 'Hades' episode, as discussed by Julieann Ulin (2011). The significance of collective memory is demonstrated early in the episode when, on their way to Patty Dignam's funeral, Simon Dedalus says that he is happy that the 'fine old custom' of taking a particular, traditional path through Dublin during a funeral procession 'has not died out' (6.36). As Ulin demonstrates, Simon is thereby expressing his devotion to 'the remembered trauma of those unable to bury the dead in Famine Ireland' (2011: 33). Bloom, on the other hand, is explicitly concerned with the economic problems now faced by the Dignam family and ponders the possibility of mass graves as a means of reducing funeral costs in general, something that 'not only recall[s] the mass graves and coffinless burials of Famine Ireland but would exacerbate their psychic wound if spoken' (Ulin 2011: 43). As Ulin summarises, Bloom's relationship with the dead is different than Simon's in a way that 'shows his cultural distance from the company in the burial jarvey' (44). In this sense, two different types of buried city come into conflict: Bloom's historical buried city that is practical and inter-community versus Simon Dedalus's memorial buried city that cannot escape the past trauma of his community. If Bloom can offer solutions, Ulin concludes, they cannot take into account the persistence of collective memory.

Conclusion

Examining buried Dublin in *Ulysses* illuminates the tensions between individual memory, collective memory, historical memory, and history in the formation of urban space. Reflecting on these tensions, the concept of the buried city emphasises the disjunction caused by the persistence of the past in non-permanent urban spaces. More precisely, *Ulysses* demonstrates both the impossibility and necessity of redeeming past utopian dreams, regardless of whether that past is imagined memorially or historically. If Joyce rejects the redemption of collective memory in so far as the communities that collective

memory forms can be violently exclusive, his novel also demonstrates that the redemption of a historical buried Dublin fails in so far as it cannot respond to the particular demands of persistent collective memories. If *Ulysses*'s representation of memorial and historical buried Dublin illuminates the disjunction between persistent relationships with the past and present urban forms that do not accord to that past, it does not offer solutions to overcome this disjunction.

This problem of the simultaneous impossibility and necessity of redemption of buried cities is currently manifested in the former slum where Joyce set his 'nighttown' episode. Today, this area is marked by various memorial sites to *Ulysses*, ignoring the fact that it was more than just the setting for Joyce's novel: it was an actual world that Joyce was representing and one which has been subsequently destroyed, even if memories of that world persisted long afterwards. The concept of the buried city demands not that we resurrect Joyce's world through various commemorations, as is currently being done, but rather that we struggle with the testimony of people like Elizabeth 'Bluebell' Murphy who actually lived in the neighbourhood where the 'nighttown' episode was set, 'It was a hard life...but I wish I was back in it again, in the tenement again. When they started tearing the old tenements down it was like tearing us apart. It tore me apart. It broke me heart. We were all one family, all close. We all helped one another. If I had a tenement house now I'd go back and live in it...yes, I would' (Kearns 1994: 92). How do we resolve, connecting this testimony directly with *Ulysses*, this problem of a relationship with past urban spaces that simultaneously cannot be resurrected—that looking back 'in a retrospective kind of arrangement, all seem[s] a kind of dream…[and that] the coming back [is] the worst thing you ever did because it went without saying you would feel out of place as things always moved with the times' (16.1400-3)—but also cannot be eliminated—that 'there are sins (or let us call them as the world calls them) evil memories which are hidden away by man in the darkest places of the heart but they abide there and wait' (14.1344-5)? How do we resolve, buried Dublin in *Ulysses* begs us to ask, the tensions between memory, collective memory, historical memory, and history in non-permanent urban space?

Notes

[1] When talking of such discussions and recent research, I am referring to a long history of Joyce criticism. The three key texts about Joyce and memory remain Gibbons (2015), Richard (1999), and Whelan (2002). Other works by Gibbons (2011, 2014) also focus on the relationship between memory, history, and the city in Joyce. This focus on memory, history, and Joyce's work has recently been analysed in *Memory Ireland: James Joyce and Cultural Memory* and in articles such as Rasmussen Goloubeva (2014), Ulin (2011), Beplate (2007), and Devlin (2011).

[2] The phrasing in this concluding sentence is thanks to Ian McBride's (2001: 26-37) analysis.

[3] Anti-Semitic discourse was present in political discourse on both the right and the left, and explicitly anti-Semitic events like the Limerick Boycott of 1904 (which would have still been occurring during *Ulysses*) demonstrate that Ireland was not free of racial hatred against Jewish residents. Nonetheless, the Irish government never adopted anti-Semitic policies,

and many testimonies of Jews residing in Ireland during this period remark on the relative absence of anti-Semitism in comparison with the rest of Europe. For more on anti-Semitism in Ireland during this period see Ó Gráta (2006) and Keogh (1998).

[4] As Reizbuam (1999) points out, the question of Bloom's Jewish identity is impossible to answer. While in the 'Cyclops' episode Bloom identifies and is identified as Jewish, he also says in the 'Eumaeus' episode, 'in reality I'm not [Jewish]' (16.1082-5).

[5] Kelleher's strict distinction is not unique. Many Irish nationalists maintained a (racist) fear that Jews were presenting as Irish in order to benefit from Irish nationalism—a logic that only functions on the assumption that those who are Jewish are not Irish (Keogh 1998: 55).

[6] Jameson does not struggle with the unreliability of the narrator in the 'Ithaca' episode (McCarthy 1984). Comments on the objectivity of historical discourse in 'Ithaca' do not signify anything about its truth value.

Works Cited

Beplate, J. (2007) 'Stephen's Lyrical Language: Memory and Imagination in Ulysses.' *Études anglaises*, 60, pp. 42-54.

Brady, J. (2006) 'Dublin at the turn of the century'. *In* Brady, J and Simms, A (eds) *Dublin Through Space and Time (c.900-1900)*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, pp. 221-281.

Briedis, L. (2016) 'Locating Vilnius on the Map of Translation.' *In* Simon, S. (ed) *Speaking Memory: How Translation Shapes City Life*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 23-44.

Budgen, F. (1972) *James Joyce and the Making of* Ulysses *and Other Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cheng, VJ. (1995) *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, VJ. (2014) 'Amnesia, Forgetting, and the Nation in James Joyce's *Ulysses.' In* Frawley, O. and O'Callaghan, K. (eds) *Memory Ireland: James Joyce and Cultural Memory, Volume 4*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, pp. 10-26.

Crinson, M. (2005) 'Urban memory—an introduction.' *In* Crinson, M (ed) *Urban Memory: History and amnesia in the modern city*. New York: Routledge, pp.xi-xxiii.

Devlin, KJ. (2011) 'Rereading Ulysses: Indeterminacy, Error, and Fixing the Past.' *Joyce Studies Annual*, 2011, pp. 5-19.

Duffy, E. (2000) 'Disappearing Dublin: *Ulysses*, Postcoloniality, and the Politics of Space.' *In* Attridge, D. and Howes, M. (eds) *Semicolonial Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37-57.

Gibbons, L. (2001) '"Where Wolfe Tone's statue was not": Joyce, monuments and memory.' *In* McBride, I. (ed) *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 139-159.

Gibbons, L. (2014). '"Old Haunts": Joyce, the Republic, and Photographic Memory.' *In* Frawley, O. and O'Callaghan K. (eds) *Memory Ireland: James Joyce and Cultural Memory, Volume 4*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, pp. 187-201.

Gibbons, L. (2015) *Joyce's Ghosts: Ireland, Modernism, and Memory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1980) *The Collective Memory.* Trans. Ditter, F. and Yazdi, V. New York: Harper Colophon.

Jameson, F. (1982) 'Ulysses in History.' *In* McCormack, WJ. and Stead, A. (eds) *James Joyce and Modern Literature.* New York: Routledge, pp. 125-141.

Johnson, J. (1998) 'Explanatory Notes.' *In* Johnson, J. (ed) *Ulysses.* New York: Penguin, 2008, pp. 763-980.

Jones, EC. (2014) 'Ghosts Through Absence.' *In* Frawley, O. and O'Callaghan, K. (eds) *Memory Ireland: James Joyce and Cultural Memory, Volume 4.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, pp. 125-144.

Joyce, J. (1984) *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition.* Prepared by Gabler, HW., Steppe, W., & Melchior, C. New York: Garland Publishing.

Joyce, J. (1992). *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.* Edited by Deane, S. London: Penguin.

Kearns, K. (1994) *Dublin Tenement Life: An Oral History.* Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Keogh, D. (1998) *Jews in Twentieth-Century Ireland: Refugees, Anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.* Cork: Cork University Press.

Kincaid, A. (2006) *Postcolonial Dublin: Imperial Legacies and the Built Environment.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Klein, KL. (2000) 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse.' *Representations*, 69, pp. 127-150.

McBride, I. (2001) 'Memory and National Identity in Modern Ireland.' *In* McBride, I. (ed) *History and Memory in Modern Ireland.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-42.

McCarthy, PA. (1984) 'Joyce's Unreliable Catechist: Mathematics and the Narration of "Ithaca."' *ELH*, 51(3), pp. 605-618.

Mitchel, J. (1882) *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps).* Dublin: R & T Washbourne.

Morse, D. (1996) '"I'm Irish! I Was Born Here!" The Conflict Between Nationalism and Internationalism in James Joyce's *Ulysses*.' *In* Zach, W. and Goodwin, K. (eds) *Nationalism vs. Internationalism.* Tubingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, pp. 177-185.

Nora, P. (1989) 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire.' *Representations*, 26, pp. 7-24.

Norris, M. (2006) 'Fact Fiction, and Anti-Semitism in the "Cyclops" Episode of Joyce's Ulysses.' *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 36 (2), pp. 163-189.

Ó Gráda, C. (2006) *Jewish Ireland in the Age of Joyce: A Socioeconomic History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Prunty, J. (1998) *Dublin Slums, 1800-1925: A Study in Urban Geography.* Portland, Oregon: Irish Academic Press.

Rasmussen Goloubeva, I. (2013) '"That's the Music of the Future": James Joyce's *Ulysses* and the Writing of a Difficult History.' *Modernism/modernity*, 20(4), pp. 685-708.

Reizbaum, M. (1999) *James Joyce's Judaic Other.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Richard, J. (1999) *Joyce's Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of Ulysses.* Raleigh: Duke University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2004) *Memory, History, Forgetting.* Trans. Blamey, K. and Pellauer, D. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rossi, A. (1982) *The Architecture of the City.* Trans. Ghirardo, D. and Ockman, J. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rubenstein, M. (2010) *Public Works: Infrastructure, Irish Modernism, and the Postcolonial.* South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ulin, J. (2011) '"Famished Ghosts": Famine Memory in James Joyce's Ulysess.' *Joyce Studies Annual*, pp. 20-63.

Whelan, K. (2002) 'The Memories of "The Dead".' *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, 15(1), pp. 59-97.

Winston, G. (2014) '"Aquacities of Thought and Language": The Political Ecology of Water in Ulysses.' *In* Brazeau, J. and Gladwin, D. (eds) *Eco-Joyce: The Environmental Imagination of James Joyce.* Cork: Cork University Press, pp. 136-158.