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Abstract

Why are there so many disabled characters in James Joyce's *Ulysses*? "Disabled Legislators" seeks to answer this question by exploring the variety and depth of disability's presence in Joyce's novel. This consideration also recognizes the unique place disability finds within what Lennard Davis calls "the roster of the disenfranchised" in order to define Joyce as possessing a "disability consciousness;" that is, an empathetic understanding (given his own eye troubles) of the damaged lives of the disabled, the stigmatization of the disabled condition, and the appropriation of disabled representations by literary works reinforcing normalcy. The analysis of four characters (Gerty MacDowell, the blind stripling, the onelegged sailor, and Stephen Dedalus) treats disability as a singular self-concept, while still making necessary associations to comparably created marginal identities—predominantly the colonial Other. This effort reevaluates how *Ulysses* operates in opposition to liberal Victorian paradigms, highlighting disability's connections to issues of gender, intolerance, self-identification and definition.
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Introduction

“Disability Consciousness,” Postcolonial Studies, Identity Politics, and *Ulysses*

[Joyce’s] writings about Ireland may not provide a coherent critique of either colonized or colonist; but their very ambiguities and hesitations testify to the uncertain, divided consciousness of the colonial subject, which he is unable to articulate in its full complexity outside his fiction.

(Nolan 130)

Because the category of disability is porous, its contingent nature is all the more challenging to identities that seem fixed [race, nationality, ethnicity]. In some sense, disability is more like class, which is constructed but not biologically determined. We might say that disability is a postmodern identity because, although one can somatize disability, it is impossible to essentialize it the way one can the categories of gender or ethnicity.

(Davis, *Bending* 86)

Why are there so many disabled characters in *Ulysses*? This question is bound to the fruitful process of discovering what interest James Joyce had in disability, how he perceived people with disability, and why his interest was so strong as to warrant their formidable presence in *Ulysses*. My thinking about Joyce's concern for disability results from an initial interest in how the author might introduce immobility into a text that
otherwise centralizes, ostensibly, an able-bodied wanderer. This is not to suggest that the
terms “immobile” and “disabled” are interchangeable, for not all physical disabilities
presuppose or even suggest immobilization. However, the most prominent disabilities in
_Ulysses_ share this common thread, for Joyce draws on the presence of characters,
disabled or otherwise, who struggle with mobility in order to emphasize Irish political
immobility.

The text’s obsession with movement is centralized in the flâneur Bloom: “[Being
modern] certainly does not involve harvesting it as a fleeting and interesting curiosity.
That would be what Baudelaire would call the spectator’s posture. The _flaneur_, the idle,
strolling spectator, is satisfied to keep his eyes open, to pay attention and to build up a
storehouse of memories” (Foucault, “What” 40). This description challenges the
perceived forward movement of Dublin’s flâneur, who returns to 7 Eccles Street after no
grand victories or life-altering accomplishments; a cuckold, a rejected father and friend.
Bloom’s counterpart Stephen seems poised to combat idleness in _A Portrait of the Artist
as a Young Man_, which concludes with the promise of a flight to the continent. Indeed,
Baudelaira’s further description of the “modern man” necessitates travel and seems to
smack of Dedalus:

_Away he goes, hurrying, searching. . . . Be very sure that this man. . . .
—this solitary, gifted with an active imagination, ceaselessly journeying
across the great human desert—has an aim loftier than that of a mere
_flaneur_, an aim more general, something other than the fugitive pleasure
of circumstance. He is looking for that quality which you must allow me
to call ‘modernity.’_ (qtd. in Foucault, “What” 40)
Stephen’s failures with movement are relayed to us when his short-lived flight to Paris (which takes place between the events of Portrait and Ulysses) immediately returns him to Dublin to open “Telemachus.” He is reintroduced as a man of unyielding shape who manifests colonial Ireland’s comparable refusal: Ireland’s stasis is reflected (one could say mirrored by a cracked looking-glass) not only by Stephen’s lack of protean movement, and Bloom’s Homeric cycle back home, but also by the variety of characters in Ulysses who struggle with movement—both physically and psychologically. The category is populated by those characters suffering physical disabilities effecting their movements. These characters will be the focus of this study which will ascertain Joyce’s disability consciousness.

By “disability consciousness,” I mean Joyce’s effort to understand and react to the injustices of living with a condition that is almost universally misunderstood and traduced. I also mean Joyce’s effort to disclose disability’s inherited connotations, and to summarily defend disability against the parties who abuse its symbolic properties in order to define normalcy. Joyce’s disability consciousness begins with his understanding of disability’s subtext and his diagnosis of Ireland as paralytic: “individual initiative has been paralysed by the influence and admonitions of the church, while the body has been shackled by peelers, duty officers and soldiers” (PW 123). This attitude informed Dubliners, so titled “to betray the soul of that hemiplegia or paralysis which many consider a city” (L 55). Anthony Burgess embraces this notion of the paralyzed city given its manifestation in Dubliners: “All the stories in Dubliners are studies of paralysis or frustration, and the total epiphany is of the nature of modern city life—the submission to routines and the fear of breaking them; the emancipation that is sought, but not sought
hard enough; the big noble attitudes that are punctured by the weakness of the flesh” (38). Burgess notes a city that with “its timidity and the hollowness of its gestures” is represented by “a paralyzed priest and a broken chalice” in “The Sisters.” By calling Dublin an “impotent” city (43), Burgess defines Joyce’s earliest composition of Dublin’s citizens in much the same way that I do for the Dublin of Ulysses: the city is populated by dis-abled legislators. The populace is so paralyzed with liberal complacency as to be responsible for (and content to allow) the continuation of an established hegemonic order, unwilling to recognize shifting paradigms replacing liberal ideals, and ill-prepared to “progress” under the terms Joyce supported.

This study seeks to establish Joyce as a writer who possessed a social consciousness of disability—while determining the motivations and the nature of this awareness—by scrutinizing the specific portrayal of disabled figures in Ulysses. I contend that Joyce understood disability and its connotations because of his own personal experience: Joyce’s near-blindness affects in him empathy and not merely sympathy for people who experienced disability and its stigmatization. Joyce’s debilitation provides the basis for the considerate tone Ulysses has towards its disabled characters which comments on Western methods of reinforcing normalcy. Joyce is as concerned with negotiating established representations of disability, as he is with understanding the disabled condition. He uses disparate representations, ranging from the highly stereotypical (in order to reveal Ireland’s victimizing capacity and its unwillingness to distance itself from the Anglo source) to the humanely grounded (in order to critique Ireland’s intolerance of the disabled and other identities which are marginalized within identity politics). He provides a comprehensive collection of disabled figures, from the
one-dimensional to the ambiguously complex, in order to make democratic sense of their circumstances, while representing his frustrations with the imbalanced control power discourse has over disability. The marginal place of the disabled in Joyce’s Dublin and their marked resemblance to other novelistic representations of the colonial Other means that Postcolonial Studies has a louder voice in this project than any other discourse which tackles struggling identities found in “the roster of the disenfranchised” (Davis, *Bending* 85). Principally, I contend that the disabled body bears a created social identity which Joyce regarded not with ambiguity, but with as strong and as defined a conscience as has been discovered in the latest research invested in Joyce’s postcolonial voice.

A discussion of Joyce, colonialism, and disability requires an initial exposition of what it means to be disabled and, further, what it means to be postcolonially Irish. I am using here the distinction made “official” by Disabled People’s International about the differences between “impairment” and “disability:” “Impairment is the functional limitation within the individual caused by physical, mental or sensory impairment. Disability is the loss or limitation of opportunities to take part in the normal life of the community on an equal level with others due to physical and social barriers” (qtd. in Barnes 2).² Hence my referring to “disability” speaks more to the frustrations of constructed identity and representation than to the everyday circumstance of physical limitation. I can effectively explain my position within the current scholarly effort to interpret a postcolonial Joyce by acknowledging Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes. *Semicolonial Joyce* provides a definition of sorts with its title (inspired by *Finnegans Wake*) that admits the “sense of a partial fit between this set of approaches and Joyce’s writing.” The collection amasses works by scholars who seek Joyce’s colonial voice.
despite “limited compatibility” between the discourses (3). Attridge and Howes contend that labeling Joyce “postcolonial” is inaccurate. The articles collected struggle with reading Joyce as a postcolonial writer while the introduction lays out the aggressive criticisms which defend both Ireland’s anomalous status in the postcolonial world and Joyce’s own problematic political messages.

Attridge and Howes admit to Ireland’s controversial place amongst postcolonial nations, which affects Joyce’s colonial awareness: “Ireland clearly belongs on both sides of each dichotomy. While Ireland under British rule was underdeveloped and deindustrialized compared to England, twentieth-century Ireland has far more in common with Europe than Africa or Asia in terms of economic performance and living standards” (8). Howes describes the unique duality of Ireland’s colonial situation in a separate text as “Ireland’s double status – as both an agent and a victim of British imperialism” (254).

I am further reminded of another facet to Ireland’s colonial exceptionality when Howes draws attention to the anxiety that permeates *Dubliners*: “the sense that Dublin is too close to England and also too far from it” (261). The distance question becomes important for disabled characters, whose space between embodiments of Englishness and Irishness is constantly in flux. The frustratingly contradictory W.B. Murphy and the duple Gerty MacDowell are examples.

Howes continues to explain the difficulties of negotiating a Joycean postcolonial voice, for its personality is contingent upon the method by which one seeks it out. To speak about *Ulysses* as a whole, or to scrutinize it word by word, encourages markedly diverse conclusions about Joyce’s colonial politics and his views of imperialism (255). Enda Duffy’s characterization of *Ulysses* as an avatar of postcolonial theory is a helpful
assertion, and one that can work in another context. Duffy’s *Subaltern Ulysses* is one of three foundational texts from the current postcolonial debate surrounding Joyce most pertinent here, alongside Vincent Cheng’s *Joyce, Race and Empire* and Emer Nolan’s *James Joyce and Nationalism*. Duffy’s original search for a postcolonial modernism has him claim *Ulysses* as its embodiment (1). His reading of *Ulysses* as the “starred text of an Irish National Literature” (2) is a starting point for debate amongst critics, especially now that the novel’s status is complicated by the commodification of *Ulysses* by the Irish government in the current “Celtic Tiger” economic revolution. Duffy’s claim that *Ulysses* as a whole operates covertly as a postcolonial text is beneficial, yet Nolan softens Joyce’s obsession with Ireland by claiming it to be somewhat “incidental” (Nolan 4); thus, word by word, the colonial presence in *Ulysses* becomes a much stickier issue. Take, for instance, Howes’s warning about Joyce’s use of “The Croppy Boy,” a nationalist ballad and song of reputable popularity in 1904. No one can absolutely conclude whether Joyce used the song for its nationalistic associations, or simply because it was popular—thus befitting his naturalist mode for the text (267): even if the former conclusion is true, Joyce cannot be claimed a nationalist in light of, for example, his dispute with Yeats’s Irish revival. The impossibility of reading Joyce in essentialist terms confronts anyone attempting to graft a postcolonial reading onto Joyce’s most celebrated text, and is an issue I face here when discussing bodily representations in *Ulysses*.

Lennard Davis aptly points out the dangers of essentializing an identity category in disability that is resistant to its equivalency with other disenfranchised modes of being (Davis, *Bending* 86). But for a Joyce scholar, the difficulty of finding a vocabulary for
speaking about disability in Joyce necessitates a degree of reliance on postcolonial scholars concerned with nation, ethnicity, and race; that is, Joyceans committed to more than aesthetics, to identity politics. Having to negotiate both discourses is by no means a disadvantage, when the treatment of the disabled by society is best summarized as being Orientalized by an "unconscious repository of fantasy, imaginative writings and essential ideas" (Bhabha 42). However, disability's own intricacies demand further definition of how disability is associated with, though not altogether equivalent to, the colonial Other. Cheng's *Joyce, Race, and Empire* explores racial difference within the discourses of power and empire, addressing Joyce's fiction both within the cultural movement of constructing Otherness (in particular, Said's Orientalism), and as analogous to the Irish condition (7). According to Cheng, Joyce uses universal analogies of Otherness to convey the Irish political situation (8). This idea problematizes any discussion of analogous disability, for disability bears its own widely accepted connotative properties. Disability's variables warn of the "limited compatibility" (Attridge, *Semicolonial* 3) it has with postcolonial modes of being and for that matter, Irish cultural representation.

For these reasons, there is danger in essentializing disability. Cheng's explanation of how Othering operates in *Ulysses* highlights this concern: "In any event, such derogatory images of 'other' cultures [Victorian culture would choose "universal primitivism" to define the Irish (23)] conjoin in what Said calls an 'essentialist universalism' in which the Other is constructed to seem unchanging, unalterable, and universal along essentialized stereotypes" (22). Cheng's work provides the vocabulary for discussing marginality in Joyce. However, it must be understood that disability is only "equivalent" to minority races, colonial Other, even Irish culture, in so much as they
are all marginalized categories, whose members are subject to lies and myths which empower the dominant culture (Said 6-7), and whose members are largely committed to the unreasonable and unspoken societal request to normalize. Yet as Michael Bérubé’s foreword to *Bending Over Backwards: Disability, Dismodernism, and Other Difficult Positions* posits, the place of the disabled and of Disability Studies is as “a sideshow of a sideshow,” identified as and interested in the “freakiest of the freaks” (viii). Bérubé’s tone here pinpoints the location of the disabled in society, and, for my purposes, in *Ulysses*. Dublin’s defense against an identity it misunderstands is prototypical of Western society: it is most comfortable labeling its disabled as freakish while treating them as spectacle, or ostracizing them out of disgust. The disabled characters that populate Joyce’s Dublin of 16 June, 1904 thus form an important group for combating lingering resistance against disability becoming “a critical term for the humanities” (Bérubé viii).

Further problematizing disability’s inherited definitions, disabled people form a group that has been historically disunited, wherein “[w]heelchair users saw no commonality with people with chronic fatigue syndrome or Deaf people” (Davis, *Bending* 11). To reiterate, this study’s intention is not to essentialize disability as bearing a capacity to allegorize only the colonial Other. The correlation of disabled and Irish identities in *Ulysses* falls on their shared marginal positions alone. Disparate disabilities are also briefly unified by the association between disabled and Irish identities because the connection is based on comparable subjections to all-encompassing persecution. Yet, there must also be accountability for the particulars of each disability as they are contextually discovered within Joyce’s Dublin. Joyce respects the nuances of
specific disabilities and the distinct relationships between able-bodied and disabled Dubliners, as he advances a critique of Irish intolerance and the imperial system that influenced it. It is for this that I appreciate Bérubé’s “freaky” description of disability as pushed to the margins of even the group of identities that is already pushed to the side: disabled characters in *Ulysses* are then equally important for practically illustrating the colonial realities of Ireland, most notably the Irish victimization of an even lower “class.” These marginal marginals fill out Joyce’s text with a volume of “freaks” that make-up a significant part of Joyce’s social commentary.

While all the disabled characters of *Ulysses* are doubly marginal, certain other characters can be similarly categorized because they are only *arguably* disabled, and are thus on the margins of being considered as such. Consider Stephen’s “nuncle” who is introduced in “Proteus” as part of Stephen’s drifting thoughts. Nonetheless, the description of him makes him appear amputated: “In his broad bed nuncle Ritchie, pillowied and blanketed, extends over the hillock of his knees a sturdy forearm. Cleanchested. He has washed the upper moiety” (*U* 39). This immovable figure lives in a house “of decay, mine, his and all”: that is, Stephen’s mind, the house itself, and Ireland (*U* 40). The progressing (or paradoxically regressing) description starkly illustrates Joyce’s characterization of Dublin in *Ulysses* as a decaying city. The choice of “moiety” to describe his body’s upper half is intriguing because it hyperbolizes two exaggerated halves, thus permitting the figure to be read as a bed-ridden cripple with no lower legs to clean. Of course, the novel does not need to rely exclusively on such contentious claims to present disability. Disability’s presence runs so deep that to give proper space to each character and reference to disability proves impossible for the parameters of this study.
Whether seen in the hobbled whales in the shallows (U 45), the warning to Dilly about standing tall (or “[she]’ll get curvature of the spine” [U 228]), deaf bald Pat’s presence in “Sirens,” the three-day labour of the debilitated Mina Purefoy, or Mrs. Riordan’s “incipient catarrhal deafness” (U 633), disability proves to have a rich presence. “Circe” alone becomes a study of disability since it is emphatically “palsied” (U 408), amputated (U 483), and mute (U 409), housing in it “a pigmy woman” (U 409), an “armless pair” (U 427), “Hoppy Holohan” (U 463), a “paralyse[d] Europe” (U 434), “inhuman faces” (U 504), and a Bloom who has a limp spine (U 429), “hereditary epilepsy . . . metal teeth” and has “traces of elephantiasis . . . among his ascendants” (U 465, ellipses added). Even words themselves become disabled at times, as illustrated in that flurried moment when Bloom’s lacking confidence as a husband provides lacking prose: “At four she. Winsomely she on Bloohimwhom smiled. Bloo smi qui go. Ternoon” (U 253).? Joyce was acutely aware of and respected disability as a constructed identity and makes the issues surrounding this construction prominent in his epic. Joyce also understood the impossibility of completely breaking ties with Ireland’s two masters, filling out Ulysses with a disabled presence to affect a complacent and paralyzed colonial Dublin.

The justification for a relationship between colonial politics and Disability Studies is strongest at this metaphysical level. Both Disability Studies and postcolonial discourse break down the relationships that occur in the traditionally separate binaries involving either subject; their willingness to interchange the Other and the disabled for the lower class, the slave, and so on permits a reading of the disabled characters in Ulysses as exaggerations of the colonial subject. Lennard Davis draws connections besides the colonial Other and the disabled body by regarding the associations all marginal
embodiments have with one another, especially because of their roles in society, and the way these roles are established and defined. He expands Foucault’s “repressive hypothesis” and its explanation of how sexual deviancy is indirectly controlled by applying it to the coded stigmatization of the deviant, the disabled, the colonial Other, among others. Davis summarizes: “Political compliance is achieved without repression through the willing cooperation of the populace” which leads to a critique of the novel as a location for administrating willing cultural production (Davis, *Bending* 83). The definitions of what it means to be disabled can be accordingly grafted onto a discussion of what it means to be a colonial Other. This notion will be used to discuss the peripheral, disabled bodies of the novel. What is left to be explored is how Joyce’s *Ulysses* is not doing what Davis claims about the novel as a form: that it has historically depicted the disabled negatively only making them central when the story is about their disability and their heroic or tragic struggle with it. Ultimately, Joyce makes Dublin a ward for the disabled in order to reflect, metaphysically, the debilitated political situation in Ireland. The interactions between able-bodied characters and disabled characters also point to Joyce’s criticism of Ireland as a prototypical nation obsessed with normalcy. Ireland is comfortable with the stereotypical representations of disability, yet threatened by its condition because (unlike congenital marginal identities), disability can assume anyone at anytime.

My calling Dublin a “ward” presumes that the disabled body is an identity comparable or interchangeable, to some extent, with the diseased or unwanted body; though again, no equivalence is posited. This interchange is so effortless because it is part of the historical perception of disability that is challenged by Disability Studies. The
first chapter of Davis’s own *Disability Studies Reader* doubles as a pertinent exploration of the struggles in negotiating normalcy, the body, and its representations in literature, and as an all-encompassing introduction to the various interpretations, discussions, and arguments about the treatment of the disabled in life and in literature. As Davis explains it, “the ‘problem’ is not the person with disabilities; the problem is the way that normalcy is constructed to create the ‘problem’ of the disabled person” (9). His goal in outlining the history of this concept is to scrutinize the maltreatment of the disabled, making it no fault of their own. Focused almost solely on literary representations, Davis discerns the contemporary connotations of “normal” to be a nineteenth-century invention (9-10) and sees a perpetuation of such connotations in literature in the way that disabled characters are pushed to the margins: “part of the project of middle-class hegemony” is a tendency to pull the “plot and character development of novels . . . toward the normative” (21, ellipsis added). When the disabled are lumped into the same category as criminals and the poor, it comes as little surprise that they have such lowly status in literature (17-18). Despite this Otherness, Davis’s larger claim becomes an intriguing one:

I have come to see that almost any literary work will have some reference to the abnormal, to disability, and so on. I would explain this phenomenon as a result of the hegemony of normalcy. This normalcy must constantly be enforced in public venues (like the novel), must always be creating and bolstering its image by processing, comparing, constructing, deconstructing images of normalcy and the abnormal. (23)

Davis’s arguments are in dialogue with the task I have at hand: engaging with Joyce is therefore difficult, as I must justify Joyce’s portrayal of a lame Ireland, whose characters
embody Otherness, while I subsequently centralize disability with this study. I certainly subscribe to Davis’s argument that all literary works, even those that do not appear to be about disability, are involved with issues of normalcy (26). The portrayal of disability in *Ulysses* bolsters the normative body; however, as alluded to earlier, it is part of an effort to dismiss the hegemonic agency over the abnormal. Joyce builds up the dominance of the normative only to knock it down.

Though Disability Studies has a wide-ranging discourse, Davis is a leader in identifying the role of literature in our definitions of disability and normalcy. His theoretical writings will be the basis of this argument, but I leave room for supplemental readings of disability from critics, like Paul Youngquist, who further point to literature and its canonized writers as appropriate subjects for a disability discourse. Youngquist’s *Monstrosities* focuses on nineteenth-century definitions of the proper British body, and I look to gauge Joyce’s reaction to these definitions. The tone of Youngquist’s most abstract claim is appropriate in a work that exposes Britain’s historical support of a proper normative body that “breeds capital and shits class” (xvii); rather, one that aids in the sustaining of “liberalism, free-market economics, British nationalism, and professionalized medicine” (xv). The British upper-middle class then weighs its worth against the labourer and colonized who “provides an occasion for [externally] measuring this prestige” (xviii). With this description, one can see how a modernist like Joyce would be interested in employing disabled characters as alternative subjects to the (white, able-bodied) characters who value the very constants Joyce’s aesthetic questioned (liberalism, imperialism, capitalism, “progress,” modernity). Youngquist ties together cultural politics, economics, and the body. His work is useful for its claims about the
normative body as the productive body (xi-xx), the corrective measures of prosthesis as an industrial enterprise (161-74), and the negotiation of the societal place of the war wounded (174-77). He insists that British normative embodiment is socially based, not only constructed but also, to a certain extent, naturalized because of the country’s wealth, war victories, standard of living, and so on (xxiii). Youngquist views this naturalization as problematic and offers a solution to the normative dichotomy by opposing the classical, unblemished, white, complacent body against monstrosities:

[Michael] Warner calls for a new kind of morality, one that affirms not identity but variation. . . . It would hazard an affirmation of the abject, pathologized life of monstrosities. When being deemed less than normal becomes an occasion for becoming more, norms aren’t transcended so much as transformed – towards the possibilities of new embodiments.

(xxviii, ellipsis added)

Joyce’s gathering of monstrous characters in Ulysses typifies the undesirable place of the disabled as maintained by society, yet some will transcend and, in doing so, will transform norms by challenging their stability. Youngquist claims: “the monstrosities that culture breeds also become material terms for its transformation” (xxix). If, as Youngquist suggests, “monstrosities can redeploy their powers, inspiring social reform, creating new solidarities, promoting a politics of inclusiveness” (xxix), then Joyce can use them to “materialize afflictions, politicize subjections” (xxviii) of the pathological state Britain constructs for Ireland, while concurrently redirecting their powers of inspiration and action which seek to encourage Dublin in its need to become a stand-alone European capital.
Gerty MacDowell, the blind stripling, the onelegged sailor, and Stephen Dedalus provide the basis for understanding Joyce’s disability consciousness, its variety, and its depth. My first chapter concerns itself with disability and gender, as well as disability’s connections to the colonial Other by focusing on Bloom’s interactions with the lame Gerty MacDowell, scrutinizing Gerty’s need to hide her disability. I read Bloom’s interest in Gerty as a sexual figure as the result of both her embodiment of a distant, two-dimensional figure who is non-threatening to the male gaze, and more importantly because of her brief yet memorable embodiment of English beauty. In the moments before Gerty walks the strand, Bloom is a desperate Irishman reaching to exploit and debase an English woman. The revelation about Gerty’s Irish girlhood and representational lameness causes an embarrassing case of symbolic self-abuse (besides Bloom’s masturbation) wherein an Irishman in fact debases an Irish woman. I will engage Garry Leonard, who has discussed Gerty’s Britishness and her affiliations with advertising and pornography. I will also integrate feminist Disability Studies in order to highlight the desperation that comes with living with disability in Ireland, while addressing the contentious issue of gendering disability. As a result, Joyce’s pessimism towards Ireland’s own desperate situation will reveal itself.

The second chapter is concerned with the Irish intolerance of not only the disabled, but also of other “traditional” marginal identities by taking a closer look at the blind stripling’s interactions with the other Dubliners of the novel. The stripling’s exceptional mobility empowers his transcendental abilities, and will be scrutinized in order to uncover a hopeful feeling within Joyce about the capacity for Ireland to overhaul its own reckless immobility. Recent changes in the critical thinking of metaphorical
blindness will demonstrate the stripling’s capacity to represent a debilitated Ireland. An autobiographical reading of blindness in Joyce will also make sense of the metafictional purpose behind the stripling, by situating the author within the character.

The third chapter treats the problem of defining a character by his disability alone while exposing the complexity of the identity. It reads the onelegged sailor and W.B. Murphy as linked in order to highlight ambiguities and contradictions in characterization. Reworking the onelegged sailor into W.B. Murphy, Joyce exposes his readers’ own prejudices by confronting them with welcome stereotype. When readers confront the problematically ambiguous Murphy, questions concerning nationalism and disability arise, not least because the sailor’s potential missing leg may be a war wound acquired in defense of England. A reading of Murphy as Irish—which, despite the name, is surprisingly difficult to prove definitively—will engage with the debate surrounding notions of colonial sacrifice as a means to mobilize oneself and find a place amongst the Imperial hierarchy.

The conclusion concerns itself with disability as a weapon for Joyce who addresses the allegorical links from disability to immobility, and immobility to Ireland’s colonial politics by allowing Stephen to be read as disabled. A defense of Joyce’s use of the disabled as inoffensive and in no way exploitive is coordinated with a final statement about what makes the subject of disability so important to Joyce, and why his distribution of these bodies appears to drive a criticism against Ireland’s complacency, infighting, and intolerance.
"She's Lame O!" The Female Body, Disability, and Irish Colonial Pathology

As Homi Bhabha points out: '[Orientalism] is, on the one hand, a topic of learning, discovery, practice; on the other, it is the site of dreams, images, fantasies, myths, obsessions and requirements'. . . . Joyce's texts, as we shall see, are at once deeply interwoven with received representations of the romance of the Orient, of the Orient/Other/Exotic as a site of imaginative 'othering' – as well as simultaneously participating in an evolving, genetic scrutiny and critique of such processes of othering and essentializing. (Cheng 78, ellipsis added)

James Joyce's pairing of "[s]tately, plump" to open *Ulysses* immediately solicits a reading of nationhood and of the body; their abutment further suggests that the literary strands that weave them are as tightly knit as Gerty MacDowell's stockings in "Nausicaa." The voyeuristic moments Bloom shares with this adolescent flirt are difficult to negotiate because Bloom's mind fluctuates and Gerty's physical exterior alters. At times, Gerty's essentialized outer layer seems to reverse the direction of Orientalism, with Bloom as colonial subject fantasizing about the Occident; yet when Gerty gets up for the first time in the episode in order to leave, the identities of the two characters embody new qualities, with Gerty making the most unexpected change, and Bloom, the most explosive:

Slowly without looking back she went down the uneven strand to Cissy, to Edy, to Jacky and Tommy Caffrey, to little baby Boardman. . . . She
walked with a certain quiet dignity characteristic of her but with care and very slowly because, because Gerty MacDowell was…..

Tight boots? No. She lame! O! (U 351, ellipsis added)

Barbara Hillyer has identified a tendency among disabled women for denial and normalization as the means to avoid a life of oppression. She warns: “The price for the woman of ignoring one of the most significant parts of herself is a damaged self-concept. Acknowledging its importance, though, evokes social sanctions” (112). The twenty pages it takes for Gerty’s disability to be revealed testify to her denial of her disability, and her struggle to negotiate between the undesirable options of either burying a significant part of herself or living a sanctioned existence. As a result, Gerty is a “damaged self-concept,” a fractured woman caught hiding honest identities of “Irishness” and colonial Other, beneath fabricated images of “Englishness” and “normality.” A limping Gerty can no longer be categorized as a picturesque occidental beauty, and yet Bloom refuses to let her newly confirmed identity as disabled/marginal/Other become a fantasy that Homi Bhabha insists is a trope of Orientalism. In response to Bloom proclaiming his relief that “[he] didn’t know it when she was on show” (U 351), feminist Disability Studies would argue that Bloom’s gaze in this illuminating moment converts to a stare. Rosemary Garland Thompson, in Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature, contends that “[i]f the male gaze makes the normative female a sexual spectacle, then the stare sculpts the disabled subject into a grotesque spectacle [and] is the gesture that creates disability as an oppressive social relationship” (26). I contend that a critique of both the Irish mistreatment of the disabled in particular, and the marginal in general, is manifested by the transformative quality of
that moment when Gerty’s lameness is disclosed. Bloom’s symbolically exploitive gaze towards a woman who briefly embodies “English” beauty retains its oppressive qualities when he is ultimately left staring at a fellow Irish colonial. Bloom’s masturbatory act is less than noble (taking place as it does on the fringe of the city). He is forced into a situation wherein his political consciousness is proven to be misdirected, though by little fault of his own. The criticism relies on the desperation of Bloom’s attempt to debase England, as characterized by his pathetic physical appearance after the sexual act, and also by his internal struggle to negotiate the falsity of outward appearances. Both the internal conflict and external falseness reflect Dublin’s refusal to nurture anyone (Bloom in particular) who can pacifistically de-Anglicize the nation. Bloom’s observation of the strand’s infertile sand likewise reflects the nation’s inability to raise pacifist leaders while sifting through Ireland’s national intolerance. Further, Gerty’s physically disabled form concurrently forces a reevaluation of how Joyce portrays a debilitated colonial Ireland. “Nausicaa” presents Bloom in his standard marginal position but also, at times, in one of patriarchal power. Joyce facilitates this duality by way of an episode characterized by shifting narratives and dramatic changes. Bloom’s dual nature is the key feature for an episode that houses an overall critical opinion of essentializing and Othering “processes” (78), to echo Vincent Cheng’s term.9

The narrative of “Nausicaa” initially insists that Gerty is “as fair a specimen of winsome Irish girlhood as one could wish to see” (U 333) with eyes of “the bluest Irish blue” (U 334). These introductory descriptions appear to contradict my argument concerned with Bloom’s metaphysical political protest; however, Joyce appropriately constructs an Irish girl who masks herself behind a veil of Englishness. The narrative
style for roughly the first third of “Nausicaa” (the section which is commonly read as independent of Bloom’s consciousness) has origins in Maria Cummin’s novel *The Lamplighter* (Gifford 384n). Gerty Flint, the heroine of that novel, is bound to a narrative style which Joyce parodies in “Nausicaa.” Joyce’s parody makes the earliest and lengthiest description of Gerty a mock-moral sketch, set to lampoon the fashionable yet absurd obedience early twentieth-century upper-middle-class women had to the sentimentalist lessons of the Victorian novel. The narrative Gerty creates for herself—that of the love-sick romantic tempting fate by presenting herself on the beach to her bicycling beau—appropriately reflects sentimental fantasy. Gerty’s narrative consciousness provides biased characterizations, yet her initial proclamations are undercut by the delicate wording: “She was pronounced beautiful by all the girls who knew her though, as folks often said, she was more a Giltrap [even a Guilt trap, or Gilt wrap] than a MacDowell” (*U* 333). The distinction questions her previously established Irishness that is ostensibly muddled when spelled out genealogically. Joyce’s notable inclusion of “though” suggests that Gerty’s beauty is uncharacteristic of Irish girlhood and raises doubts about her Irishness. Despite her youthful disposition, Bloom and even Gerty herself ultimately render her non-Irish. In fact, “God’s fair land of Ireland did not hold her equal” (*U* 334). Before scrutinizing Gerty’s falsely British appearance any further, the Englishness of the setting in which this voyeurism takes place must be explored so that we may see how it supports a reading of Bloom’s exploitation as actually directed at a girl he thinks of as English.

Since the narrative already parodies the moralist Victorian yarn, the setting itself becomes suspect in terms of its Irishness. Considering how Gerty’s moralist narrative
serves as a reminder of the extent to which Ireland is dependant on Anglicization, the setting further develops the initial characterization of Gerty as an embodiment of Englishness. The strand, further east than any other municipal location in Dublin that Joyce uses, may be thought of as the Westernmost shore of imperial Britain. The "setting sun in the west" (U 331) is backwardly displayed—not as it sets over the water, but as it sets over the city, signaling Dublin's dark future. It thus fails to reflect any serene image out of Turner with an aesthetically pleasing horizon; the mere mention of the setting sun is an allusion to the pride Britain takes in the sun never setting on its empire.10

Joyce fills out "Nausicaa" with characters and landmarks that put the Irishness of the scene into question. He reveals the twins to be appropriately dressed in sailor suits with HMS Belleisle printed on them (U 331). Joyce comments on not only the British naval presence in Ireland but also, via the satire of the ship's name, the impressive indoctrinating capacities of the British military, whose press-gang past is never long forgotten. Joyce disrupts Bloom's masturbation by way of these two allegorically charged boys who are controlled by the young women of the chapter. The "little mariner[s]" (U 332) initially prevent Bloom from acting upon his desires with Gerty, quite literally because Bloom cannot commit such an act in the presence of children, but figuratively because of their own roles as British guardsmen. The children are Gerty's protectors as much and as farcically as Privates Compton and Carr are defenders of Cissy in "Circe." Here, Gerty will not be taken advantage of under the watch of Tommy and Jacky Caffrey. Their castle-building confirms the power of the twins as guardsmen and conquerors, which requires Bloom to wait for their disappearance before he can engage sexually with Gerty. The twins are eager to shape and lay ownership to castles such as
Howth, which stands on guard to the north of the strand. Masters Tommy and Jacky reflect a military purpose in their castle by fashioning a door to reflect the nearest Martello tower. The subverted maxim "every little Irishman's house is his castle" (U 332) reflects the depths of Irish Anglicization. Couple the Martello tower's disruption of the strand's beauty with the prevalent attendance of the Roman Catholic Church of Mary and the infiltration of both masters, "an English and an Italian" (U 20), deducts from a vision of an Irish Ireland, which this scene determines impossible.

While the strand's British tones accentuate Joyce's central female figure, the author struggled with the volume of allusions he wanted for the setting. I make this claim because of a discrepancy between the Rosenbach manuscript and Beach's 1922 edition: Gerty's initial purpose for being on the beach is not to promulgate herself for Bloom, but for W.E. Wylie, who up until the 1922 edition lived on London bridge road (Driver 334). Gabler's edition resurrects this detail (750,751), raising questions concerning Joyce's intention here. It could well be that Joyce never meant for this detail to find a place outside his manuscripts. He must have then had reasonable anxieties about being too overt in calling Ireland an extension of England, unwilling to bring it down to street level.

Consider also the diluted principal descriptions of Gerty's beauty: her Englishness is mediated by descriptions of classical beauty, beginning with the comparison of her image to the smooth marble of a statue: "The waxen pallor of her face was almost spiritual in its ivorylike purity though her rosebud mouth was a genuine Cupid's bow, Greekly perfect. Her hands were a finely veined alabaster with tapering fingers and as white as lemon juice and queen of ointments could make them" (U 333). Joyce
establishes Bloom’s taste for classical beauty in food-crazed “Lestrygonians,” and thus makes Venus-like Gerty an appealing vision to Bloom:

His downcast eyes followed the silent veining of the oaken slab. Beauty: it curves: curves are beauty. Shapely goddesses, Venus, Juno: curves the world admires. Can see them library museum standing in the round hall, naked goddesses. Aids to digestion. They don’t care what man looks. All to see. Never speaking. (U 168)

Notice Joyce’s reuse of the root “vein” in “Nausicaa,” which causes a literal link between Gerty and the statue, thus confirming Bloom’s desire to have his “Galilean eyes” look upon Gerty’s own “mesial groove,” to echo the words of the homophobic Buck (U 192). In addition to this connection, Joyce alludes to Englishness within the classical description: her “rosebud mouth” (U 333) echoes England’s national flower, while the later admission that Gerty is “as delicate as the faintest rosebloom” (U 333) provides an accurate description of a girl-turned-woman who only carries the slightest bit of Englishness, just enough to disguise her Irish girlhood in order to create an alluring exterior. Joyce takes this connection to its pinnacle when Gerty wonders “why you couldn’t eat something poetical like violets or roses” (U 337). The pairing of the national flower with a flower whose hue signals royalty reveals the falsity of her rhetoric; Bloom will soon prove that such poetry housed in Gerty, however stately, can and will be devoured by his sexual appetite.

What is ultimately more exciting about Bloom’s interest in classical beauty is his appeal outside of physical attributes: Bloom is also attracted to what Philip Sicker calls a “voyeuristic need to maintain the illusions of invisibility and private viewing” (95), an
aversion of the medusa’s gaze. This prerequisite for Bloom’s sexual appetite is initially revealed in “Calypso,” when he attempts to catch a glimpse of a woman’s “moving hams” (U 57). From there, his gaze is focused consistently on the rear; along with his interest in the backside of the Venus, he greets Molly’s “plump mellow yellow smellow melons of her rump” with a kiss upon settling in for the night in “Ithaca” (U 686). This ruse is a literal escape from the female gaze, and is defined further by his choice of sexual object in “Lotus-Eaters.” The woman who flashes “rich stockings white” to Bloom as he gazes across the road is a traveler, evidenced by her exit from the Grosvenor Hotel (U 71). Her fleeting presence in Dublin makes her an appealing object for Bloom’s gaze with little chance of her being seen again. As for Gerty, the young girl appears anomalous against these other attractions as she engages directly with Bloom, meeting his gaze head-on. While Bloom and Gerty exchange scopophilic gazes, Joyce ensures that Gerty’s (Irish) eyes never look upon Bloom by making her dogmatically obedient to London fashion, thus aligning Gerty with the other Irish women mentioned: the English Gerty is fashioned by her usage of the queen of ointments hand cream, a real cleanser produced by M Beetham & Son in Cheltenham, England (Gifford 385). Likewise, “Madame Vera Verity, directress of the Woman Beautiful page of the Princess novelette [a weekly magazine published in London (Gifford 385-86)] . . . had first advised her to try eyebrowleine [sic] which gave that haunting expression to the eyes” (U 334, ellipsis added), thus masking their once bluest of blue Irishness, converting them into “eyes of witchery” (U 334). Her dedication to London fashion is thus responsible for hiding a young Irish girl behind an embodiment of empowered British womanhood. Gerty’s eyes are “impart[ed] with a strange yearning tendency [with] a charm few could resist” (U
334) and are more effective at drawing the gaze than those eyes of “squinty Edy” (U 334). Edy is virtually ignored by Bloom (aside from an observation about her delicacy and speculation by Bloom that she is “near her monthlies” [U 351]). Cissy fails to attract Bloom’s attention because she is “not one of your twofaced things” (U 338) and does not convey Gerty’s desperation. Gerty’s effort to disguise her disability offers compensatory flirtations that engage Bloom’s sexual appetite (whereas Cissy is not compelled to be receptive) until a lame Gerty suddenly offers more than the requisite “accessibility” for which Bloom is looking for. Richard Ellmann employs this term to describe Joyce’s relationship with Marthe Fleischmann—one of Gerty’s prototypes, and Joyce’s real-life Nausicaa (JJ 450). Joyce uses this desperate showcasing to parallel Gerty’s “accessibility” to Bloom with Ireland’s colonial accessibility to England, for what was Ireland’s relationship to England if not one of access? Bloom ultimately accepts and embraces Gerty’s false English appearance because he is aroused by the inaccessible, by the thought that an English woman is making herself available to an Irish Jew. His rejection of Gerty when she is discovered to be all too available carries the notion that Ireland’s current problem of being too accommodating to Anglicization should be just as definitively redressed.

Bloom must rationalize the capacity for all women to deceive in this manner in order to retain the fantasy of the inaccessible. During his narrative following the disclosure of Gerty’s lameness, notions of wearing exotically false skin prevail: “Because those spice islands, Cinghalese this morning, smell them leagues off. Tell you what it is. It’s like a fine fine veil or web they have all over the skin, fine like what do you call it gossamer and they’re always spinning it out of them, fine as anything, rainbow colours
without knowing it" (U 357). Though speaking specifically of Molly here, Bloom’s suggestion of woman as a creature of numerous veiled colours is fittingly set against his interaction with Gerty. With “gossamer” also carrying the denotation of a porous argument which is easily seen through, Joyce ironically ridicules Bloom’s inability to see through Gerty’s falseness until the deed is done. Bloom struggles with this sense of defeat, rationalizing her affectation as universal:

Almost see them shimmering, kind of bluey white. Colours depend on the light you see. Stare the sun for example like the eagle then look at a shoe see a blotch blob yellowish. Wants to stamp his trademark on everything. Instance, that cat this morning on the staircase. Colour of brown turf. Say you never see them with three colours. Not true. That half tabbywhite tortoiseshell in the City Arms with the letter em on her forehead. Body fifty different colours. (U 360)

Bloom’s own “stare case” is explored in this description, for Gerty’s wealth of catlike colours is summarized by Bloom’s insistence on the shared multiplicity of outward appearances in felines and in women, and by the diversity of perspectives (as represented by light and shade) which skews a man’s ability to determine what is real and what is fabricated in terms of a woman’s outward appearance. Alas, such revelations would have better served Bloom before he was taken in by the bluest blue of the understandably deceptive Gerty.

I say understandably because Gerty’s effectiveness as an object of desire requires her desperation. Indeed, her “one shortcoming” (U 348) forces the strained extraction of all she can out of her outward appearance. Her fashioned image culminates in a
deliberately alluring pose; the language which describes her precarious lean backwards comments on the dangerous balancing act Gerty performs, for she is always teetering on the edge of being found out, being exposed for her lameness, her Irishness, and therefore her marginal colonial position. Gerty catches “her knee in her hands so as not to fall” (U 349) not merely because of an imbalance created after attempting a better view of fireworks. In this position, she can also expose her underskirt to Bloom; such a pose would undoubtedly be classified by Garry Leonard as a “bodily confession” (637). Foucault’s ideas about sexual power are helpful here, wherein “power is always the dominant infrastructure in the construction of pleasure” (636). Foucault states:

[Repression of instincts and the law of desire] both rely on a common representation of power which, depending on the use of it and the position it is accorded in respect to desire, leads to two contrary results: either to the promise of a ‘liberation,’ if power is seen as having only an external hold on desire, or, if it is constitutive of desire itself, to the affirmation:

you are always-already trapped. (History 83)

Gerty epitomizes the helplessness of this design. Both Leonard and Thomas Richards read Gerty’s construction as “purely social” (Sicker 96), agreeing with Suzette Henke’s description of Gerty as a woman “doomed to construct a media-controlled self-image” (Henke 138). I extend this definition to explain how the disabled are likewise doomed by the controlling hand of a discriminatory society. Her place in Bloom’s fantasies results from her willingness to create this two-dimensional “tableau” (U 352), the physical embodiment of an unattainable female-type that Bloom (consumptive patriarch in this
instance), desires to fantasize about without fear of the female gaze striking back in judgment.

This picture of English beauty is admired by Bloom and given the label “Gertrude” and not “Gerty” (U 346), for the latter label connotes Irish girlhood while the former denotes womanly England. These labels highlight the division in Gerty’s character, and foreshadow the reversion back to “winsome Irish girlhood” her limp initiates. All English associations abruptly halt, for as current disability scholarship suggests, a lame Gerty no longer has license to embody British normality. Lennard Davis attributes the nineteenth-century emergence of the contemporary connotations of “normal” to the economic impact of European industrialization, with the word taking on its modern meanings in the 1840s (“Constructing” 10). Fittingly, Paul Youngquist ties the proper British body to the productive body but only because the ruling powers of that century valued “Western” economic productivity. This preference meant the exclusion of those bodies which did not “traditionally” labour. Youngquist explains this by citing the lack of value Native-American bodies had because they “did not labor” in any meaningful capacity to Britain and later the United States (xvii). Gerty’s lack of production is characterized by her difficulties entering the “traditional” economics of marriage, difficulties symbolized by her lack of movement in “Nausicaa” and by the roots running so deep for the character. Healthcare Bloom observes Gerty’s limp as the reason why “she’s left on the shelf” (U 351)—quite literally left on the rock in relative inertia when set against the rest of her active party. The consumerist language explaining her lack of productivity mirrors the desperate social situation in which Gerty finds herself, owing to her disability and the “grim power relations” (Leonard 661) of marriage. Joyce
establishes that, in her beautified state, “Gerty MacDowell might easily have held her own beside any lady in the land [with] patrician suitors at her feet vying with one another to pay their devoirs to her” (U 333-34), but the conclusion is that Gerty is not marriageable because of her lameness, and will be passed over by shopping males. Leonard argues that Gerty’s commodification is a result of her enthusiasm for women’s fashion magazines which attempts to reverse her “diminishing prospects for marriage” (661), the only productive role she can strive for due to the gender restrictions at the turn of the century which no amount of wearing “blue for luck” (U 335) will remedy.

Gerty’s willingness to showcase herself assumes that Gerty is a woman who aspires to marry, and is a person of disability who aspires to be “normal.” This aspiration is hers, but only in so much as the British ruling class has indoctrinated her. Feminist Disability Studies understands, as well as Bloom does, the undesirable circumstance Gerty characterizes when she limps off that rock. Just as Bloom laments, “A defect is ten times worse in a woman” (U 351), so does Susan Wendell empathize: “Disabled women struggle with both the oppressions of being women in male-dominated societies and the oppressions of being disabled in societies dominated by the able-bodied” (261). The latter oppression pervades literature, for Davis contends that “the very structures on which the novel rests [and he is speaking generally of literature here] tend to be normative” with few characters of disability being anything other than minor or secondary (“Constructing” 21). Davis distinguishes this narrative normativity as creating “by definition. . . the abnormal, the Other, the disabled, the native, the colonized subject, and so on” (22, ellipsis added). The interchange forces a reevaluation of how Joyce constructs Irish colonialism pathology, for it appears to be housed within Gerty’s lame
state: the abnormal, the Other, the disabled, and the colonial subject are labeled indistinct from one another by Davis, after their shared property of being defined against “normal” identities is acknowledged; this truism is found not only in Disability Studies but also in Postcolonial Studies. Anne McClintock similarly correlates binary relationships when discussing the Imperial abject:

Under imperialism, I argue, certain groups are expelled and obliged to inhabit the impossible edges of modernity: the slum, the ghetto, the garret, the brothel, the convent, the colonial bantusan and so on. Abject peoples are those whom industrial imperialism rejects but cannot do without: slaves, prostitutes, the colonized, domestic workers, the insane, the unemployed, and so on. (72)

Notice how appropriately McClintock’s language describes both Gerty and Bloom, two second-class citizens whose voyeuristic exchange occurs fittingly on the geographically “impossible edge” of Dublin. McClintock’s coordination of binary halves makes sense of where colonial embodiment emerges in Ulysses. By encouraging Gerty’s paradoxical mobility (paradoxical because of her physical immobility) between once distinguishable categories now synthesized, Gerty can be plural in her marginality. She is disabled, female, Irish colonial, idle, immoral, all at once, identities covered up by her Englishness before the revelation of her limp.

Bloom chooses to acknowledge his eclectic tastes for the female body as a way of rationalizing his ability to ejaculate to a disabled woman: “Hot little devil all the same. Wouldn’t mind. Curiosity like a nun or a negress or a girl with glasses” (U 351). Bloom’s fantasy of the inaccessible influences this admission, as he tries to make Gerty
exotic, while downplaying his physical attraction to her. The interesting range of female types in his rationalization reveals that Bloom is as entirely bored with his own marriage as Molly is. While the pair’s lack of sexual relations was initiated by the death of Rudy, the current remission is the product of boredom. Clearly, neither has lost his or her sexual appetite, but Molly has lost her hunger for Poldy. Their desires are satisfied in two very different ways. Molly still “a good armful” (U 102), can charm Boylan into having sex, but Bloom is left to fantasize about tarnishing the piety of a holy woman, embracing dark exotic flesh, and affixing his gaze on as different a woman (relative to Molly) as one who wears glasses. The extension of his fantasies into actual masturbation gives a layered perspective to his pathetically subservient place in his marriage (which is further exemplified by his welcomed domination by Bella/o in “Circe”), and to his marginal place in Dublin.

Yet all of Bloom’s actions and thoughts are grounded in Joyce’s realism and as a result, are influenced by Dublin’s hindrance of Jews. The city is responsible for Bloom’s position, and for Gerty’s unfortunate feeling that she must normalize her appearance by hiding her disability, in order to find marital success. When Bloom views Gerty as the embodiment of British and classical normative beauty, he is described as “eying her as a snake eyes its prey” (U 344), which articulates Bloom’s capacity to represent both the victim and the victimizer. A more ironic claim depends, once again, on Joyce’s use of “though:” “His eyes burned into her as though they would search her through and through, read her very soul” (U 342). The “though” here problematizes this effort, indicating a lack of interest in ever reading her that deeply. This failure is confirmed by his shallow interest in her surface beauty and his abrupt dejection of her disability which,
had Bloom invested any deeper interest in her, would have negated Gerty’s need to ask if his eyes could be trusted (U 342). For a hero who Joyce insists is above all else “kind,”¹⁴ his intentions in this moment are uncharacteristically selfish, and politically impotent. Bloom’s remorse over his regrettable actions appropriately comes after climax and before Gerty rises. He realizes what “an utter cad he had been,” while lamenting that “[h]e of all men” (U 350) could be responsible for such a pathetic attempt to degrade and debase a woman he perceives as English. The act characterized as “their secret, only theirs” (U 350) epitomizes the lack of public opportunity Bloom has to legislate, while Joyce avoids placing the blame for this lack on his hero in order to make Ireland responsible.

Bloom is left to speculate that Gerty “[w]ouldn’t give that satisfaction” (U 354) by refusing to look back when she was going down the strand; however, his meandering mind lacks clarity in this moment. He is right to speak in the past tense of the “fine eyes she had” with the whites responsible for bringing them out (U 354), for her eyes have since changed as a result of her transformation into a lame duck. Gerty’s eyes are no longer English with darkened frames that make the whites pop. With her lameness revealed, Gerty’s Irish eyes return and thus make any hesitation on Gerty’s part to look back a product of her newly established vulnerability. The reversion is emphasized by the inability of the two characters to retain sight of each other. Any observation made of the other in the last pages is done without the character’s locking eyes. Joyce satisfies this with the incompletion of Gerty’s conclusive narration about “that foreign gentleman that was sitting on the rock looking was” (U 365). Gerty realizes (with a look) the exploitation of her outward appearance, yet is not afforded the agency to say so. She is silenced by a clock that speaks for her, one that labels Bloom a cuckold with its repetitive
"Cuckoo" (U 364-65). Her sentimentalist narrative pieces together his motivation for his interest in her, yet refuses to allow her to weigh in on the implications. She looks towards Bloom with her Irish eyes for the first time, yet there is no definitive break with sentimentality. The incompleteness strengthens a reading of her as colonial, a lame character who can look, but is silenced, who can disguise her vision and speak endlessly, yet is not afforded both sight and speech concomitantly. The disruption of her sight and her speech, her lameness and lack of agency, make her an appropriate vision of the colonial Other.

These concluding moments of "Nausicaa," leave us with a vision of the marginal that colours gender, sexual orientation, race, and ethnicity. He uses the vehicle of the disabled woman to comment on the injustice of the marginal's dogmatic commitment to normalize, when anyone in that position should not feel as though this is his or her place. The sheer lengths to which Gerty goes to create a "normal" body are more extreme than, say, the blind stripling's silent resistance to any help crossing the street—a plea to be treated as an equal. Yet both are relatively well suited to illustrate a belief within Disability Studies concerned with the enforced hegemonic necessity for disabled individuals not to identify or even accept the disability, but to find strategies of normalizing. Strategies can include the acceptance of newer and more realistic prosthetic limbs, even the belief in medical science to normalize the mind. What is unique to the disabled is their flexibility and ability to change, not to mention the official public support to normalize their bodies, which comes more visibly and more easily than to other marginalized identities.\(^{15}\) Despite this uniqueness, the disabled still find a place in the "multicultural, rainbow quilt of identities" (Davis, Bending 13) which is asked by the
ruling power to normalize. Joyce’s scene on Sandymount strand reflects the long history of this request.

Discussions of performativity and constructionism in terms of gender set an important precedent for understanding disability. Rosemary Garland Thompson’s discussion of disability performance and construction is helpful here: “strategic constructionism de-stigmatizes the disabled body, makes difference relative, denaturalizes so-called normalcy, and challenges appearance hierarchies” while “strategic essentialism. . . validates individual experience and consciousness, imagines community, authorizes history, and facilitates self-naming” (Extraordinary 23, ellipsis added). The disabled require these strategies to breakdown the system that created them. While disability can prompt us to face certain realities, even force reevaluations, it must rely on conscientious artists to combat its stigmatized representations by employing the strategies outlined by Thompson. Joyce’s empathetic tone discloses the desperation of Gertys situation, and may well seek to “liberate psychologically subjects whose bodies have been narrated to them as defective” (Thompson, “Feminist Theory” 283), expose the oppression, and critique the system responsible.

Bloom’s confident (yet false) resolution about Gerty’s eyes carries his burgeoning need to detach the disabled/Irish image of Gerty from his mind. His need explains the official position of today’s support for normalizing the disabled body, while specifically highlighting Irish intolerance. Bloom’s meandering thoughts turn quickly to Molly and other women who are “straight on [their] pins anyway not like the other” (U 355), yet his inability to escape the physical reminder of his exploitation (his wet clothes) causes an abrupt interruption. Joyce makes Bloom delusional about “the strength it [masturbation]
gives a man" (U 353). Bloom’s conquest is undercut by his pathetic corporeal presence, observed as he recomposes himself. Bloom’s position as conquering hero alters to that of an adolescent whose masturbation exposes Ireland’s own “self-abuse” in the face of attractive Englishness. Bloom’s childish ridicule of Gerty illustrates the juvenile Irish susceptibility to abusing its own citizens:

Mr. Bloom with careful hand recomposed his wet shirt. O lord, that little limping devil. Begins to feel cold and clammy. After effect not pleasant. Still you have to get rid of it someway. They don’t care. Complimented perhaps. Go home to nicey bread and milky and say night prayers with the kiddies. (U 353)

Bloom’s infantile attack is representative of Ireland’s difficulties in escaping the paralytic effects of infighting. Bloom undergoes a process in “Nausicaa” by which his maturity degenerates which ultimately enriches this idea. Bloom shares a place with little Baby Boardman and Tommy Caffrey. All three discharge bodily fluids in the episode: Tommy Caffrey relieves himself behind a pushcar (U 336), baby Boardman causes Cissy to cry out to “Holy Saint Denis” as he is discovered to be “possing wet” (U 341), and of course we know all too well about Bloom’s discharge. Joyce’s decision to have Bloom share in this distinction infantilizes him at the moment of orgasm, thus signifying his attempt to debase Gerty as immature, and selfish. Joyce establishes sympathy for Bloom, which discounts him as a figure to blame for such desperation. The connections between the characters relay Joyce’s potential opinion of Dublin as a city plagued by childishness and embitterment that prevent meaningful pacifist resistance.
The nature of Bloom’s deflated protest leaves him at a crossroads. He can either define himself as unfortunate victim or seedy perpetrator, though Joyce would have him be both to reflect the real problem of the Irish victim turned victimizer. Bloom’s attempt to spell out his identity by carving “I... AM A” into the sand (U 364, ellipsis added) dramatizes this struggle. Bloom’s uncertainties about how to “best” define himself asks Gerty, as the embodiment of Englishness and as disabled woman (further as Irish colonial), to be necessarily separated from one another. Bloom should feel neither remorse nor doubt about his action against the English Gerty because it had the potential to be an action against Ireland’s controller; unfortunately, the adolescent nature of the act, and the realization of Gerty’s lameness prevents a clean break from these emotions and complicates the political overtones of the chapter which Bloom addresses by metaphorically discussing the sand into which he sinks: “Mr. Bloom effaced the letters with his slow boot. Hopeless thing sand. Nothing grows in it. All fades” (U 364). In this moment, Joyce summons the image of Stephen’s own difficulties treading the suck of the strand, providing a like moment of immobility for the principal hero. Unable to find enough space to complete his declaration, despite an embarrassing amount of beach on which to write, Bloom’s comments indicate the complex reality of Ireland’s colonial situation, which itself cannot be easily spelled out. The admission of sand’s infertile nature more directly reflects the postcolonial trend of using a soil metaphor in order to symbolize national intolerance. The infertile nature of Sandymount strand represents the Ireland which Joyce is concerned about reseeding with European culture and influence. Ultimately, the Irish dis-ability to de-Anglicize makes Joyce claim of the island: “She’s lame! O!”
“Our eyes demand their turn. Let them be seen!” (FW 52.18-19):

The Transcendental Blind Stripling

this slow blind face
pushing
its virginal nonentity
against the light

Pure purposeless eremite
of centripetal sentience
Upon the carnose horologe of the ego
The vibrant tendon index moves not (Loy 10-17)

Mina Loy, like James Joyce, is preoccupied with language; her poem has a linguistic jouissance which resembles that of Ulysses. In addition, Loy’s blind youth bears an interesting likeness to Joyce’s blind stripling: both are nameless “nonentities.” Each has impeccable hearing (as they are defined in terms which signify sound). Each has as his prevailing trait his blindness, which is built into his common label. The two share the role of purposeless hermit in the eyes of their respective communities. More abstractly, the interesting personification of a clock, which Loy grafts onto her Kriegsopfer, connects him with time in as much as Joyce unites his piano tuner with musical time. The one crucial difference in their behaviours is that the “vibrant tendon
index” of the blind soldier “moves not,” while the blind stripling is impressively mobile, taptaptapping his way across the pages of *Ulysses*. The potential for Loy’s 1923 poem to be read as a response to one of Joyce’s least critically discussed characters is legitimized by a poem entitled “Joyce’s *Ulysses*” in the same collection as “Der Blinde Junge.” The coordination of ideas between the two authors at least informs the critic of the modernist consciousness of disabled figures. The two works share a critical opinion of liberal complacency which, for Loy, produced the war that blinded her soldier and, for Joyce, caused the colonial imbalance that bred a Dublin plagued by infighting and marginalization. The interactions that this nameless secondary character has with Bloom, and the patrons of the Ormond street bar, affirm Ireland’s resistance to pacifistic transformation; the stripling is a symbol of hope for transcending a complacent Ireland, whose pathological state taxed Joyce’s patience. He further functions autobiographically, providing a model of Joyce other than the disengaged Stephen, a different platform from which Joyce’s political voice can be heard. Indeed, Joyce’s own problems with sight mean the stripling can be read as an embodiment of Joyce who metafictionally finds a place in *Ulysses*. This chapter will address historical transformations of reading blindness as metaphor, and the methods by which Joyce employs disability to characterize the stripling as a figure of moral complexity. It will also tackle the stripling’s reflection of Stephen and Bloom while distinguishing signifying differences that exist between each pairing. It will also speak to the issues surrounding mobility and blindness.

Naomi Schor claims that the metaphorical implications of blindness have been reconstructed in recent years:
Even as the traditional metaphorization of blindness continues to inform modern and postmodern fiction and film, taking an increasingly technological turn, a newly reconceptualized body institutes a departure from that tradition and takes into account the realm of the senses and the tensions between mythical and scientific theories of blindness. (84)

Claiming a sort of catachreses for blindness—"a necessary trope, an obligatory metaphor, to which language offers no alternative: e.g., the leg of the table, the arm of the windmill"—Schor claims that the initial "obligatory" referencing of blindness to the "‘deprivation of the moral sight’" (77) is outdated even by the modernist era. She is more concerned with abilities that are attributed to symbolic blindness, the opposite of loss in fact, arguing that a kind of insight is gained by blindness. I contend that this line of thinking links blindness to two other identities, the grotesque and monstrous, and by extension to the colonial Other. This series of associations is key to understanding the uses of Joyce’s stripling, which are far from essentialized in moral terms.

Schor’s focus in recounting a viral paralysis Derrida had to undergo argues the potential for blindness to be monstrous, enlivened by Derrida’s explanation of the ailment: “[It is] a real sight for sore eyes—the eyelid no longer closing normally: a loss of the ‘wink’ or ‘blink,’ therefore, this moment of blindness that ensures sight its breath” (qtd. in Schor 81). As Schor explains, “this instance of non-blindness, of enforced perpetual sight, the failure of the eyelid to close persists for several days [and] blindness is quite literally monstrous” (82), yet in this moment it is said that Derrida has a moment of “critical insight” (78) into a Rousseau text, thus problematizing the metaphor of blindness as representing a lack of perception: the stripling is best understood by way of
this paradoxical Derridian logic, as a character whose insight and perceptiveness are admirable, but whose place as a grotesque marginalizes him; in fact, it turns him into a representation of the Other with the tradition of representing the colonial body as deformed. Bloom views the stripling as lacking perception when he disbelieves the stripling’s capacity to exercise common sense. Bloom is startled when the stripling calls him “sir,” stating, “[k]nows I’m a man. Voice” (U 173), and reflects on the perceptiveness of the resourceful stripling: “Sense of smell must be stronger too. Smells on all sides bunched together. Each person too. Then the spring, the summer: smells. Tastes. They say you can’t taste wines with your eyes shut or a cold in the head. Also smoke in the dark they say get no pleasure” (U 173). While Bloom hypothesizes the stripling’s ability to negotiate his way in Dublin and about life’s sensations, the examples of the stripling’s strong sense of smell reflect a perceptibility that the able-sighted lack. There is an odd layering of “critical insight” to these moments as well, as its source actually promotes similar rationality and understanding in Bloom, besides his speculative notions about the stripling’s “other senses [being] more” (U 173). His utter disbelief about how the stripling knew the proximity of a van is simplified: “Must have felt it. See things in their foreheads perhaps: Kind of sense of volume. Weight would he feel it if something was removed. Feel a gap. Queer idea of Dublin he must have, tapping his way round by the stones. Could he walk in a beeline if he hadn't that cane?” (U 173).

Imbedded in Bloom’s thinking about the insightfulness of the stripling is an apt critique of Dublin, for the stripling does have a “queer idea of” the city, not because he must tap, but because his presence is met with condescension; we know this because, as much as Bloom attempts to credit the stripling with innovative navigational techniques,
condescension still colours Bloom’s thoughts, exemplified in the earlier example by the idea that “they” (and the generalization is key here) “see things in their foreheads perhaps” (U 173). His condescension blooms into other reflections: “Stains on his coat. Slobbers his food I suppose. Tastes all different for him. Have to be spoonfed first. Like a child's hand his hand. Like Milly’s was” (U 173). Bloom’s ironic awareness of this condescension is humourously exaggerated by a hypocritical statement when the two men come to a silent moment: “Say something to him. Better not do the condescending. They mistrust what you tell them. Pass a common remark” (U 172). For all the arrogance Bloom shows, it is discounted as single-minded and lacking kindness. These reflective moments cause a withdrawal to generalization, words to be spoken by all of Dublin; likewise, Bloom’s infantilizing of the stripling is to be understood in the context of his Odyssean quest to reclaim his fatherhood. This context transforms a seemingly patronizing moment into one of paternal care. The later, pluralized reflections give a more integrated picture of how Dublin treats its blind: “Look at all the things they can learn to do. Read with their fingers. Tune pianos. Or we are surprised they have any brains. Why we think a deformed person or a hunchback clever if he says something we might say” (U 173). Bloom rather unfairly groups himself with the rest of Dublin here: he is, after all, the only citizen kind enough to offer help, and is certainly kinder than Farrell, who knocks the stripling aside in “Wandering Rocks.” As a result, the reflections are critical of Dublin’s treatment of its own—whether the discredited disabled population, or the marginalized races, ethnicities, and genders—by personifying the city’s intolerance.
Nicholas Mirzoeff firmly agrees with Derrida’s paradoxical representation of blindness as an historical construction for metaphorical insight (382), suggesting that Modern artwork offers blind subjects who gain insight by not seeing. He understands blindness in the art of the ancien régime as only reminding the viewer of his vulnerability to human sensory perception; blindness in the nineteenth-century, with the advent of modern medical science, becomes a pathological state with the trilogy of disease, abnormality, and immorality linked together to this day (388). Blindness (as an opposition to the “normal” mode of seeing) is automatically categorized as an abnormality, and its presence in literature and art appropriately takes on new connotations. This habitual place amongst a seemingly disparate group of abnormalities rests (as all in the category do) on disability’s reinforcement of normalcy. Identity categories are conformed in this way, and allow the blind stripling to exaggerate the struggle of colonial Ireland’s marginal citizens. Cindy Marie LaCom details the advantages to representing Otherness with the disabled body, via the writings of Homi Bhabha:

If, as Bhabha suggests, ‘the very question of identification only emerges in-between disavowal and designation’, then the disabled body multiplies the possible terms of disavowal for both the colonizer and the colonized; because disability can be a more evident signifier even than the color of one’s skin, it becomes a visual means by which to define normalcy and, by extension, nation. (140)

The blind stripling personifies a colonial nation ill-equipped to set sight on its problems. His ignored position in the capital city further accuses Ireland of being unsupportive of its
own useful citizens. The stripling, more than any other disabled character, promotes this reading because of his namelessness, which gives universality to his representation.

Incidentally, the stripling is not the only nameless character with poor eyesight who represents a specific type of Ireland; what he does to correspond with the part of Ireland that is oppressed, the cyclopean citizen does to speak for the other part comprised of steadfast oppressors. Scrutinizing the citizen as disabled is profitable, when one considers what a comparison of his figurative cyclopean disability to the stripling’s complete blindness offers to a conception of Joyce’s disability consciousness. The stripling acknowledges his disability as completely as he is blind. The citizen, like his partial blindness, has one eye closed to his disability. As Bloom suggests with religious clarity: “Some people... can see the mote in others’ eyes but they can’t see the beam in their own” (U 312, ellipsis added). The stripling’s reaction to disability is entirely about adopting the ear, and compensating with music; whereas, the citizen principals sight over his other senses by seeing only what he wants to see of others. It is the citizen, and not any other patron equipped with both eyes, who insists on seeing Bloom outside the bar (U 290). The first person “I” narrative, and the saturation of the episode with discussions of healthy eyes and perfect vision point to how the citizen dismisses his disabled identity, which denial is further emphasized by the tunnel-vision style of “Cyclops.” This should be expected from a bigot who is deadly certain of his views. The citizen exemplifies a person afflicted with disability who goes in the opposite direction of the stripling by ignoring other ways of interpreting an affliction while becoming aggressive in defense of the hegemonic power that ironically defines him as an outsider. Joyce contested nationalism and nationalism is what the citizen drums. It is therefore
fitting that the citizen would be the exception to the rest of the disabled identities in the text. Yet the villainous qualities of Dublin's Cyclops could complicate Joyce's depiction of him, since Davis identifies disability as a common attribute that accentuates villains in literary representations ("Constructing" 21). However, the citizen is without a disability consciousness: his villainy is more a product of his narrow-sighted stubbornness and irrationality, and less an accentuation of his villainy by Joyce in an effort to typecast his most potent antagonist.

Davis also identifies marginal literary representations for the disabled as a testament to the state apparatuses that reinforce normalcy (21), a trend that Joyce can again be accused of perpetuating despite the volume of disabled characters in Ulysses. I do not contend that Joyce's decision to keep the blind stripling's presence in Ulysses at a minimum is evidence of any conscious decision by Joyce to reinforce cultural norms, since the impact the stripling has in the novel is based on what effect he has in the space he is afforded. Youngquist identifies transformative potential in the disabled, colonial figure like the stripling. He argues that, from the nineteenth century onwards, "monstrosities of various kinds become occasions for advancing, resisting, or transforming its operations in British culture" (xxx). I quote LaCom at length, who also acknowledges this potential:

But if the colonized body constitutes the abjected outside, if it is part of what Alexander and Mohanty call a 'citizenship machinery which excludes and marginalizes particular constituencies on the basis of their difference,' how are we to read the disabled colonized body? How does it fit into this dialectic between colonizer and colonized and into
the transaction of the post-colonial world? From a Bakhtinian perspective, one might argue that the very grotesqueness of disability has the potential to disrupt hegemonic paradigms and revise cultural norms. Donna Haraway considers such a possibility in “A Cyborg Manifesto,” where she claims that the cyborg has the ability to transcend, transgress, and destroy boundaries. And often, reading disability in terms of transgressive power provides a useful means for deconstructing the traditional paradigm of disability as tragedy. But in most literary texts which incorporate characters with disabilities, that liberatory and transformative potential is written in the margins and difficult to detect if it is expressed at all.

(139)
Joyce embodies this potential in his (at times indifferent, at times quarrelsome) blind stripling, who always remains a Bakhtinian grotesque that unconventionally centralizes “liberatory” properties. Joyce gives the stripling transcendental power in that “difficult to detect” (139) way by disclosing such transgressions in his defiant and innovative mobility and his responsibility for the sounds of “Sirens.” In this way, the stripling does not normalize himself, yet he finds innovative ways of transforming normal activities; this method of transgression distinguishes him from Gerty, whose efforts to normalize conform to the hegemonic order.

The mention of the stripling’s indifference and quarrelsome character traits offers an intriguing comparison to Stephen Dedalus. There is a physical connection between the two because of their canes which produce the signifying “tap” of a blind man’s walking stick. Stephen’s association with the “tap” turns him into what Dominic
Rainsford calls “a veritable blind man *manqué*. ‘I am getting on nicely in the dark,’ he says. ‘My ash sword hangs at my side. Tap with it: they do’” (49). Besides the semantic link created, notice the “Othering” undertone of Stephen’s last two words, which stands as another example of Dublin’s marginalization of the disabled. Further, the indifference Stephen has for Bloom’s helpfulness, characterized by his lack of enthusiasm for a future meeting and the dismissal of an invitation to stay the night, is equaled by the stripling’s disregard for Bloom’s kindness, characterized by his short responses and non-responses to Bloom’s offerings in “Lestrygonians.” The stripling and Stephen provide memorable moments involving their canes. Stephen uses his to smash a chandelier in a climactic moment (*U* 542), while the stripling proves his intolerance for the Dubliner who brushes him the wrong way:

As [Cashel Boyle O’Connor Fitzmaurice Tisdall Farrell] strode past Mr Bloom's dental windows the sway of his dustcoat brushed rudely from its angle a slender tapping cane and swept onwards, having buffeted a thewless body. The blind stripling turned his sickly face after the striding form.

- God's curse on you, he said sourly, whoever you are! You're blinder nor I am, you bitch's bastard! (*U* 240)

Cashel’s absurd name makes him a representative of several Irish tribes who victimize the marginal because of their own exposure to England’s oppressions. His general disregard for the stripling suggests a similar lack of care Ireland shows to its disabled population, an identity which (much like the stripling) is relegated to move “distantly
behind” the able-bodied (U 240). The symbolism is abstract, but the anger is real, set to criticize a Dublin that remains literally disunited, treating its marginal citizens with disrespect, and figuratively disunited in the colonial project of “getting out of the binary structure and into an internationalist, multilingual, and multiculturalist perspective” (Cheng 51); the latter reading is, to reiterate, dependent on the stripling’s associations with the identity of the colonial Other, achieved by the grotesqueness of his disability (“his sickly face” [U 240]), the interchangeability of the categories of marginalization, and his function as the novel’s embodiment of revolt.

This last claim is enriched by the comparison of the stripling’s presence in Ulysses to another artistic representation of blindness that is comparable in its purpose, appropriately modernist, and coincides with the time in which Joyce writes the stripling to the page. A 1916 manifesto photograph by Paul Strand, Blind Woman, “hailed as a modernist masterpiece,” carries a representation of blindness which Nicholas Mirzoeff claims to be the embodiment of revolt and coming of age, quoting a contemporary critique: “The portrait conveys qualities: endurance, isolation, the curious alertness of the blind or nearly blind. . . The whole concept of blindness is aimed like a weapon at those whose privilege of sight permits them to experience the picture” (393, ellipsis added). This critique is re-worked by Mirzoeff to a reading that echoes Joyce’s tactical use of the stripling: “In this view, Strand’s photograph of the blind woman functions as an abstract, moral discourse on perception. The weapon of blindness belonged not to the blind woman but to the photographer” (393). Joyce’s potentially politicized use of the stripling would make blindness the author’s weapon. In addition, Joyce’s own connection to the stripling, which lay in the author’s own eye troubles that caused him to fear complete
blindness, emphasizes the political comments surrounding the stripling. Their connection separates these moments from others in the realist text wherein the portrait of Dublin is merely “incidental” (to reuse Emer Nolan’s term). The stripling is significant not as a representation of Joyce, but for locating Joyce in his own novel, whose own colonial commentary might well end “Sirens” as the author impatiently taps nearby:

    Tip. An unseeing stripling stood in the door. He saw not bronze. He saw not gold. Nor Ben nor Bob nor Tom nor Si nor George nor tanks nor Richie nor Pat. Hee hee hee hee. He did not see.
    Seabloom, greaseabloom viewed last words. Softly. *When my country takes her place among.*
    Prrprr.
    Must be the bur.
    Fff! Oo. Rrpr.
    *Written. I have.*
    Pprrppppppffff
    *Done. (U 278-79)*

The “unseeing” stripling’s inability to view the patrons of the Ormond Street bar (note that the last character to be mentioned is deaf bald Pat, thus emphasizing disability in this moment) comments on the Dubliners who he may in fact not want to see, in as much as Ireland does not want to separate itself from English rule. The use of “unseeing” and not
“blind” connotes greater agency, even ability, perhaps a voluntary (or at least welcome) blindness towards those patrons. His laughter is directed at those unseen people. The stripling does not need the approval of these individuals to prove himself useful and important. His independence and his rejection of them as people worth seeing can be read as Joyce’s suggestion that the most insightful character in this episode is the one who was conventionally (and wrongly) used to portray a lack of moral insight. The pairing of the stripling’s unseeing eyes with Bloom’s departing flatulence additionally comments on the uselessness of judgmental singing drunkards to the Irish cause—who request songs of a nationalistic bent—by leaving them in a stink. Of course, not only does this moment lead into “Cyclops,” arguably the most politically conscious episode of the novel, but the italicized words of Robert Emmet also promote such a politicized reading of this entire exchange: “When my country takes her place among . . . Nations of the earth. . . . Then and not till then. . . . Let my epitaph be . . . Written. I have. . . . Done” (U 279, ellipsis added). Not dispelling what has been “done” assumes that Ireland has accomplished nothing to speak of before it has written its epitaph. Joyce may well be “done” waiting for a significant change in Irish political attitude which does not appear forthcoming. The country’s inaction has prevented Dublin from being perceived as a European capital and from justifying a claim to such a title. The coordination of Bloom’s departure with the stripling’s accentuates the comparable levels of their marginalization. Joyce’s appropriation of Emmet’s words impresses the idea that until there is an embrace of all Ireland’s people, “the nations of the earth” will not include Ireland.

The moment offers a specific critique of Ireland for its mistreatment of both Jews and the physically disabled, from which I have extrapolated my larger claim. Yet, only
one of these groups appears to have a character capable of a serious effort at transcending his double marginality (Cheng 6), a distinction Bloom and the stripling share (Bloom for his Jewishness, the stripling for his blindness, and each for his colonial Otherness).

Whereas Bloom is continually ignored or disrespected when attempting to help Irish Jews transcend their status, Joyce’s blind stripling does, on behalf of the physically disabled, embody qualities of revolt and growth even more than the blind woman of Paul Strand’s photograph. Unlike a still image, the stripling is mobile and symbolic of change. The Western tradition of controlling its degenerate population is visible in Strand’s photograph, with the woman wearing a registration badge, identifying her as a “‘[l]icensed peddler’ . . . . ‘really’ blind and not simply ‘idle’” (Mirzoeff 394, ellipsis added). Tagging the disabled is only the beginning of the influence Eugenics had on the control and treatment of the disabled in Joyce’s time. The 1920s and 1930s in Britain saw open debates about the merits of mandatory sterilization for mentally-ill women. Of course, these decades witnessed the rise of Fascism, which would be responsible for the “extermination of between 80,000 and 100,000 disabled people by the Nazis” (Barnes 20). The stripling appears untouched by this controlling hand, while still facing the overt persecution of disability that was officially encouraged in Europe before the liberation of Nazi death camps ended such publicly sanctioned behaviour.

The stripling freely moves about Dublin, and in the most creative of ways. When we first meet him in “Lestrygonians,” he is mobile enough for Bloom to guess correctly with “no tram in sight” that he “wants to cross” (U 172). Joyce uses Bloom’s ridiculous assumption (for a tram is never “in sight” for the stripling) in order to expose sight as the dominant sense used in narrative prose, exaggerating the difficulties of living with
disability in a world that is built for (and described by) the able-bodied. The notion of crossing the street then becomes a metaphor for turning a corner. I make this claim because of an earlier moment in “Calypso” when Bloom crosses to the “bright side” of the street (U 55). Joyce expresses the literal movement of the stripling as controlled and impressive, letting him “on his way, drawing his cane back, feeling again” after his encounter with Bloom, then moving him to the hotel bar of “Sirens,” and lastly by having him “taptaptapping by Daly's window where a mermaid, hair all streaming (but he couldn't see) blew whiffs of a mermaid (blind couldn't), mermaid coolest whiff of all” (U 277). The parenthetical additions again emphasize where blindness fits in narrative prose, the description of the vision in the window taking precedence over the stripling’s confirmed blindness, which becomes irrelevant to the narrator’s ability to describe the window dressing. Despite this relegation, the stripling is as impressive a wanderer as Bloom, which prompts a figurative reading of Bloom as, perhaps, blind himself.

Such a reading, offered most recently by Vicki Mahaffey, changes the scene between the stripling and Bloom entirely. The potential for Bloom’s blindness gives new meaning to his curious inquiries about living blind. “Lestrygonians” may, in fact, end with an image of the blind leading the blind, with an empathetic and not sympathetic Bloom knowing all too well the difficulties of living blind. There are moments when voyeuristic Bloom does not want to be seen to be seeing. Even as Molly tucks away Boylan’s letter after Bloom delivers it to her while entering the room with “halfclosed eyes” (U 59), there is the sense that Bloom self-imposes blindness. He fittingly preoccupies himself by putting the window blinds up, informing his own desire to see, but still feeling the need to turn his back to her reaction to the letter. Regardless, Bloom
and the stripling garner empathy from the reader as a result of their shared marginalization and their shared propensity to wander.

The stripling has an abstract ability to move about the pages. The “tap,” which dots “Sirens” even before the stripling arrives to tune the piano, signifies his ability to navigate *Ulysses*; he walks into the novel’s subconscious, showing up in “Ithaca” (*U* 677) after previously making his way into “Circe” during one of Bloom’s lengthy hallucinations:

**BLOOM: (Shaking hands with a stripling) My more than Brother! (U 459)**

The fraternal connection between two of Dublin’s persecuted sons takes place during a highly politicized hallucination in which Bloom becomes Dublin’s mayor (*U* 452), is called “successor to my famous brother” by John Howard Parnell (*U* 456), and eventually becomes emperor of his own state. In this moment, Joyce shows Bloom to have aspirations beyond, say, the ideas he expresses in “Hades” concerning the improvement of Dublin’s infrastructure (“and another thing I often thought is to have municipal funeral trams like they have in Milan, you know” [*U* 94-95]), which only finds lukewarm reception (“-Oh that be damned for a story, Mr. Dedalus said” [*U* 95]). The stripling’s presence in “Circe” is a reminder of the treatment both “brothers” must endure, reflected in Joyce’s satire of the absurdly temperamental crowd which turns on Bloom as quickly as they support him (“THE MOB: Lynch him! Roast him! He’s as bad as Parnell was” [*U* 464]).

The stripling continues his travels by making his way into the songs of *Ulysses*, producing one of his own, even if it is instrumental and highly sexual, a reflection on the four o’clock hour of the prescheduled meeting between Boylan and Molly: “Bloom.
Flood of warm jimjam lickitup secretness flowed to flow in music out, in desire, dark to lick flow, invading. Tipping her tapping her tapping her topping her Tup... tup... tup” (U 263, ellipses added). The impact of the stripling’s mobility is experienced only because of his disability and forces a question: if a blind man can successfully navigate his way around Dublin, and abstractly around Ulysses, then why can able-bodied Dubliners not move themselves away from their Anglicized present by as simple a gesture as supporting the reasonable suggestion of a Jewish citizen who tires of sitting in traffic?

The contented inertia of the “gratefully oppressed” (Dubliners 38)—to steal a potent description from “After the Race”—is the political consciousness of Irish citizens before the events of the uprising. This consciousness is found not only in the citizens who travel with Bloom to Dignam’s funeral, but also in the trio who breakfast in the Martello tower as they typify Irish economics during the payment for the milk (U 15). The stripling’s mobility distinguishes him from Stephen; Stephen’s lack of protean movement, his inertia and unwillingness to change shape, corresponds with Ireland’s liberal complacency. Joyce—by means of the blind stripling—calls Ireland to mobilize itself as this so-called “degenerate” does. Stephen’s brooding is useless to Ireland’s improvement, and opposed by the stripling’s practicality as the essential piano tuner responsible for the music of “Sirens.” Joyce’s comprehension of how the disabled are represented in society is confirmed and complicated by the stripling’s profession. As a piano tuner, the stripling is dedicated to making something useless, like an out-of-tune piano, regain its worth; but it is the opinion of the listener as to what sounds “right.” The comment here is on societal control of the abnormal, which points to a reliance on public
definitions of normalcy. Nonetheless, the stripling’s opposition to Stephen’s uselessness is linked to Joyce’s modernism which seeks to move away from liberalism. Such “progress” starts with a new level of respect for those people who have the undiscovered qualities to transform Dublin.

Joyce supported to the end Home Rule leader Charles Stewart Parnell. A hypocritical public would mistreat Parnell and momentarily blind him by throwing quicklime into his eyes the year of his death. It is no stretch to imagine the stripling as, at times, the embodiment of a persecuted and blinded Parnell, certainly when one considers how two episodes in which Parnell’s brother appears are two episodes involving the stripling. John Howard Parnell’s presence in “Sirens” and “Circe” reminds one of his brother’s existence, with the greater purpose of bringing him into the reader’s mind at the precise moment when a blind figure is present in the text. Bloom’s kindness in “Lestrygonians” towards the blind stripling resonates with Joyce’s own sympathies for Ireland’s fallen leader. What makes the kindness even more impressive is the selflessness of helping the blind. As illustrated by an 1858 photograph of a Parisian male beggar’s placard (“Give to the poor blind man, he will not see you” [Mirzoeff 393]), there is a feeling of altruistic charity in helping someone who will never know the face of the person offering aid, a lack of acknowledgement that prevents the charity from being in any way construed as self-indulgent. Bloom’s motives are selfless, even unconsciously looking to be forgotten by speaking of something as commonplace as the weather (U 172). He is not looking for remembrance or praise, as a simple “thanks, sir” (U 173) is enough for Bloom. He does carry unfair assumptions about the blind here though, when he states his reason for speaking of the weather as he does: “they mistrust
what you tell them” (U 172). In fact, as I have already pointed out, he has a list of these assumptions, yet he does take more of an interest in the stripling than does anyone else in the course of his sightless travels: “Wonder if he has a name. . . . what dreams would he have, not seeing? Life a dream for him. Where is the justice being born that way?” (U 174, ellipsis added) Indeed, the injustice of being “important” only in terms of disability is reflected in Bloom’s question about whether the stripling has a name as opposed to what his name is. It is a question the narrators of Ulysses never bother to ask, content to define characters by disability alone. Notice also, Bloom’s ironic assumption about life being a dream for the stripling, a phrase which has connotations that do not define the realities of living blind in Dublin. Bloom continues to consider the stripling’s life in terms of his interactions with the opposite sex:

And with a woman, for instance. More shameless not seeing. That girl passing the Stewart institution, head in the air. Look at me. I have them all on. Must be strange not to see her. Kind of a form in his mind's eye. The voice, temperatures when he touches her with his fingers must almost see the lines, the curves. (U 173)

Notice how Bloom’s commentary principals sight again over all other senses, with his insistence, and need to believe that “[the stripling’s] fingers must almost see the lines, the curves,” and yet, the stripling knows not what conventional sight is. This insistence devalues the stripling, yet Bloom is certainly full of pity and, as I have characterized it, empathy for the stripling, having “touched the thin elbow gently” and “took the limp seeing hand to guide it forward” (U 172). He states, “[p]oor fellow! Quite a boy. Terrible. Really terrible. . . . Dear, dear, dear. Pity, of course: but somehow you can't
cotton on to them someway” (U 174, ellipsis added). Rainsford attributes the significance of the stripling to Ulysses to his ability to invoke pity for Joyce himself: “Thus, Ulysses shows Joyce enacting a catharsis of self-pity and autobiographical obsession which is ultimately liberating: Joyce’s implied interrogation and exposure of himself raises the ethical stakes, encouraging the reader to take the suffering of the novel seriously” (48). Emphasizing the stripling as autobiographical and as a cathartic figure highlights the kind of empathy Joyce wants not merely for himself, but for his Dublin, and for figures like the blinded Parnell; the interaction between Bloom and the stripling is significant in that it dramatizes Joyce’s desire to see the end of infighting which characterized Dublin in his time there. The stripling becomes James Joyce and Parnell both at once. The youth carries with him a significant political message about the lack of readiness for Irish reform, a confirmation that infighting and persecution still remain, with the example that those citizens prepared to reform are marginalized and silenced.

The blind stripling commands that autobiographical catharsis (to use Rainsford’s words) which expels Joyce’s frustrations with his own disability by putting it to the page. Joyce’s correspondence during the final months of 1916 and the first eight months of 1917 are laden with apologetic refrains explaining the delay of his replies which he maintains are the result of his first serious bout with the glaucoma and syneccia which would embattle Joyce until his death. Though he could later joke about his near blindness, calling himself an “international eyesore” (qtd. in JJ 412), Joyce’s situation was desperate. He would turn to Nora—who was generally disinterested in his work—in order to write Harriet Shaw Weaver in August 1917, as he was clearly not able to write himself (L 107). Joyce’s apologies for these afflictions (he could not control) exemplify
societal control that demands he take responsibility. He would fall victim to this thinking when he sought to relieve the pain by submissively finding drier climes; it must have been utterly humbling for a literary figure who did little apologizing for any of his actions or words during his lifetime, to be expected by society to begin or end the majority of his correspondence during this time with words of apology. It is no coincidence that the chapters produced and thought about during these years included a nameless blind character to counterbalance Bloom, besides the cyclopean Citizen of episode twelve. The blind stripling was integrated into “Lestrygonians,” written in 1917, and “Sirens,” written shortly after Joyce suffered a third bout of eye trouble in Zurich late in 1918. More interestingly, he finds a place in the one chapter in which Joyce deviates from the Odyssean parallels: “[Joyce] then decided to add an episode not in Homer, the Wandering Rocks, based on the voyage of the Argonauts; his purpose was to bring the city of Dublin even more fully into the book by focusing on it rather than upon Bloom or Stephen” (JJ 452). The resolute selection of characters represent pieces of Dublin to be placed on stage in an episode that makes Dublin the lead role: two of its visibly disabled characters, the onelegged sailor and the blind stripling, are front and centre. Certainly, Joyce felt that Dublin suffered from blindness because it was a city Joyce would personally associate with eye trouble from as early as 1910. Iritis and sciatica accompanied his return to Dublin that year. As his sister suggested to him then, there must be something about Dublin that disagreed with him (JJ 308).\(^{24}\)

Indeed, Dublin would become for Joyce, outside and inside the universe of Ulysses, a city for the politically blind and immobile. It was Joyce’s personal experience with near-blindness that associates immobility with disability. The 1910 attack of iritis
caused Joyce to be practically bed-ridden, leaving Stanislaus to tend house, with Joyce only getting up to give piano lessons, always staying out of the public eye (JJ 308-09). Joyce’s embarrassment informs the later apologies he would make to his friends, publishers, and patron, leaving us with a writer who understood the irony of his visionary work coming from a person whose vision deteriorated with each passing year. The further account Ellmann gives of his eye troubles in Zurich has acutely exaggerated links to immobility: “[Joyce] was walking in the street when a sudden pain incapacitated him from moving for about twenty minutes. He managed ‘to crawl into a tram and get home’” (412). The symbolic properties of the root-word “blind”’s seventy-one uses in Ulysses (including those times in which it describes residential blinds being closed to the world) carries similar notions of incapacitation.

The stripling can be further scrutinized for the associative qualities between his disability and the colonial Other, which effect his complex ability to transcend his stigmatizations with movement. Naomi Schor, in linking motion to sound (which commonly affects portrayals of disabled characters), provides another sense of transcendence appropriate for the stripling:

For the deaf, seeing is hearing, just as for the blind, touching is seeing.

The world of sensory deprivation is ruled by another tropological system, that commanded by synesthesia and favored by so-called visionary poets such as Victor Hugo, Charles Baudelaire, and Arthur Rimbaud; synesthesia is the trope of liminal sensory states that arise not when the senses are overloaded. . . . in synesthesia vision is handed over to speech, smell is made tactile, and motion is translated into sound. In the realm of
deficient senses, the crossing of sensory borders is an effect not of plenitude, but of lack: absent one sense, another comes to substitute for it, to supplement its absence rather than to add to its presence. (100, ellipsis added)

The sense of “lack” implicates the stripling as an embodiment of the abused colonial Other; but the idea that motion translates into sound makes the tapping of the cane, the music of “Sirens,” a problem for any straightforward connection to the colonial Other. The scope and innovativeness of his sounds, or those for which he is responsible, diminish his marginal status.

Even the stripling’s sense of time is a means to critique Ireland’s complacency, and to offer a solution to its political inertia. Stephen Kern states: “The public time that Proust found superficial and Kafka terrifying, Joyce found to be arbitrary and ill-suited to order the diverse temporal experiences of life” (17). Kern uses the fluctuating measurements of time found when Bloom explains when he last weighed himself to explain this idea:

It was ‘the twelfth day of May of the bissextile year one thousand nine hundred and four of the christian era (jewish era five thousand six hundred and sixty four, mohammedan [sic] era one thousand three hundred and twenty-two, golden number 5, epact 13, solar cycle 9, dominical letters C B, roman indication 2, Julian period 6617, MMXIV.’ We are told that Bloom walked around Dublin precisely on June 16th, 1904, only Joyce leaves us wondering exactly when that is. (18)
Relying on church bells, the kind offerings of patrons, a gauge in temperature to tell night from day, the stripling’s sense of public time becomes difficult to relate. His system of time is measured in private accomplishments such as crossing the street to tune a piano. This epitomizes Joyce’s sense of political time, in that it should not be publicly regulated. Joyce’s provision about Bloom’s hallucinatory victories in “Circe” is the complication that only seconds of public time pass. Kern describes “Circe” as a “dramatic interruption in the forward movement of narrative time” (31), an episode in which Joyce observes the insignificance of public time, in relation to private time, or the moments from which reconstructive thinking and political victories can be attained. Bloom’s political victory and defeat in “Circe” take place in the mere seconds which house his hallucinations; victorious or not, his poetics are legislative and mobile, never inert. The stripling’s own reliance on his hearing and his perseverance against dogmatic public time makes him a highly symbolic figure of political change, and less a counterpart to an oppressed colonial Other. Rather, he complements the colonial identity, and drives Joyce’s covert political criticisms of Ireland, by being an exemplary transcendental figure.

The notion that the stripling is more in tune with sound than sight makes him more closely linked to time than space. However, Postcolonial Studies and disability discourse are motivated by finding new spaces for the Other. This does not, however, undermine the stripling’s representation of the marginal because Joyce is ahead of the obvious need for a new place for the Other and is calling for the quick resolution of such a demand. For Joyce, it is high time to improve the space of Dublin. Joyce sees in Ireland a country that has closed its eyes to pacifist options for de-Anglicization. Molly’s prolonged and conclusive struggle to close her eyes in “Penelope” is ironic, for she, of all
the characters in *Ulysses*, finds the most time to stay in bed over the course of the day. It is appropriate that Bloom, with his farseeing political agenda, and a concern for the disabled, wakes up his wife.

By the time Joyce turns to his last work, his patience has worn completely through. Gone is the artistic subtlety of the concluding analogy to "Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages" wherein he claims:

> If [Ireland] finally wants to put on the show for which we have waited so long, this time, let it be complete, full and definitive. But telling these Irish actors to hurry up, as our fathers before us told them not so long ago, is useless. I, for one, am certain not to see the curtain rise, as I shall have already taken the last tram home." *(PW 126)*

Joyce by 1939, commands *Finnegans Wake*, a call to all Finnegans to open their eyes, unblind themselves, and get on with the "show." *Ulysses* is likewise an impatient book, owing much to the blind stripling. The stripling is most visible in "Sirens," which has as its organ the ear (in accordance to the Gilbert and Linati schemas). Frank Budgen reminds us that the ear is an organ of balance (142), and yet ironically, or perhaps fittingly, Joyce provides an episode wherein the imbalance of Ireland's classes is on display what with the memorable exchange between the barmaids and the boots ("Imperthnthn thnthnthn, bootsnout sniffed rudely" [*U 247*]). Budgen also comments that "Sirens" is one of two chapters that pleased Joyce "in the writing of them" more than any others because it was the first of the episodes written when the Great War ended (132). Joyce did not ignore opportunities to comment on the Great War in his text. An episode entirely dedicated to notions of time, written in a fugue, filled with music,
provided with a coda, housing an enduring blind youth with a finely tuned ear, responds to the war’s end by disclosing the impatience Joyce had towards violent conflict. It certainly gives heightened meaning to the emphatic and isolated “Done” of the chapter. Joyce appears to be “[d]one” with Ireland’s mistreatment of its marginal citizens, its Jews and its disabled. Modernists used time as a means to pressure those complacent liberals responsible for the Great War. Just as Mina Loy makes an “horologe” out of her blinde Junge, so does Joyce make a unique clock out of the blind stripling. This gesture gives him a significant place in Ulysses not only as a transcendent disabled character further embodying the colonial Other, but also as a ticking clock which pressures movement towards a continental identity for Ireland.
Disabled Legislators and the War-wounded in *Ulysses*

He could reason; he could read. . . . he could add up his bill; his brain was perfect; it must be the fault of the world then—that he could not feel.

(Woolf 75, ellipsis added)

He sat in a wheeled chair, waiting for dark,
And shivered in his ghastly suit of grey,
Legless, sewn short at elbow. Through the park
Voices of boys rang saddening like a hymn,
Voices of play and pleasure after day,
Till gathering sleep had mothered them from him. (Owen 1-6)

The onelegged beggar who weaves his way through “Wandering Rocks” is one of several disabled characters who remains nameless (the blind stripling is the other obvious example). The namelessness comments on the generic condition of the disabled in Dublin; and yet the character may in fact be reincarnated later as W.B. Murphy, when he is given a full name, and his travels become compensatory for an ailment that hinders even his ability to walk the street. No critic has proven that the onelegged sailor and W.B. Murphy are the same character, yet symmetries between the two cannot be denied. The two never cross paths, and yet Murphy claims to have come into Dublin that morning on “the threemaster *Rosevean* from bridgewater with bricks” (*U* 580), while his earlier manifestation makes his last appearance in the tenth episode just as “the threemasted
schooner *Rosevean* from Bridgewater with Bricks" (*U* 240) is seen from Wapping Street. This implicates the homebound sailor of the *Rosevean* as that same beggar we are introduced to in “Wandering Rocks.” The sailor already has the crucial ability to unite polarized characters. Ralph Rader calls Murphy the “linchpin of the book” (570) because of his metaphysical ability to connect Stephen with Bloom, and his responsibility for the long-awaited (and subsequently disappointing) climax of the novel. Reflections of Shakespeare’s “greyed-auburn” hair is repeated in a “double thought” Stephen and Bloom share, which semantically connects them together (570). The sailor’s dichotomous personalities are defined as the onelegged sailor and W.B. Murphy, equally brought together by the “double thought” of the *Rosevean*.

A composition error complicates Murphy’s full name while still strengthening his ability to unite. Joyce’s original intention was for the sailor to be named D.B. Murphy, but a typist for Sylvia Beach’s 1922 edition made an error, replacing the sailor’s name as W.B. Murphy. The error is only known to have been passively authorized by Joyce; regardless, Murphy as a result is at least two distinct persons. Robert Polhemus has suggested that the original name is meant to stand for “Dedalus Bloom,” suggestive of how Murphy brings the two men arm and arm (572). Because Joyce amputates all but the first letters of his name, Murphy must also be seen as semantically incomplete, something which accentuates his missing limb and impresses upon the reader the fractured quality of the disabled identity. He is a man who lacks any one identity, caught between four, two of which (in Stephen and Bloom) are themselves suffering from a crisis of recognition, and who remain a part of Murphy, despite the error. Joyce abuts details of Murphy’s borrowed trousers and of his son lost at sea (*U* 586) in order to
emphasize the parallel circumstances of Buck's charitable passing of cloths to Stephen (which he wears for the day), and Bloom's loss of Rudy eleven days after birth. Murphy also uses these details to change the subject after he is questioned about having seen Gibraltar, which challenges his truthfulness. His strategy, apparently, is to throw Stephen and Bloom back at themselves in the hopes that this deflection will reshape their interest.

Why then Joyce's decision to label only the sailor of "Wandering Rocks" "onelegged," while later affording him a name in W.B. Murphy? Joyce understood society's propensity to define unfairly a person by his or her disability. He then ensures that the narrator of "Sirens" and "Wandering Rocks" comfortably describes the blind stripling and the onelegged sailor in such one-dimensional terms. The narrator represents society's biases by defining these men by their most visible attribute. When the sailor becomes W.B. Murphy of "Eumaeus," there is no further mention of his legs, in part because the narrator is more concerned with aggrandizing Murphy in order to parody his lies, and because Murphy himself is not as dependent on his disability in "Eumaeus" as he is while begging that afternoon. The narrator of "Wandering Rocks" is somewhat forgiven for his insistent label because the onelegged sailor defines himself through his disability. The beggar's livelihood depends on being an amputee and garnering sympathy for his condition. Joyce in this moment adds to his comprehensive portrayal of the disabled condition in Ulysses. Whereas Gerty is thought to be able-bodied before she is revealed to be lame and the blind stripling is always defined by his disability, W.B. Murphy replaces the onelegged sailor of "Wandering Rocks," the two becoming melded together in "Joyce's gallery of the comic-grotesque" (Budgen 251). The two identities are symbiotically connected in order to create one commentary about the displaced
marginals of Dublin, characterizing the war-wounded as misunderstood, largely ignored, and distrusted.

The sailor is introduced as he collects donations from Dubliners during "Wandering Rocks," a chapter showcasing Dublin rather than Stephen or Bloom. Like the blind stripling's presence, the one-legged sailor's exposure becomes an indication of the extent to which Joyce connects disability to Dublin. The beggar is connected briefly with Molly in the episode when the cripple turns onto Eccles street, soliciting money with the call "For England... home and beauty" (U 216, ellipsis added):

A plump bare generous arm shone, was seen, held forth from a white petticoatbodice and taut shiftstraps. A woman's hand flung a coin over the area railings. It fell on the path.

One of the urchins ran to it, picked it up and dropped it into the minstrel's cap, saying:

- There, sir. (U 216)

The sailor is mocked here for his helplessness by facing not one, but two moments of charity: one from above in Molly's coin flip, the other from the children who are so poor as to be shoeless, but who nonetheless pity the sailor too much to take his money. The description of the beggar as a "minstrel" accuses Dublin of seeing the amputee as an entertainment in as much as a street performer does tricks for money. Joyce exaggerates the desperation of the grotesque spectacle by subjecting the sailor not only to monetary charity, but also to the less-than-helpful spiritual charity of Father Conmee. The priest essentially puts his own price on the sailor when he "blessed him in the sun for his purse held, he knew, one silver crown" (U 210). As a representative of the church, Conmee's
refusal to part with a silver crown indicts the hypocrisy of religion which claims to be impartial and charitable, yet hides behind unhelpful prayer while being selective with its hand-outs. Joyce shames Conmee and the church’s unwillingness to aid the disabled and the underprivileged by isolating “he knew” between two commas, in order to stress the priest’s awareness of the hypocrisy.

The potential for Joyce’s criticism of society’s perception of the disabled as unduly grotesque entertainment relies on the reactions of others who encounter the sailor: his “crutching” and “jerking” around Dublin cause children to “gap[e] at his stump with their yellslobbered mouths” (U 216). He becomes a sideshow for Buck Mulligan, who shaking “gaily with laughter” proclaims, “you should see him. . . when his body loses balance. Wandering Ėngus I call him” (U 239, ellipsis added). The reactions of both the children and of Molly are characteristic of disability’s startling presence: “The fact is that disability disturbs people who think of themselves as nondisabled. While most liberals and progressives would charitably toss a moral coin in the direction of the lame, the blind, or the halt, few have thought about the oppression committed in the name of upholding the concept of being ‘normal’” (Davis, Bending 38). Clearly Molly and the children, indeed the population of Dublin, are not prepared to ponder such philosophy, content to relegate the onelegged sailor to his established, if unfair, place as a poor beggar who collects moral coins, and who ends his day hidden away with Bloom and Stephen. Joyce’s disability consciousness, which informs his decision to keep Murphy tucked away in “Eumaeus” as an “unimportant” character to Dublin, is accurate to the plight of the disabled.
Michael Bérubé regards disability as "simultaneously unsettl[ing] the categories of race, gender, class, and sexuality yet cannot be thought of without them, especially (but not exclusively) because disability is so intimately related to poverty, illness, and long-term unemployment" (xi). As such, it is not surprising that Joyce groups together the "sandwichman, distributor of throwaways, nocturnal vagrant, insinuating sycophant, maimed sailor, blind stripling, superannuated bailiffs man, marfeast, lickplate, spoilsport, pickthank, eccentric public laughingstock seated on bench of public park under discarded perforated umbrella" as mendicants (U 677). The consecutive appearance of "maimed sailor" and "blind stripling" in this list stresses the place of the disabled in this collection of "discarded" Dubliners, and Joyce's refined understanding of how little it takes to become a marginal figure in Ireland. Regardless of what each character offers, be it seven years in the service or a skill for tuning pianos, Dublin will ignore all else except his disability, and place each at the foot of the societal ladder. The reemergence of Dublin's most visibly disabled character in the onelegged sailor amongst a comparably downtrodden group consisting of streetwalkers (U 587), bucket dredgers (U 575), crossing sweepers (U 574), "waifs and strays and other nondescript specimens" (U 577) deliberately reflects society's lowly place for disability in society.

While the sailor is given little chance to provide information about himself when he is onelegged, W.B. Murphy is afforded the space to provide extensive, if apocryphal, details. The sailor's initial lack of agency, and his later falsities, makes a question out of the sailor's identity. His obscurity remains important to a reading of Joyce's disability consciousness. Whether Murphy is meant to be doubly marginal, disabled and colonial, is difficult to discern. Indeed, Eric Smith places him on the same level of mystery as
M’Intosh, while pointing out the sailor’s proliferating laundry list of names which
“further fragments his identity as well as draw[s] parallels between himself and local,
historical, and literary figures” (762-63). The sailor’s service in the British navy
complicates his claim to hail from Carrigaloe, certainly because he only associates with
the Irish region for his ties to Fort’s Camden and Carlisle (U 579-80). The echo of
Compton and Carr in the names exaggerates their Britishness. Joyce was also under the
impression that “since the Fenian revolt under James Stephens, the government had never
sent an Irish regiment to Ireland” (PW 117-18), a fact that all but disallows Murphy an
Irish identity despite his comically Irish name (one as common as Shakespeare [U 578]),
until one remembers that he has been discharged.28 Murphy “who scarcely seemed to be
a Dublin resident” (U 580) is nonetheless married to England, as he reintroduces his
beggar’s call, “For England, home and beauty,” while claiming: “She’s my own true wife
I haven’t seen for seven years now, sailing about” (U 580).29 Murphy’s nationality
becomes as complex as Gerty’s, which means that there is no conclusive evidence to
suggest how, where, and for what or whom W.B. Murphy received his wound, if in fact
he is the onelegged sailor, and if in fact Murphy has even been to all of the places he
claims to have been. Murphy’s representations are further problematized when one
considers his connections to the Orient, which Brandon Kershner describes: “The sailor
Murphy, who appears to have translated himself into a walking representative of popular
literature (‘a bit of literary cove in his own small way’), is identified as ‘friend Sinbad’ by
Bloom; later, Murphy himself admits that ‘The Arabian Nights Entertainment’ is his
favorite book” (277-78). Yet the sailor again disallows a singular reading of him as an
Orient representation because he is “a false adventurer, an Odysseus pseudangelos who
may have genuinely traveled but who manages to destroy his credibility by too blatantly
telling his listeners what he thinks they want to hear” (278). His perpetuation of a
stereotype and his willingness to play a role that discredits him perceive Joyce as
understanding the unfortunate compensatory manner of a cripple who feels compelled to
be something “greater,” if not something “normal.”

The questions asked of Murphy’s identity are misguided because Joyce seeks to
provide not a realistic portrayal of a “maimed sailor,” but to produce for the late night
shelter a caricature of an ancient mariner, set to tell tall tales. This distortion exposes
readers’ biases. Murphy is introduced to Ulysses in the same manner as Bloom. Joyce’s
rhetorical strategy to introduce anti-Semitism before the arrival of a Jew foreshadows the
author’s similar play with reader expectations by first inviting prejudices about beggars,
sailors, and the disabled into the text, before confronting the reader with a disabled
character who is rife with ambiguities. Besides lacking a leg, Murphy is a drunk with
“drowsy baggy eyes” (U 578), who “quite in keeping with his character” (a line Joyce
uses to expose the character as a fabrication) carries a “dangerous looking claspknife” (U
584). He also requests a plug of tobacco, speaks of Caoc O’Leary (U 580) (Chaoc is Irish
for one-eyed [Gifford 540]), and bares a tattoo which is characterized as “the
timehonoured symbol of the mariner’s hope and rest” (U 586): Joyce goes out of his way
to create the stereotype of the ancient mariner, which appears to discredit any sympathy
or empathy Joyce has towards the disabled. However, Joyce is entirely honest about
societal expectations, while satirizing imperial authors (Stevenson, Dickens, Haggard,
Kipling) who readily provide stereotypes of the disabled, or the Other. The hollowness
of the absurd caricature exposes Joyce’s social consciousness here. The same hegemonic
order which, Lennard Davis explains, has exploited the public venue of the novel to reinforce normalcy, is mocked by Joyce. He provides a human portrait of a monochromatic one-legged sailor to be weighed against the multicoloured W.B. Murphy in order to satirize popular novelistic representations of the disabled like Long John Silver and Tiny Tim. The contradictions, juxtapositions, and ambiguities surrounding the sailor make it difficult to see him as a reliably and consistently politicized figure, yet Murphy still provides the means for Joyce’s acute depiction of the marginal’s position in the city, and the predicament that befalls the war-wounded.

Despite Murphy’s variables, his constants—his military service, his unemployment and his poverty—embody the economic imbalance faced by the men of the cabman’s shelter, which (the alleged) Skin-the-Goat derides by claiming that Ireland is the “richest country bar none [and is] drained out of it by England levying taxes on the poor” to which “all agreed that that was fact” (U 595). This reaction comes as no surprise, with the troubles of the figures collected in the cabman’s shelter making them living examples of such exploitation. The presence of a crippled sailor amongst them represents a further indictment of Ireland’s complacency in an economic system that compels enlistment and leads to the desperate existence of the returning wounded. Jay Clayton makes a useful observation for disability discourse (as it concerns the collection of oppressed figures in “Eumaeus”) when he discusses the presence of naval veterans who have lost a limb in the works of Charles Dickens and Joyce. His admission that Dickens categorically portrayed sailors with wooden legs suggests Dickens’s own obsession with normalcy, and the Victorian desire to define sailors in stereotypical terms:
[F]or Joyce, the figure of Dickens conjured up (1) London, the capital of (2) the British empire, which rivalled the sway of (3) the *imperium romanum*, as Palmerston boasted, and which maintained its preeminence by (4) naval power, a dominance first founded and subsequently symbolized by (5) Admiral Nelson, particularly insofar as (6) Dublin’s declining fortunes were tied to Britain’s maritime success . . . . Conveniently, Joyce gathers them all together late in the novel in the scene in the cabman’s shelter in ‘Eumaeus.’ (338, ellipsis added) 30

Joyce’s honest portrayal of the disenfranchised means that the men of the shelter are as “invalid” as Boylan claims Molly is.31 Their poverty and their unemployment, their illnesses and their disabilities—coupled with the hyperbolic narrative of “Eumaeus”—point to the uselessness of the words spoken in the episode, making their discussion of economics important to the novel’s politics but insignificant to the Dublin that rests around them. This dichotomy displays the capacity for Dublin to enact political change, while explaining the unfortunate situation of this potential being found amongst citizens who are never encouraged to flower. “Eumaeus” exposes the tendency for cultures to suspend and marginalize the disabled by locating this stigmatization in Murphy, thus underlining the vicissitudes of the entire commune of Dublin’s invalidated, depoliticized citizens. The economic implications of such an existence are fused into the discussion of Dublin’s colonial realities in order to personify Ireland as itself impoverished, disabled, and as reluctant to transcend as Murphy is to be validated.

Such exposure of the disenfranchised taking place in an episode labeled “Eumaeus” is fitting. The Eumaeus of *The Odyssey* was himself a servant, a swineherd
whose loyalty brings about personal pain as he must watch the best of his animals served to invading suitors, a situation that reflects the relationship between Ireland and Britain.

Despite Gifford’s suggestion that the sailor corresponds more closely with Pseudangelos than with Eumaeus (534), the sailor also corresponds with Odysseus. Murphy is a man coming home, and his telling of tall tales suggests a problematic identity reversal involving Bloom and Murphy, because of the Homeric characters’ roles. In Homer, the disguised Odysseus is the story-teller, fabricating lies about his travels, just as Odyssean Murphy will for the swineherd Bloom in the cabman’s shelter. Also like Homer, Joyce connects the underprivileged with deceptiveness; however, Murphy is not as admirable as Eumaeus: “But till that moment [of Odysseus’s returns], destitute as I am, I will accept nothing; for I loathe like the gates of Hades the man who is driven by poverty to lie” (212). Likewise, Odysseus views fabrication amongst the destitute with contempt: “If on the other hand your master does not return as I say he will, you shall tell your men to throw me over a precipice, just to teach the next beggar not to tell lies” (219). Joyce’s approach is to display Murphy’s desperation in full with hyperbolic lies. The presence of two stereotypes provided by the sailor—first as the beggar, and second as the liar—critiques the unfair disadvantages of the disabled, with societal ignorance and mistrust being the root causes of his sad existence. It is truistic though essential to point out that a disabled identity is not originally the sailor’s choice, nor is it his initial desire to enthusiastically embrace the castigation of that body; yet he attempts to make use of his disability for his livelihood only to be rewarded by having no money for refuge outside of the cabman’s shelter. The initial lack of agency that the sailor has over his disabled condition is Joyce’s indictment of social intolerance. W.B. Murphy, the least reliable
speaker of the episode and the most symbolic of marginalization, is subsequently characterized by a lifetime of attempts at proving his worth, which end when he inevitably succumbs to the simplicity of perpetuating a stereotype.

Paul Youngquist’s work with monstrosities, those deformed and disabled figures represented in Romantic-era literature, is concerned with the British positioning of the war-wounded whose crippled bodies were “manufactured” during the Napoleonic campaigns. Youngquist argues that the value of deformed and damaged bodies increased because field reports came back from the front producing “a standard by which wounds and resulting deformities reinforce the norm of the proper body and the national identity it incarnates” (176), thus “assur[ing] their importance to the cultural projects of nation and empire” (177). The wound becomes a contemporary measure for human sacrifice, a piece of the so-called “normal” body given up for the nation. Such sacrifice becomes problematized when imperial campaigns like the Boer War and Crimean War compel commonwealth nations into deforming themselves on the battlefield for Britain. Joyce must have seen parallels with these earlier fights to the conflicts of his time which were fought with similar kaleidoscopic participants. Could the Irish soldier or sailor have taken his “battle scar [to be] a badge of belonging that incorporates the nation and testifies everywhere that ‘existence as a political being entails (not simply disembodied beliefs, thoughts, ideas but also) actual physical self-alteration’” (Youngquist 177)? Joyce disapproved such image-fashioning for the Irish, whether this desire for inclusion be written onto the bodies of soldiers looking to find legitimacy as an “honorific national deformity” (176), or in the eyes of a young Irish girl looking to feel part of the London fashion scene.
Youngquist’s conception of the abnormal deformity as an embodiment of Britishness is dependent on a completed sequence which sees “the injury, the disfigurement, the scar, the treatment, the rehabilitation, the restitution, even the possible prosthesis” brought to its end in order to reconstruct as close to a normal, productive body as can be had (177). The onelegged sailor, put simply, does not fit. He proudly exploits his disability, displays his stump in public, and refuses to transcend a position of marginality, seemingly accepting an unproductive place in society. He does not fit when placed alongside the other disabled characters of the novel, with his acceptance and exploitation of his injury for financial gain.32 Whereas Gerty and the stripling go to lengths to normalize, the sailor is dependent on his physical ailment and proudly exhibits it. His status as a monstrosity defies normalcy and defiantly protests the requirement to normalize by the ruling power. The sailor’s insubordination becomes an avenue from which Joyce can communicate his distaste for such enforcement. While the patriotic nation is determined to cover up and normalize these sources of shame, and painful reminders of the costs of war, Joyce is not disgusted by wounds. He sees their potential for dramatic protest against the powers seeking to control disability, and for that matter, sexuality, race, gender, and ethnicity. The consequence of protest or even of compliancy is the same, as illustrated by the dismal location of Murphy in the text; a contradictory character who protests normalcy only to appease stereotype. His presence in “Eumaeus” projects Joyce’s understanding of identity politics, and remains the most indicting criticism of an Ireland that resembles its British master too closely for Joyce’s tolerance.

This leads me to the alternative tragedy of the sailor’s willing embrace of a disabled identity. Stephen’s nuanced allusion to Irish economics in “Eumaeus” carries
the tragic circumstance. As the demented streetwalker leaves the front window of the cabman’s shelter, her fleeting presence prompts this observation: “Stephen had noticed her and shrugged his shoulders, merely remarking: -- In this country people sell much more than she ever had and do a roaring trade. Fear not them that sell the body but have not the power to buy the soul. She is a bad merchant. She buys dear and sells cheap” (U 588). Murphy, too, has made regrettable purchases. He has happily spent seven years crafting his body, even losing a leg for the cause of facilitating stereotype. The return on his investment is his relegation to selling his body cheaply and his stories to a sleepy and drunken audience, the only people willing to buy them. Even then, Bloom’s skepticism reflects the difficult market, and prevents Murphy’s ability to reveal a soul, the inner realities of his character, which no one would otherwise believe he possesses. Society’s need for stereotypes like Murphy is the source of this preventative power, which is too strong for Murphy to combat, and too appealing for Murphy not to collaborate with. Murphy embraces compliancy because he knows, first hand, that it is easily facilitated:

- See here, [Murphy] said, showing [his tattooed] Antonio. There he is, cursing the mate. And there he is now, he added. The same fellow, pulling the skin with his fingers, some special knack evidently, and laughing at a yarn.

And in point of fact the young man named Antonio’s livid face did actually look like forced smiling and the curious effect excited the unreserved admiration of everybody. (U 587)
Murphy understands that that which is written on the body is easily manipulated for the cause of a more pleasing message. Murphy’s own example admits to the system’s inevitable success, and produces one less person society need fear. Indeed, as Woolf says of Septimus, “[I]t must be the fault of the world then—that he could not feel” (Woolf 75). Such is the economy of disability, colonialism, and imperialism.

When Percy Bysshe Shelley called poets the unacknowledged legislators of the world, he pointed to society’s ignorance of their good work. Joyce appears to reformulate Shelley’s claim with “Eumaeus,” removing the poet legislators of his novel to the unacknowledged margins of Dublin. It is comparably difficult to legislate poetically when Dublin relegates you to the insides of a cabman’s shelter, as it is to break imperial cycles of victimization when Ireland is filled with attitudes of reluctance. The revelation of the hidden existence of the oppressed, the forgotten, and the disabled of the city is Joyce’s metafictional critique of Dublin’s reluctance to nurture those marginal figures housing the poetic capacity for change.
Conclusion

Stephen’s Crutch and the Weaponization of Disability

How then is the gulf to be got over between the ineffective plight of the bowman and his proper use of the bow, between his ignominy and his destined glory? Only by the intervention of one who is guileless enough to treat him, not as a monster, nor yet as a mere magical property which is wanted for accomplishing some end, but simply as another man, whose sufferings elicit his sympathy and whose courage and pride he admires.

(Wilson 295)

Although there is little evidence to suggest that Stephen is literally physically disabled, there are moments in Ulysses when his eyesight betrays him, and when his ashplant staff becomes a crutch. When Lynch and Stephen walk into Nighttown, Lynch commands, “Here take your crutch and walk” (U 412), while Stephen later describes “Connee on Christass lame crutch” as a “[d]ance of death” (U 538), which itself reverses Christ’s healing power over the lame. I appreciate Joyce’s redefining of the ashplant for those drunken moments when a crutch is desired, but I contend that the figurative qualities of Stephen’s walking-stick make it a crutch he leans on in order to skirt political responsibility. Stephen’s unwillingness to acknowledge a sort of blindness as manifested by a “crutch” is defended by the latent quality of his disability; he even fails to acknowledge such potential in himself to be disabled. When Stephen is compared with Gerty, the stripling, and Murphy, one sees varied levels of acceptance by these characters
of their disabilities, which multiplies the dimensions of Joyce’s representations of the disabled.

Stephen Harder agrees with the notion of Stephen’s ashplant as something far more powerful than simply an aesthetic addition to his continental look. Claiming that “no single possession or article of clothing has as profound an effect on its character’s actions as Stephen’s ashplant,” Harder is interested in its qualities as a metaphor of absence, a lack of the phallus (241). I, too, am interested in it as a metaphor of absence: as a symbol of Stephen’s unwillingness to legislate poetically; more broadly, as a symbol of Ireland’s political and cultural complacency. The qualification of Stephen as unwilling as much as he is unable is necessary because Stephen has no practical need for the ashplant cane he swings at his side. The larger claim is driven by the climactic moments of “Circe” in which Stephen is without his “ash sword” (*U* 37), a fitting weapon considering Stephen is defenseless without it. That moment before his confrontation with Privates Compton and Carr, when Stephen smashes the brothel chandelier, for Harder, “induces a symbolic unmanning” (246), and for me, induces Stephen’s political responsibility. The moment further defines the terms of Stephen’s longstanding unwillingness to poetically legislate.

Bloom is the keeper of Stephen’s ashplant during the encounter with Privates Compton and Carr, a space of twenty-seven pages (*U* 543-69) in which Stephen is vulnerable to British aggression. Stephen meets Compton and Carr’s verbal abuse (their phrase “fucking king” [*U* 553] is a label worse than any misconstrued words for which Stephen is accountable) with mixed commitment. Stephen continues to represent the immobile Ireland which refuses to eject its uninvited guests (*U* 545-46) when he insists,
“personally, I detest action” while “disengag[ing] himself” (U 547), and yet this attitude passes when his “centre of gravity is displaced” and he “taps his brow” to quote Hamlet, prince of inertia: “But in here, it is I must kill the priest and the king” (U 548). Stephen is cajoled into fighting by various Irish nationalist figures (the Citizen, the Croppy Boy, Old Gummy Granny) who appear to encourage the violence, but the origin of Stephen’s willingness to stay and face the Privates is that displaced centre of gravity which accompanies Stephen’s thoughts of deposing the king. Stephen’s mental imbalance is manifested by the lack of his customary cane which usually helps him keep his physical balance.

With Stephen’s “yellow stick” (U 412), Bloom becomes passive, committed to convincing the Privates that there is no division between Ireland and England (“We fought for you in South Africa, Irish missile troops. Isn’t that history?”[U 553]) and even insisting that Stephen is still “incapable” (U 558) of protest. Yet the change in attitude which mobilizes Stephen causes him to resist Bloom’s suggestion that he take his sword back: “Stick, no. Reason. This feast of pure reason” (U 557). In this defining moment, Stephen understands how disabled he has been in his protest against his English masters. Stephen’s epiphany is accompanied by unavoidable violence. Joyce appears to denounce complacency (and perhaps drunkenness for that matter, for “Ireland sober is Ireland free” [U 298]): the unwillingness to aid in the de-Anglicization of Ireland has been too long in Stephen. The epiphany is the first and the only moment of significant change in Stephen’s attitude and political consciousness. This epiphany, coming so long after the character’s introduction in Portrait, speaks to the unhurried speed at which Ireland moves to support de-Anglicization.
The moment is an epiphany because Joyce characterizes Stephen as a person having changed little if at all from his incarnation in *Portrait*. Joyce pairs him with characters and events in the Telemachiad that specifically reflect Ireland’s disinclination to address its own colonial cycle of exploitation, a cycle characterized by an unwillingness to embrace the artistic ideals held by Stephen and the merits of continental influence. Stephen’s symbiotic relationship with the ashplant before the climactic moments in “Circe” represents his literal inability to change shape, which suggests that he is a failed artist. The rhetorical repetitiveness of the Telemachiad implicates Stephen’s inability to change, which is linked inextricably to his lethargic immobility, and emphasized by juxtaposition against the pace of Bloom’s movements in his own episodes.

Tracy Teets Schwarze argues that Joyce’s depiction of the Irish colonial situation sets out “not so much to condemn British mistreatment of Ireland as... to expose and deride Ireland’s oppression of its own sons and daughters as it attempts the impossible task of ‘purifying’ or ‘de-anglicizing’ Irish culture” (244, ellipsis added). The alleged impossibility of the task exposes her contradiction, for the oppressive capacities of the Irish have their origins in the British mistreatment of its colonial neighbour. This crippled Ireland is a critique of the system that created it, in as much as it in turn accounts for Irish complacency. The natural propensity for the victimized to turn victimizer protects Ireland from an outsider’s unconditional persecution. The nation’s reluctance is explained away by an inability to combat the ingrained values of its culture. Stephen’s failed efforts to influence Ireland are equally explained by this principle, his failures deemed acceptable by the reader.
Stephen’s time away from Dublin (in body though not in mind) meant little in the way of change. Michael Groden notes the resemblance of the Stephen of “Telemachus” to the Stephen of Portrait’s final chapter: “he is lonely, isolated, arrogant. . . . There are only two major developments in his personality, the failure of his stay in Paris and his guilt over his refusal to obey his dying mother’s wishes” (25, ellipsis added). These regretful reflections provide evidence of a literal continuation of his unwillingness to bend. Stephen’s own journal entries confirm his unyielding morality when he refuses to repent, an act in Catholic ceremony which asks one to bend and kneel before the priest in confession. When Buck Mulligan poses as a mock priest to open “Telemachus,” he reminds Stephen about the exile’s role in his mother’s death: “you could have knelt down damn it, Kinch, when your dying mother asked you” (U 5). Though Stephen’s later regret towards his own actions undercuts the severity of Buck’s accusation, the re-visitation and confirmation of Stephen’s refusal to bend at the knees symbolize his lack of transformation in exile; his dialogue with Buck eventually causes a reflection on his mother as caretaker: “Her glazing eyes, staring out of death, to shake and bend [his] soul” (10). Stephen makes an even earlier request for an outside force to work upon him, as it seems he is incapable of shaking or bending himself. He asks in his Portrait journal that the “white arms of roads” and “black arms of tall ships” make ready for his journey by “shaking the wings of their exultant and terrible youth” (P 275). Recycling the root-word “shake” is not coincidental: though the means by which the ineluctable youth expresses an inability to change himself moves from a physical expression in writing to an internal brooding, the inability to escape language, to find another word for the forces that he calls to him, implies that he is a lost cause for poetic legislation.
One of the Telemachiad’s key strategies in terms of establishing “Stephen’s policy [of] inertia”\(^{34}\) (Cixous 231) is a comprehensive repetitiveness. Richard Ellmann has discussed the repetition of events by comparing Stephen’s struggle with movement to Bloom’s formidable travels, while aptly describing them not as opposites, but as the yolk and the white of the same egg (Consciousness 40). Fatherly Bloom as counterpoint to youthful Stephen “enabled [Joyce] to secure the same repetition with variations that he had obtained in A Portrait . . . So the two traverse at different times the same parts of Dublin, or think of like things at the same moment. They repeat each other” (JJ 359, ellipsis added).\(^{35}\) Stephen’s associative thoughts betray his inability to change shape. The youth is unable to narrate his internal monologue without the use of the root-word “brood” (U 10, 49), which has stuck with him as a result of Buck’s earlier recitation of a Yeats verse (U 9). He also cannot get past events occurring the morning of 16 June, carrying lamentations over Haines’ apologetic words from breakfast (U 25, 30).

Stephen’s re-visitations in Ulysses mimic the way he carries with him the conversation with the dean of studies on the merit of “tundish” (P 204) into the final journal style narrative of Portrait (274). Even thoughts of Cranly’s arm transcend Portrait, managing to follow Stephen into Ulysses (7) and, of course, Stephen is still trying to awake from his nightmarish History. The absurd repetition of Stephen’s reflections in Ulysses implicates him as no different from his Portrait self: he is an immobile person whose paralytic circumstance is inseparable from his inability to change shape. His immobility is characterized as a disability because it is physically rendered by his ashplant. Stephen with his staff personifies Ireland’s inertia, the country’s longstanding unwillingness to transform due to the difficulty in combating ingrained British values.
The ironically titled “Proteus” episode provides a lasting image of a man physically unable to move along the Strand, coupled by a mind ill-prepared to move forward: “He had come nearer the edge of the sea and wet sand slapped his boots. The new air greeted him, harping in wild nerves, wind of the wild air of seeds of [sic] brightness. Here, I am not walking out to the Kish lightship, am I? He stood suddenly, his feet beginning to sink slowly in the quaking soil. Turn back” (44). Stephen’s decision to walk in the most difficult section of the beach (between the dry sand and the water) indicates a desire to struggle in movement, or at least a desire to give the impression of struggle. Also in this moment Stephen’s staff becomes more than an aesthetic affectation: it begins to indicate his straining pace, and later indicates his reluctance to move at any great speed when “[h]e took the hilt of his ashplant, lunging with it softly, dallying still” (U 50). With his feet stuck fast in the sand, Stephen resembles a child deliberately slowing down his parents, perpetuating an infantile Ireland unwilling and ill-prepared to leave the suck.

Frank Budgen identifies the metaphorical resemblance in Stephen’s physicality to Ireland’s colonial situation:

But there’s the rub. Stephen is entirely without means. He stands in boots and clothes that were given to him by Mulligan. He has a job as a teacher at Mr. Deasy’s school but his salary is barely sufficient for drinks. . . . Let an individualist artist deny religion and politics as vehemently as he will, economics is something he cannot deny. . . . he must eat the bread, wear the clothes and shelter under the roof made by others, and pay for these privileges. (42, ellipses added)
Stephen’s sad existence signifies Ireland’s refusal to renounce Britain’s economic control. Hugh Kenner likewise characterizes the Stephen of *Ulysses* as an unchanged self who suffers from an embarrassing lethargy:

The Stephen of the first chapter of *Ulysses* who ‘walks wearily’, constantly ‘leans’ on everything in sight, invariably sits down before he has gone three paces, speaks ‘gloomily’, ‘quietly’, ‘with bitterness’, and ‘coldly’, and ‘suffers’ his handkerchief to be pulled from his pocket by an exuberant Mulligan, is precisely the priggish, humourless Stephen of the last chapter of the *Portrait* who cannot remember what day of the week it is. (112)

Stephen’s counterpart, Leopold Bloom, has a refreshing ability to grow and change his form from bud to flower (as his name suggests). Bloom opposes Stephen’s inertia as the more accomplished mover of the novel. He can change his character by signing his name Henry Flower, whereas Stephen struggles to negotiate signatures (*U* 37). The changing pace from “Proteus” to “Calypso” is purposeful. “Calypso” moves with the rapidity of Milly’s postscript (*U* 64). Opening with Bloom’s eating “with relish the inner organs of beasts and fowls” (*U* 53) immediately provides a refreshingly physical action, a far cry from the lamentations of a slumping artist stuck on a rocky beach, anxiously picking his nose (*U* 50). Above all, Bloom is mobile, his actions purposeful. Whereas Stephen is “walking through it howsoever” (*U* 37), Bloom’s introduction sees him “[step] hastily down the stairs with a flurried stork’s legs” to rescue the burning kidney (*U* 63). He later travels by hired cab in Dignam’s funeral procession, and even leaves and returns to his place of business while procuring an advertisement. Bloom also has to help Stephen
back onto his feet to open “Eumaeus” (*U* 570), while not even a locked door prevents Bloom from entering his house, and rescuing Stephen from the porch where he stands (*U* 621-22).

Mobility, then, is the measure by which Joyce weighs the importance of Bloom over Stephen, and although Bloom’s Jewishness subjects him to marginalization—devaluing suggestions that would otherwise encourage change—his proclivity for speaking his mind becomes admirable. Stephen’s immobility (of the mind) has an almost allegorical relationship with Ireland, and reflects a disinterest for the nation to take on the almost impossible task of changing its shape. Reading Stephen as disabled links disability to immobility and immobility to the politics of the novel. Stephen’s ashplant is the physical manifestation of his disability and the symbol of Ireland’s own crippling reluctance to walk away from British rule peacefully to create a “rival, bilingual, republican, self-centered and enterprising island... with its own commercial fleet and its ambassadors in every port throughout the world” (*PW* 125, ellipsis added). The expression of hope here is taken from Joyce’s 1907 lecture, “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages.” While the politics of his later fictions appear subdued in comparison, Joyce cannot be said to have reached anything like late Wordsworthian conservatism by 1922. Though the tone of *Ulysses* is more unassuming than his earlier political writings, Joyce’s characterization of Stephen houses the author’s opinion that Ireland has changed little. Joyce still understood that a “self-centered and enterprising island” had no chance of developing when Dublin’s most revolutionary youths fail in their flights, and return only to spend time with their feet stuck in the mud. The Dublin of *Ulysses* intimates the observations of another Irish author: “‘We Irish,’ Oscar Wilde said one day to a friend of
[Joyce’s], ‘have done nothing, but we’re the greatest talkers since the days of the ancient Greeks’” (PW 126). Wilde’s lament, as satirical as it is, carries the enduring and predominant sentiment found in impatient Irish authors who are perpetually frustrated by Ireland’s submission to Anglo rule and its unwillingness to support marginal figures prepared to de-Anglicize the island pacifistically. The avenue of disability provides a way to attack intolerance and simultaneously elucidate disability’s unfair representations in society’s hegemonic order. Joyce draws on prejudiced assumptions about disabled mobility to hyperbolize the presence of immobility in his text so he can mock Irish complacency. The effort shows the depths to which his politics reach into the pages of Ulysses, not to mention Joyce’s keen social consciousness regarding disability itself, and its societal representations which lead to the weaponization of disability.

Edmund Wilson argues in The Wound and the Bow that art can be created out of a wound. He believes that literature can be the bow of a wounded man seeking retribution, understanding “the conception of superior strength as inseparable from disability” (287). Wilson asserts:

genius and disease, like strength and mutilation, may be inextricably bound up together. It is significant that the only two writers of our time who have especially interested themselves in Philoctetes – André Gide and John Jay Chapman – should both be persons who have not only, like the hero of the play, stood at an angle to the morality of society and defended their position with stubbornness, but who have suffered from psychological disorders which have made them, in Gide’s case, ill-regarded by his fellows; in Chapman’s case, excessively difficult. Nor is
it perhaps accidental that Charles Lamb, with his experience of his sister’s insanity, should in his essay on *The Convalescent* choose the figure of Philoctetes as a symbol for his own ‘nervous fever’. (289)

I quote at length because of the parallels which arise between the authors Wilson isolates and Joyce who, “positioned with stubbornness,” was himself a wounded man suffering from near-blindness. Joyce was “ill-regarded by his fellows” (most notably by Wyndham Lewis and Gertrude Stein), “excessively difficult,” and supported a daughter with a psychological disorder. More importantly, Wilson showcases the common coping mechanism used by Gide, Chapman, Lamb, and Joyce. Joyce can be said to channel the fighting spirit of Philoctetes, the archer exiled because of a wound, when he employs disabled characters in *Ulysses* to judge the insensitivity of the able-bodied, and uses Issy in *Finnegans Wake* to expel his frustrations with his daughter’s illness.

In the quotation which opens this chapter, Wilson speaks specifically of Philoctetes’s refusal to go to Troy when the archer rightly assumes that he is being exploited by Odysseus for his magical arrows. It is somewhat ironic, then, that *Ulysses* is supportive of its castaways. Joyce is subsequently compelled to weaponize his experience with a disabling condition. His bow is that shortsightedness which limited him—and his birth nation. Joyce launches his arrows at societal biases responsible for manufacturing an undesirable disabled identity. His humane portrayals of the disabled avoid the monstrous or “magical property” (Wilson 295) of disability—except where he is set to satirize the stereotypes and denounce their users. Joyce viewed disability not with sympathy but with empathy. As a result, he does not waste the opportunity to disclose Ireland’s construction of the marginal condition, its frustrating monoculturalism,
its intolerance and infighting. Rather, he gives the disabled a key place in *Ulysses* from which to facilitate this commentary.

As Vincent Cheng so aptly captures, universal suffering is a central concern for Joyce:

A writer who opposed anti-Semitism, racism, blind nationalism, male aggression, imperialism; who explored the nature of female consciousness; and who, as an exile and cosmopolite, lived his life in cities with culturally mixed populations (Trieste, Zurich, Paris) – Joyce repeatedly gave voice in his works to those silenced and exiled to the margins of dominant cultures. (7)

Joyce does not exploit disability “for accomplishing some end” (Wilson 295) because he embraces a disability consciousness: he does justice to the realities of the disabled condition, makes sense of the connotations society imposes on such a condition, and connects disability to other marginal identities. These efforts highlight colonial Ireland’s pathological shortcomings, and its place as a disabled nation itself suffering British stigmatization and abuse.
Notes

1 This lack is identified by Hugh Kenner: "‘Stephen no longer interests me to the same extent [as Bloom],’ said Joyce to Frank Budgen one day. ‘He has a shape that can’t be changed’" (112).

2 This definition was created in 1981 by “the first international organisation controlled and run by disabled people” (Barnes 2). DPI still exists today, and its mandate still reflects the definition. As it is a definition of disability created by disabled people, I favour it over all others.

3 Davis identifies the request as a key avenue from which race, gender, sexuality, and disability conjoin. They have all been subject to eugenics programs set to construct national bodies, wherein the movement to cut out those bodies and identities unnecessary or unwanted by the nation occurs (Davis, Bending 14). Cheng points out that the rhetoric of an “Us/Them binarity and difference which functions to reify the dominant Western culture’s sense of itself as civilized and rational by contrast” (22-23) binds these same identities together.

4 Bérubé’s alternative exposure of society’s hypocrisy, its silent acceptance of “freak” as a label coupled with an agreement to never verbalize it (hence one’s shock at seeing it on his page), is not why I employ this notion, though it remains a necessary idea to keep in mind.

5 Despite this source of disunity, the unifying capacity brought on by discrimination has a long history involving the disabled. Colin Barnes charts discrimination as part of the disabled identity in Britain from early biblical representations, Shakespeare’s exposure of
the “high premium [placed] upon physical normality” (12), and cites industrialization as a movement which advanced the inequity: “Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the policy of segregating severely disabled people into institutional settings slowly increased [suggesting that] the widespread incarnation of disabled people is directly attributable to the transition from agriculture and cottage-based industries to the large-scale factory type system.” The latter system produces far more disabled bodies, while also being more discerning in terms of the types of bodies it requires in order to operate machinery (15).

I employ this notion not only as Bérubé defines it, but also as Cheng introduces the concept in *Joyce, Race, and Empire* (6). Whereas the characters Cheng focuses on are doubly marginal due to their race and their position as colonial, those which I focus on are so because of their disabilities and colonial position.

The sequence I have focused on anticipates the “lacking” prose of *Finnegans Wake* with its incomplete words and phrases. Roy Gottfried is also interested in lacking letters in the context of “unstable and insubstantial character[s] in the novel [who are] subject to further obscurity,” citing M’Intosh and D.B. Murphy, who has his “D” misplaced in certain editions of *Ulysses* (98).

Youngquist believes that this is alternative to symbolism because it is often material representations that expose this awareness stating: “Monstrosities symbolize nothing” (xxvii). While I have characterized the ability for the disabled characters of *Ulysses* to symbolize a disabled Ireland, I also mean exactly as Youngquist suggests: that they literally capture the shortcomings of constructionism.
Cheng's institution of Bhabha's description of Orientalism as in part "'the site of dreams, images, fantasies, myths, obsessions and requirements'" is helpful, for Bloom and Gerty are involved in "such processes of othering and essentializing" (78). I extrapolate from the language of this postcolonial critique the language of the marginal, and therefore, the language of the disabled condition.

This cliché is found elsewhere in *Ulysses*. Stephen alludes to the aphorism during a conversation with Deasy in which Stephen receives ironic advice from Shakespeare's villainous Iago about where the youth should put his money (*U* 30).

Years before the production of *Ulysses*, Joyce had already resolved that a pure vision of "Irish" culture was impossible: "Our civilization is an immense woven fabric in which very different elements are mixed, in which Nordic rapacity is reconciled to Roman law, and new Bourgeois conventions to the remains of a Siriac religion. In such a fabric, it is pointless searching for a thread that has remained pure, virgin, and uninfluenced by other threads nearby" (*PW* 118).

Richard Ellmann compares Marthe Fleischmann's immobility to Gerty's: "Marthe did not work; she spent her days smoking, reading romantic novels, and primping. She was vain and wished to be snobbish" (*JJ* 449).

Rosemarie Garland Thompson echoes the sentiment: "Both the female and the disabled body are cast as deviant and inferior; both are excluded from full participation in public as well as economic life" (*Extraordinary* 19).

Just as "soft" is associated with Molly, "jingle," with Boylan, and "brood," with Stephen, I read "kind" to be Bloom's word attribute. I make this claim because of the
noticeable repetition of the word as it surrounds him in his introductory episode

“Calypso.”

15 This hegemonic policy to seek newer ways for the disabled to reintegrate what they lack, and what causes them to be “abnormal,” is still predominant today. On 3 July of this year, BBC news reported medical science’s ability to attach prosthetic limbs to human bone allowing the central nervous system to motorize the attachment (“Bionic”).

16 For evidence of this link in more “traditional” postcolonial texts, see Sanjeev Uprety’s “Disability and Postcoloniality in Salman Rushdie’s Midnight’s Children and Third-World novels.” For evidence of this as it pertains to Ireland’s colonial situation, see Enda Duffy’s third chapter on the spectacle of the native in his Subaltern Ulysses.

17 Gabler’s edition of Ulysses reads: “Kind of sense of volume. ^Weight or size of it, something blacker than the dark.^ Wonder would he feel it if something was removed” (384, 385). The addition is important for assessing this moment as it provides further proof of Bloom’s rational thinking about the stripling to be juxtaposed against the uneducated assumptions he makes about blindness as a whole. The 1922 text creates an interesting balance between the assumptive and the rational, thus perpetuating greater conflict in Bloom about how the blind function, and how Dublin interprets their presence.

18 The citizen’s paradoxical reply (“There’s no-one as blind as the fellow that won’t see” [U 312]) implicates him as blind, but he still resists the label by undercutting the claim with “if you know what that means” (U 312), which he clearly does not.

19 There is a certain irony to Stephen’s figurative blindness when one considers the Oedipal connections. Oedipus sacrificially tore his eyes out in order to save Thebes,
whereas Stephen’s blindness conveys his desire to keep his eyes closed to the problems of a nation he resists sacrificing any part of himself for.

20 Bloom rightly assumes that the stripling wants to cross, but his further assumption that the stripling desires help to cross is not resolved. The stripling’s resistance to gregarious thanks informs his desire to cross independently. Along with Gerty MacDowell’s actions in “Nausicaa,” both characters share in their obligatory aspiration to normalize as demanded by society. What separates the stripling from this unfortunate position, thus permitting his transcendence, is the way he sidesteps normalization (with his unique mobility), which goes beyond the desperate efforts of Gerty merely to fit in.

21 This is later repeated by councilor Nannetti in “Circe” to the standard reply of Bloom’s flatulence (U 514). It would seem, given the Italian roots of Nannetti, that similar protest is being sounded by Bloom to the second of Ireland’s two masters.

22 Mahaffey concluded a paper delivered at the XXth International James Joyce Symposium in June 2006 by questioning whether Bloom’s narrative regarding the bat of “Nausicaa” provides evidence of “blindness” being linked to mental illness (as in being blind as a bat in one’s belfry). Her argument also debated the potential for Bloom’s emotional trauma to warrant him a symbolically blind character, who closes his eyes to painful images.

23 The sequence which takes place during the payment of the milk-woman in “Telemachus” sees the Irish Mulligan pay to the endorsement of the English Haines, through the mediation of a relinquishing Stephen (U 15): the role of each character in the sequence reflects Ireland’s contentment to serve Britain, and the poet’s inability to break the cycle. Of course, Buck’s insistence to have milk with tea (and therefore the necessity
to settle with the milk-woman) begins with his initial rejection of Stephen’s continental suggestion to drink tea black with lemon: “—O, damn you and your Paris fads, Buck Mulligan said. I want Sandycove milk” (U 12). Buck’s narrow-minded stubbornness for a local Irish product informs Ireland’s unwillingness to de-Anglicize because it distastes European culture. For Joyce, simple gestures carry the most potential for change, which makes Buck’s rejection an important one that defines the fabric of the nation. The author’s own concerns about an all too “Irish Ireland” play out in Buck’s insistence for milk as well. These same feelings would prompt Joyce to reject Yeats’s Irish Revival: “Although Joyce welcomed Yeats’s initiative, by 1901 he began to fear that the theatre, in dealing solely with Irish themes and producing Irish plays, ran the risk of becoming ‘all too Irish.’ He felt that Ireland would cut itself off from the mainstream of European culture” (Manganiello 28).

24 Indeed, Roy Gottfried sees the text of Ulysses, the words Joyce meticulously chose to describe the Dublin he would lastingly remember alongside his iritis, as indicative of the irritations of an author who used troubled eyes to write a troubled novel: “The letters of the text, irritated by Joyce’s iritis, infect the reader with Joycean dis-lexia. . . (the ‘dis’ reflecting all the disruption and confusion that Joyce works into his text and the sight of it; the ‘lexic’ like the clinical term, pertaining to the letters themselves)” (51, ellipsis added).

25 Robert McAlmon claimed in a review of Work in Progress that the “renderings of [Joyce’s] subconsciousness” were present in the author’s work. Concerned with a passage dedicated to allusions of eye trouble, most notably characterized by wordplay with “glaucoma,” McAlmon claims, “In the above quoted passage the emotional impact
of its meaning could be the painful record of a subconscious quivering with terrors as in a
night crisis, but by using the English language only as a basis, while weaving in classic
mythology, German, Latin, and French, words or rhythms [sic], he managed to
depersonalize his emotions and situations sufficiently to take the raw quivering of a
suffering spirit out of the passage" (110). The same can be said of passages in Ulysses, in
which Joyce's subconscious concern for blindness is disguised by a fleeting character in
an episode that drowns out the suffering spirit with music.

26 In "Hades," the ceremonial blind-closing on Newbridge Avenue (a rather appropriate
street name because of the metempsychosis talk of the previous episode) for Paddy
Dignam offers an appropriate passage to illustrate how even house blinds offer a reading
of Joyce producing for us a city with its eyes closed: "[Bloom] passed an arm through the
armstrap and looked seriously from the open carriage window at the lowered blinds of the
avenue. One dragged aside: an old woman peeping. Nose whiteflattened against the
pane. . . . Extraordinary interest they take in a corpse" (U 84, ellipsis added). Notice the
language of the Other, the deformity of the flattened face against the pane, and the stigma
attached to looking outside: all provide an image of Dubliners as safely contained within
their homes, unwilling to look (in fact, encouraged not to look), but instead to remain
blind to the city's death. The eeriness of an entire street with closed blinds is an image,
when paired with the death of Dignam that presents Dublin's condition, heightened
because the ritual's origin is markedly Irish (Gifford 105).

27 This refers to Áengus of the birds, Irish god of youth, beauty, and love. In the most
popular versions of his myth, he wanders to find his love, transforms himself into a swan
after discovering she is one herself, and flies away with her (Gifford 252).
When Murphy presents his discharge papers, he shows Bloom and Stephen a document which declare him an A.B.S or Able-bodied Sailor (U 580). This simply means that Murphy is an experienced sailor in the merchant navy who can perform the routine duties of a ship, yet irony relies on taking this label out of context and viewing the sailor as able-bodied despite missing a leg. The narrator is inclined to neglect a description of Murphy’s legs, leaving doubt as to what is meant by “A.B.S.” Joyce is then able to criticize the predispositions of a society which needs to believe that a sailor who could serve seven years in the British Navy must or should be able-bodied.

Murphy may mean this last declaration to be connected to his “little woman” (U 580) who waits at home, but the sequence betrays this intention. It is also difficult to know whether Bloom’s description of the sailor’s homecoming that immediately follows means a return to Carrigaloe, or to England.

Interestingly, Nelson is characterized as an “onehanded adulterer” during a conversation between Myles Crawford and Professor McHugh in “Aeolus” (U 142). The pairing of disability with sexual deviancy requests that sexual frustration be similarly linked, which relationship “Nausicaa” also exposes.

Molly appears to do little moving over the course of the day and personifies an inert Ireland as a result. When Blazes Boylan goes into Thornton’s to order a gift for Molly, he requests a rush delivery because “it’s for an invalid” (U 218). When one questions Boylan’s untruth, the near bed-ridden Molly then has intriguing potential to be labeled an invalid, and more generally, disabled. Molly does not leave her bed, save for one time (that we know of) during “Penelope,” and although she has planned a tour in Belfast, within the course of the novel’s narrative, she remains relatively immobile.
Jerome E. Bickenbach's article on "voluntary" disability primarily negotiates current employee rights for those fired after a self-inflicted injury prevents them from continuing their occupation. Bickenbach does, however, find a place to address the unemployed under this guise. While I am not suggesting that the sailor voluntarily injures himself, I do see him as voluntarily disabled. Bickenbach's article addresses the "worth" of a beggar as being determined "not because of idleness, but because of disease or deformity, a condition over which he or she ha[s] no control (113). The value placed in the uncontrollable circumstance explains Dublin's decision to financially support the sailor, yet it also betrays the sailor's own rationale for ensuring that his disability be visible. Whether or not the sailor's amputation is self-inflicted, his subsequent embrace of the disability volunteers him for sympathy, and challenges the transparency of giving to the poor.

Notice how this last sentence can operate above the narrative to stand as a claim about Ireland in much the same way as "She's lame! O!"

This claim begins a chapter appropriately titled, "Heroism is Ridiculous." I say appropriate because Joyce himself is aware that Stephen lacks the forward thinking and adaptability to be the hero of his epic, thus pushing him to the side in favour of Bloom.

Ellmann notes additional parodic repetition of events in Portrait, such as Bloom's rendezvous with his own bird girl on the beach, and the Jew's renouncing of religion for Darwinism (JJ 359n).

Notice, again, the deliberate reuse of the word "wild," which I do not believe is a rhetorical device in this instance, that accuses Stephen of a laziness that is similar to his disinterest in finding a suitable replacement for "brood."
Works Cited


http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/5140090.stm


Davis, Lennard. Bending Over Backwards: Disability, Dismodernism, and Other


Mahaffey, Vicki. “How to Read Ulysses.” Joycean Unions. XXth International James


---. “Feminist Theory, the Body, and the Disabled Figure.” Davis, *Disability* 279-92.


Works Consulted


