

**Linguistic and Pictorial Portrait: A  
Montage of Performances  
in  
*A portrait of the Artist as a Young Man***

اللوحمة اللغوية والمصورة : مونتاج للعروض

في

رواية لوحمة الفنان في شبابه

إعداد

د. / منهل عبد الرحمن الفريخ

أستاذة اللغويات الإنجليزية المساعد

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية والابها

كلية اللغات والترجمة

جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية

### المخلص:

رواية "لوحة الفنان في شبابه" هي محاولة الراوي لرسم الصورة في الذاكرة، وهي محاولة معقدة للغاية، ويصعب متابعتها، حيث تنتهي جهود الراوي الجادة لرسم صورة ثابتة لا تتزعزع بمآسي رهيبية في كل مرة. ومع ذلك، فإن الدلالة اللوحية تكتسب قوة كبيرة تتطور إلى لغة جديدة تمامًا ودلالة تصويرية. ومع هذا القدر الهائل من التعقيد والارتباك والتوتر، يمكن القول بأن هذه الرواية هي تصوير لغوي وبصري. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، سيعزز الباحث افتراضاته في هذه الورقة البحثية باستخدام أفكار ونظريات نقاد بارزين مثل جورج لوكاس، وبول دي مان، وجاك دريدا.

حبكة "لوحة الفنان في شبابه" معقدة للغاية، ويصعب متابعتها، فهي محاولة الراوي لرسم صورة في التذكر. إن مساعي الراوي المكثفة لرسم صورة خطية وغير مشوهة تنتهي دائمًا بكوارث مروعة. وهكذا، يمكن القول إن هذه الرواية هي صورة لغوية وتصويرية تتسم بتعقيد لا يصدق، وعدم يقين وتوتر. إن استخدامه المتكرر لـ "الماضي" و"الماضي التام" و"المبني للمجهول" قد جذبه إلى سرد غامض لا يمكنه فرض الخطية لأن الأداة ذاتها، أي اللغة، هي بالفعل غير خطية باستمرار.

### الكلمات المفتاحية :

اللغوية، عدم اليقين الخطي، التصويرية، المقاومة.

**Abstract:**

*A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is the narrator's attempt to sketch the portrait in memory is extremely complex and difficult to follow. Every time, the narrator's earnest efforts to paint a straight-line, unwavering portrayal end in terrible tragedies. The signifier "portrait," however, gains significant strength and develops into a brand-new language and pictorial signified. With such enormous complexity, confusion, and tension, one could claim that this story is a linguistic and visual depiction. Additionally, this paper will bolster its claims using the ideas and theories of eminent critics like George Lucas, Paul De Man, and Jacques Derrida.

The plot of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, being very intricate and challenging to follow, is the narrator's attempt to draw the portrait in recollection. The narrator's intense endeavors to draw an undeviating and linear portrait always culminate in appalling catastrophes. But the signifier 'portrait' acquires great power to become a new linguistic and pictorial signified. Thus, one can say that this novel is a linguistic and pictorial portrait with incredible intricacy, uncertainty, and strain. The recurrent use of the 'past', 'the past perfect' and the 'passive' have drawn the narrator into a murky narrative which cannot enforce linearity since the very device, i.e., language, is already constantly non-linear.

**Keywords:**

Linguistic, Linear-Uncertainty, Pictorial, and Resistance .

Linguistic and Pictorial Portrait: A Montage of Performances in  
*A portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*

The plot of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* being very intricate and challenging to follow is the narrator's attempt to draw the portrait in recollection. The narrator's intense endeavors to draw an undeviating and linear portrait always culminate in appalling catastrophes. But the signifier 'portrait' acquires great power to become a new linguistic and pictorial signified. Thus, one can say that this novel is a linguistic and pictorial portrait with incredible intricacy, uncertainty, and strain. His recurrent use of the 'past', 'the past perfect' and the 'passive' have drawn him into a murky narrative which cannot enforce linearity since the very device, i.e., language, is already constantly non-linear.

Distancing Stephen, by the past and passive, helps a little. Stephen's 'history' keeps snapping up calling for the 'present' and 'future' forms to act. Language itself acquires power but the organizational structure becomes comical and at several times irrational. Pointless to say that it is very disjointed and ruptured. Stephen is made of language and the portrait is to be made of language. Now, with the pictorial portrait as a signified, things go into the depth of 'framing'; framing the many linguistic frames into one frame which is a portrait.

To frame Stephen, the painter-narrator picks him up and selects him away from many settings that are within him and outside him. Regardless of the distancing and subjugation enforced on him by the narrator and family-school-church clash, Stephen sturdily resurfaces whenever he is sidelined. Unknowingly, the enormous subduing and repressing powers do empower Stephen's 'I' and assures its existence and intimidating nature. As a way out, the painter-narrator finds no other way but to art up Stephen's 'I', offering him a prospect to persist.

This paper is going to be about Stephen who the narrator deals with as a case study of an artistic effort to draw a portrait of a young man and whose only option to reestablish a nearly crushed 'I' is through becoming an artist. It shall use a poststructuralist approach to explain how one free signifier which is 'portrait' makes the whole novel. The paper shall further support arguments with the concepts and theories of prominent critics such as George Lucas, Paul De Man, Jacques Derrida and Saussure. It shall investigate how Stephen makes it despite the suppression of narrator and oppression of family-school-church. It shall explore the fluctuating nature of Stephen's 'I' that narrator constantly tried to suppress through language as a weapon and tool. It shall extend further to look into why and how Stephen was able to bring himself to a survival point in spite of constantly alternating between drowning and floating. It shall lastly conclude by illustrating that Stephen's survival was because of certain buoyant forces and factors that made him remain afloat and finally survive.

There's indeed justification in bringing the problem of who the narrator is and the effects that this may have for clarification to the forefront in an evaluation of this novel. The purpose of the narrator in a narrative text is crucial as not only could it be in possession of the authority to determine how characters and happenings are shown but their role also bears on interpretation of the work as a whole. It is of best value then to spot the narrator and examine the narration of activities to be able to manage to establish the narrative situation in a text (Fleischer 1-2). That poses an especially complex issue in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as the narrator's several and complex modes of narration forbid a definitive and fixed identification of the character Stephen. Narrator, like a painter, creates a portrait of Stephen using language and frames. Dictionary.com defines portrait as "a likeness of a person, especially one showing the face, which is created by a painter or photographer".

The narrative text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* shows the story of a character by the title of Stephen Dedalus and identifies in detail a few of his experiences in childhood and adolescence however the way it is narrated is equally complex and perplexing. The rendering of functions involves descriptions of such refined sounds as “A film still veiled his [Stephen’s] eyes but they burned no longer” (71), which indicate the related knowledge to function as the narrator’s own. But confusingly Stephen is here perhaps not known in the first person as will be the convention in the third person, which is indicative of the phrase being talked as an external narrator.

In Bal’s and Boheemen’s principle of narratology the external narrator is a term which “indicates that the narrating agent does not figure in the fabula [events] as an actor” (21), and it is typically related by having an objective narrator who identifies the characters in the third person. Paradoxically then, the explanation of film protecting Stephen’s eyes demonstrates the narrator knows Stephen’s connection with sounds at a primary individual stage.

Thus, the complex mixing of subjectivity and objectivity in this novel effects in a narration which is really a complex combination. In a slightly various way it is the strategy found in the presentation of the textual fragments on the initial one and a half page of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, which actually resembles the setting of presenting narrative in film. Finney, as an example, in the article stated in the introduction, examines narration in that passage in the situation of camera strategy, the inverted point-of-view shot which is therefore popular in filmmaking (135).

The narrator in this novel would be to such high stage intertwined linguistically with the identity of the protagonist that it is at times nearly impossible to distinguish his words from those of Stephen’s own. The narrator’s partial attitude toward Stephen

can also be detected. The expression “He drew forth a phrase from his treasure and spoke it softly to him” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 140) contains a word which clearly allows that relationship away. “Treasure” according to Dictionary.com means wealth and thus Stephen digging up a quotation out of his “treasure” gets the implication that Stephen is in possession of good wealth. Whether a collection of graceful lines stored inside one’s mind is usually to be considered as anything of good price, which apparently is the narrator’s interpretation, remains uncontested in this novel, as other characters are banned to contemplate Stephen, just he (Fleischer 7). But it doesn’t need an excessive jump of the creativity to visualize what Stephen’s father, who at one time calls Stephen a “lazy bitch of a brother” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 148), would think of his son’s gathered “wealth” had he been given the opportunity to contemplate the matter.

Moreover, the quotation itself “A day of dappled seaborne clouds” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 140) is really a misquotation of a point from the Hugh Miller poem, and should read: “A day of dappled, breeze-borne clouds” (Gifford 219). That Stephen’s misquotation is allowed to move uncorrected by the narrator points to a consideration with the character which will be such a thing but “objective”, though there’s also the possibility of supposed irony here. If that’s the case, the question is whether it’s just at the expense of Stephen being in possession of a “false” value or as the misquotation moves unnoticed whether the narrator gets his weapon of language at work to interpret and suppress Stephen.

The main element of this passage is this content of what Stephen is expressing and what this demands with regards to the narration. Stephen is musing on the poetic line he’s only spoken to himself and is pondering what it is that he finds beautiful with phrases: “Words. Was it their colors?” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 140) That Stephen arrives at a spot in his growth

when he must establish to himself his relationship to language comes as no real surprise as he began very early in his life to ponder the denotation of words in a significant manner. He thought at that time it had been a process which would lead him to a better understanding of the world (Fleischer 8). But here being an adolescent he knows that his elementary love for phrases has nothing regarding what the words reference in the encompassing world.

As an alternative, Stephen discovers that his love for language has their sources in “the poise and balance of the period itself” (140), put simply, in the keeping of the entire end and by expansion the utilization of punctuation in written language. That discovery startles him somewhat and he questions himself: “Did he then love the rhythmic rise and fall of words better than their associations of legend and colour?” (140) And further, whether it might be the event it is since he is nearsighted and withdrawn he finds “the contemplation of an inner world of individual emotions mirrored perfectly in a lucid supple periodic prose” (140) more pleasurable.

The linguistic system is based on structural relationships and conventions (grammar) that produce meaningful language. Derrida “equates grammar with Writing as a system of inscription, i .e. a general system of signification, which precedes and gives meaning to any individual act of linguistic production, written or spoken. There can be no speech without an understanding of grammar and so writing, in fact, precedes speech” (McQuillan 22). It is substantial that Stephen makes number effort to locate any responses to his questions but instead welcomes his understanding without resistance.

Consequently, it’s a fact that he is more interested in grammar and punctuation than in connotation of words in experiences and descriptions. It can also be a fact it is the contemplation of his own mental inner life reflected in refined

language which will be worth addressing to him (Fleischer 8). Hence, in this above mentioned lines from the novel, Stephen not only makes the way in which for the revelation of his calling as an artist but he also more importantly suggests the sort of artist he will to become. Stephen will become an artist who discards denotation of words in the true, external world for their own inner, mental experience “mirrored perfectly in a lucid supple periodic prose” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 140).

The transformation that occurs in Stephen’s mind at this point in his growth demonstrably features a great influence on how he reacts and interacts with different individuals from that time on. The first manifestation of his choice to prioritize his internal experiences of reality to that particular of the world beyond him is seen exactly after the “discovery” of his connection to language. It’s a passage which typically is seen mostly by critics as associating Stephen with the Greek fable of Icarus, which of course is the intention of the narrator. Stephen’s feelings drifts off, taking him to mainland Europe and its great selection of persons and from a distance he listens to his friends calling out his name to him, teasing him in mock Greek. But his friends’ presence have now lost their significance to him and he contemplates “How characterless they looked”; their phrases no further affect him as he “parried their banter with easy words” (142).

Stephen lets himself be carried away by his imagination and begins to bring a simultaneous connection between himself and the Greek inventor Daedalus, his namesake. And utilizing the historical Greek to permit his chosen skill in a situation of ecstasy Stephen bellows: “Yes! Yes! Yes! He would create proudly out of the freedom and power of his soul, as the great artificer whose name he bore, a living thing, new and soaring and beautiful, impalpable, imperishable” (143).

It's incontestable why these passages which take place at the end of chapter four symbolize a radical transformation in Stephen's behaviour. It's at the commencement of chapter five that narrator through Stephen's father calls him a 'lazy bitch' and that his pal MacCann calls out, "Dedalus, you're an antisocial being, wrapped up in yourself" (150). Therefore, by distancing Stephen from his friends and making him fantasizing around his name, watching it as a prophecy of his prospect, narrator not just removes him from the immediate environments but concurrently also starts to create him reside in an environment of his own.

The first segment of the first chapter is regarded as significant since "Many of the motifs that help make this novel dense and coherent are stated in the first two pages". It divulges Stephen's "delight in all the five senses" and presents key words such as "road, cow, water, woman, flower, and bird" (Tindall 86). Kenner too views the section to "enact the entire action in microcosm" and here "An Aristotelian catalogue of senses, faculties, and mental activities is played against the unfolding of the infant conscience" (33). The "infant conscience" is a vital point as the passage largely is observed as presenting with its textual fragments and its simple sentences as the conscience level of a kid. Brunsdale debates that the introductory line "Once upon a time..." which fits in customary fairy tales account and "appears without quotation marks" gives the impression of the narrator openly speaking to the readers.

This in turn "re-creates a familiar childhood experience and immediately allows readers to identify with 'the nicens little boy'". And "ellipses then shift the storytelling point of view abruptly to Stephen, reflecting the child's sudden precocious awareness of the difference between fiction and reality" (56-57). Nonetheless whether the short passages of the introductory section can be regarded as fragments taken from the conscience of an infant is debatable because the narration is not as innocent as its imminence originally gives the impression of being.

The initial idea of this novel presents textual fragments apparently without any intrusion on part of the narrator in order to illustrate a baby's and a child's observation of the proximate sphere. But a close reading exposes that there is a point at which the narrator can be sensed altering the story to suit his purpose which is to construct the image of himself as Stephen's suppressor through language as a weapon. It is the subsequent paragraph: "He was baby tuckoo. The moocow came down the road where Betty Byrne lived: she sold lemon platt" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 1). The vital information to focus on here is not that Stephen's father told Stephen a tale when he was a baby and so planted in him the seed of affection for language because this is exactly how the narrator wants the text to be read. This contradicts Saussure's studies that "led him to reject the idea the language is simply a tool to be used to represent a preexistent reality. That is, he did not accept the idea that it is mimetic or transparent. Instead, he argued that language is a system that has its own rules of operations" (Dobie 153).

What is important is the initial of these phrases because at core it claims that Stephen is able to see his identity as baby tuckoo as an infant (Fleischer 15). That inconsistency sparks a line of issues and Finney rightly asks "When did Stephen realize that he was a baby tuckoo? At the time his father told the story? Or a little later? Or only now that as narrator is telling the story? Is this the experience of Stephen at the time he heard the story?" (135). It's not possible that Stephen as an infant can form the concept of himself as baby tuckoo. Hence the connection will need to have been produced at a later point; therefore the phrase is a reconstruction of the ability produced by narrator as in opposition to a real experience connected in the moment.

There's in the initial phase yet another case which exhibits the controlling presence of the narrator, and that is also used by Finney in his analysis: "When you wet the bed first it is warm then it gets cold. His mother put on the oil sheet. That had a queer smell" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 1).

The initial word is deceptive because it well might be the language of a child because it is simple and without punctuation, like, a comma after "warm" (Finney 136). But in addition the word order points to it being spoken by a child as a grownup may possibly claim "it is first warm" (1). The narratorial "slip" to discover nevertheless is the utilization of the pronoun "you" since, as Finney highlights, "The isolated occurrence of the use of the second-person is enough to signal the presence of a different voice. "You" has the force of "one." To generalize about experience is an adult trait" and Finney draws the conclusion that "the entire narration is being rendered in the voice of an adult narrator" (136). Narrator attests moreover to be an expert manipulator of texts as he controls to hide Stephen's presence in the narrative to this type of high degree he almost makes him invisible. Narrator's excellent ability for functioning with language in combination with his vivid imagination and need for proof open- up for the likelihood of the narrative being altered and fabricated. And it is certainly in the imaginary realm of the fairy tale that Stephen's tale begins.

Stephen with the means of expanding and planning to go beyond a psychologically limited feeling of life endeavors to achieve intellectual flexibility or what he calls 'aesthetic intellection' by forsaking 'absurdity which is logical and coherent' and adopting 'the one which is illogical and incoherent' (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 208): Stephen 'wanted to meet in the real world the unsubstantial image which his soul so constantly beheld' (52).

The outlook that Stephen favors ‘unsubstantial’, ‘illogical and incoherent’ in life advocates evidently a modernist understanding of individuality as unsolidified and uncertain. This view of life as ‘fluid and impersonal’ frees him from the inclusion of the static self associating him with the idea that “it is no longer a given in literature that truth is static, absolute, and unified. Now it is deemed to be relative, dynamic, and open” (Dobie 152) It offers Stephen an understanding that the expansiveness will serve for him to synchronize the religious and corporeal sides of his nature with the outer world. Furthermore, it may also help him to rise above the vulgarity of his setting, particularly above the ‘nets’ of society: ‘A new wild life [sings] in his veins’ (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 144), and he calls, ‘to greet the advent of the life that had cried to him’ persistently (145). Stephen’s outlook of ‘a new wild life’ denies the ‘race’ and ‘country’ that struggle to create him. For the benefit of the ‘new life’, certainly, he rejects assertively what limits him. Thus, he states candidly of his refusal when his friend Cranly, inquires him about his ‘point of view’ of life:

Look here, Cranly, he said. You have asked me what I would do and I would not do. I will tell you what I will do and what I will not do. I will not serve that in which I no longer believe, whether it call itself my home, my fatherland, or my church: and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can, using for my defense the only arms I allow myself to use - silence, exile and cunning...I will tell you also what I do not fear. I do not fear to be alone to be spurned for another or to leave whatever I have to leave. And I am not afraid to make a mistake, even a great mistake, and a lifelong mistake and perhaps as long as eternity too...I will take the risk... (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 210-11)

Evidently Stephen demands liberty, by which he is able to be artistic being an artist. He frequently thinks himself “drifting amid life like the barren shell of the moon” (Joyce and Levin 245). He attempts independently a new outlook of life that will

relieve his complicated and restless spirits. The reader therefore chases him through the phases of collapse and raising distress in his outside setting as he sees the natural principles as breaking; Catholic Church loses their authority over his sentiment. What Stephen yearns for in life is to become 'like the fellows in poetry and rhetoric' as free even though 'that was very far' (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 10). In the next three chapters, therefore, narrator signifies Stephen in a way that he deserts nationalism, politics and religion:

He mistrusted the turbulence and doubted the sincerity of...comradeship, which seemed to him a sorry anticipation of manhood. The question of honor here raised was, like all such questions, trivial to him. While his mind had been pursuing its intangible phantoms and turning in irresolution from such pursuit he had heard about him the constant voices of his father and of his master, urging him to be a gentleman above all things and urging him to be a catholic above all things. These voices had now come to be hollow sounding in his ears. When the gymnasium had been opened he had heard another voice urging him to be strong and manly and healthy and when the movement towards national revival had begun to be felt in the college yet another voice had bidden him to be true to his country and help to rise up her language and tradition. In the profound world, as he foresaw, a worldly voice would bid him raise up his father's fallen state by his labors and, meanwhile, the voice of his school comrades urged him to be a decent fellow, to shield others from blame or to beg them off and to do his best to get free days for the school. And it was the din of all these hollow sounding voices that made him halt irresolutely in the pursuit of phantoms. He gave them ear only for a time but he was happy only when he was far from them, beyond their call, alone or in the company of phantasmal comrades. (68-69)

In the quotation, narrator clearly presents the whole state of Stephen as a modernist character. Stephen is perhaps not rational and stable, yet he continually wavers between the 'hollow sounding' voices, which wants him to be like a person that social sphere demands and their own pursuit of 'the intangible

phantoms' or 'another voice' that will decrease his wavering in life. Hence Stephen is struggling to begin a secure and harmonious outlook of life throughout this novel. This advocates his fragmentation as he varies constantly between both of these yearnings. Through this illustration, narrator displays that human identification is not a thing which can be understood and described easily. De Man talks about rhetoric that leads to multiple interpretations<sup>1</sup>. (McQuillan 18)

Stephen is not only unknown to himself but also to those around him. His living is entangled in his need, frustration and powerful consciousness of the difficulty of life. After reviewing and inspecting his own life regarding the hollow sounding voices of his father, his school friends and country, Stephen comes to apprehend that ethnic and religious principles of society cannot be answers to his understanding of life. Consequently, he must reject the hollow sounding voices other than the 'intangible phantoms'. The image of Stephen's visualization as 'intangible phantoms' cannot be described as it is concurrent, idealized and inexpressible in words, however what is significant for him is to declare what he is through these 'intangible phantoms' (Gunes 46).

George Lucas states, "then the soul finds everything it needs, it does not have to create or animate anything out of its own self, for its existence is filled to overbrimming with the finding, gathering and molding of all that is given as cognate to the soul" (qtd. in Mckeon 192). He rejects the hollow sounding voices of what confines him, so that he understands the want to escape these voices of nationalism, politics and religion. Conversely, the outlooks of 'a new wild life', 'intangible phantoms' and 'another voice' enthrall him; he feels that he may get rid of the wing of the Jesuits as well as of the psychological split-up and partition only by taking refuge in these views. Stephen's desire for 'a new wild life', 'intangible phantoms' or 'another voice' in a free world exhibits an image of another life and self in a seamless future.

For the ‘another voice’ of life, consequently, narrator emphasizes upon the subjective experience of Stephen, which changes his life into art. The fragmentation and ambivalence is a basic state of narrator’s artistic inventiveness, as he is in the process of recreating and alternating these fragments into ‘the essence of beauty’ (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 149): ‘to live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life’ (145). Narrator sees the task of the modernist as fashioning out of fragments. In this novel, for example, Stephen describes narrator’s outlook of art to Lynch:

We are right...and the others are wrong. To speak of these things and to try to understand their nature, and having understood it, to try slowly and humbly and constantly to express, to press out again, from the gross earth or what it brings forth, from sound and shape and colour which are the prison gates of our soul, an image of the beauty we have come to understand - that is art...Art...is human disposition of sensible or intelligible matter for an aesthetic end. (175)

Stephen illustrates that ‘The object of the artist’ is to make ‘beautiful’ (157). The ‘aesthetic intellection’ or art implies Stephen’s lifestyle as well as a denunciation of the life he has known as such. Through art, he craves to dissect and see life stylishly. Having moved outside himself and the limits of politics, nationalism and religion of society, Stephen sees ‘his soul...in flight’ (157-191).

The inventive motivation empowers Stephen not just to escape from the grim vision of life additionally to speak to a progressive attempt to construct a free self out of the surplus of impacts, instincts and discourses which he experiences. The perspective of ‘a free self’ subverts the groundwork of settled character, as well as give him innovative or idealized understanding of his reality and life, a mode of life or of art whereby...[his] spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom’. (Joyce and Levin 361)

The artistic and expressive motivation to apprehend life and reality infuses Stephen's beliefs throughout this novel. Once the narrator sees that his very own language tool is collapsing and encircling him, he provides Stephen with the artistic instinct to escape from the desolate vision of the present moment caused by his annoyance: "the causes of his embitterment were many, remote and near. He was angry with himself for being young and the prey of restless foolish impulses, angry also with the change of fortune which was reshaping the world about him into a vision of squalor and insincerity" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 54). The inventive vision consequently empowers him to find a domain of harmony and coherence when he is intolerant with the spitefulness and filth of his country, family, religion and nationalism. As a kid at Clongowes Wood School, Stephen associates 'nice sentences' in 'Doctor Cornwell's Spelling Book' to 'poetry' (4). Furthermore, Stephen, unlike other boys, enjoys and composes poetry on the flyleaf of his geography book about the universe. Through the vision shaped by poetry, he desires for surpassing the tangible world and pursues a new relation or life beyond it:

What was after the universe? Nothing. But was there anything round the universe to show where it stopped before the nothing place began? It could not be a wall but there could be a thin line there all rounds everything. It was very big to think about everything and everywhere. Only God could do that. He tried to think what a big thought that must be; but he could think only of God. God was God's name just as his name was Stephen. (9)

Additionally, when he is at the university college in Dublin, Stephen frequently reads the poetry of the past, the poetry of Classical as well as Romantic poets, in which he not only becomes able to stand back from life and to attain a figurative remoteness from the restriction of self, but he also envisions and wishes to find a sense of unity and coherence under his indefinite, fragmented and tangled.

Much of Stephen's development comprises of his advancement in endeavoring to define the 'right' word or phrase, and in dismissing the 'wrong' one in the light of the sense-information he gets or the mixes of them which he continuously makes. To place it in an alternate way, just when he has discovered the right word for something; if he fulfilled that he has grasped the part of actuality, it suggests (Fernando 85). Determining the issue of the connection between language and actuality thusly is a system including strenuous control, and it is not amazing that his psyche surrenders this 'rigour' every once in a while to freewheel, sort of, between 'the word and the vision' (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 74), when his earnest attempts of discernment abandon him profoundly disappointed.

His battle is a repetitive argument between the two, saying and vision, as though he were attempting wildly to make them concur, attempting to mend the crack between language and actuality. What confuses Stephen's deliberations is that the vision is just speculated; it is not a totally known thing for he has not yet discovered the language in which to express it. This, he continuously arrives at catch, must be the artist's focal concern. The dramatization of this novel manages the early phases of this mission: with the artist's exertions to escape the twin perils of solipsism and realism every step of the way, and the agony of realizing that while the journey is totally fundamental, full achievement must bring about his becoming dull of presence 'like a film in the sun'. (77)

Obviously as an immediate outcome of the family quarrel, test religious appellations are tried for their impactful force, and are discovered basically to speak to substantial sensations. The young Stephen's advancement is metalinguistic to a more amazing degree than a customary child's (Fernando 87). 'Words he did not understand he said over and over to himself and through them he had glimpses of the real world about him' (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 50). Nevertheless Stephen is not fulfilled by the world so uncovered. He has gotten persuaded that its physical

nature, uncovered to the faculties of sight, touch and smell, is best case scenario an inadequate picture of actuality, its language degraded by the utilization to which it is put by his elders. At that envisioned purpose of conjunction, language itself might blur — or elevate to in the correct actuality (Fernando 88). His genuine fight to escape the ‘nets’ of common language now starts, as he matches its ability to help to keep up rational soundness in a mundane world against the approaching prospect of its serious insufficiency for anything past that. He has as of recently started to doubt ‘the constant voices of his father and of his masters . . . happy only when he was far away from them, beyond their call, alone or in the company of phantasmal comrades’. (69)

For Stephen, the vision has come alluringly closer. The clouds, he perceives, had emerged from Europe which:

lay out there beyond the Irish Sea, Europe of strange tongues and valleyed and woodbegirt and citadelled and of entrenched and marshaled races. He heard a confused music within him as of memories and names which he was almost conscious of but could not capture even for an instant; then the music seemed to recede, to recede, to recede... (141)

The first genuine indications of linguistic alienation start here, if anyplace, in his profession as an artist, an unavoidable process in perspective of the metaphysical extent of his agenda. He has grappled with the languages of politics and religion and rejected them as excessively diminutive and restricting for his reasons: in contemplation he ends up strolling “in a lane among heaps of dead language” (151). Presently he longs for moulding a more exhaustive, all grasping one, proclaiming its alienated language or linguistic enhancement.

One may see that throughout this novel, Stephen’s attempt is to comprehend the language of art by living in it; in this manner, he utilizes language as the complete medium, which validates understanding as an elucidation in the medium of language. De Man also discusses about figurality that deals with the difference between figurative and ordinary language<sup>2</sup>. (McQuillan 19)

The distinguishment of diverse meanings of a solitary word in language, as a method for conception and correspondence, has a striking capacity in Stephen's understanding. For example: "God was God's name just as his name was Stephen. Dieu was the French for God and that was God's name too [...]. But though there were different names for God in all the different languages in the world and God understood what all the people who prayed said in their different languages still God remained always the same God and God's real name was God" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 9). Thusly, Stephen is included in the session of languages. In and through the medium of language he participates in dialog with others, in an occasion of seeing toward oneself in which he experiences what is other than himself, and in which he is taken past his subjective starting points and changed in the system. To comprehend the meaning of what is said; Stephen makes an interpretation of it into the right language of his own. He tries to structure ideas for himself by method for language, which is a means at the same time his 'being-in the world.' Stephen's rationale of comprehension compares with the structure of dialog (Zarrinjooee and Jamili 280).

The language he utilizes has its "true being only in dialogue, in coming to an understanding" (Gadamer, Weinsheimer and Marshall 443). From his early stages Stephen is "fascinated by words ('belt' and 'suck', for example); and his adolescence is detained by the words 'detain' and 'tundish'" (Tindall 68). Through captivating into the language, he gets to be more than he was, a development in which his getting to be more is the consequence of a basic recognizance. He doubts the rationale of words to distinguish the force of words and the part of language in his comprehension:

Words. Was it their colours? He allowed them to glow and fade, hue after hue: [...] No, it was not their colours: it was the poise and balance of the period itself. Did he then love the rhythmic rise and fall of words better than their associations of legend and colour? Or was it that, being as weak of sight as he

was shy of mind, he drew less pleasure from the reflection of the glowing sensible world through the prism of a language many coloured and richly storied than from the contemplation of an inner world of individual emotions mirrored perfectly in a lucid supple periodic prose? (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 140-41)

By arriving in the domain of language, he overpowers his preconceptions and restrictions of his prior understandings of the world. He contemplates about the implications of the words and their relations to other notions. Stephen's reasoning concerning the purposes of the words, through which he acquires "glimpses of the real world about him" is worthy of note. For instance:

—The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words *home*, *Christ*, *ale*, *master* on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be for me an acquired speech. I have not made or accepted its words. My voice holds them at bay. My soul frets in the shadow of his language. (160)

Stephen's understanding of what is meaningful in an occurrence dazzles him; consequently, he who has a language picks up information of his own, subsequently, a world. In understanding, he is drawn into an occasion of truth and arrives what he should accept. The language he uses impacts his thought, making a methodology of elucidation in words (Zarrinjooee and Jamili 281). The embodiment of his thinking is the "interior dialog of his soul with itself," such a dialog is a consistent going past himself and a comeback to himself, his notions and perspectives (Gadamer, Weinsheimer and Marshall 547). The limitless dialogs with himself describe his thought. As such, through the inside dialog, as a concurrent expectancy of dialog with others and an introduction of the others into that dialog with himself, the world starts to open up to Stephen. He develops into language and into world, and hunts to discover and make his language through his dairy, which creates his life. In this appreciation, his dairy is another mode of living, a revolt, his "revolt" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 211).

Procuring encounters and learning of himself, Stephen can put his life and concerns inside a bigger skyline, because of the progressions striking him. In the same way that a well-bred individual, Stephen gains better standards, qualities and capacities. In short, he learns discretion, taste and judgment; i.e., he realizes what to say and what not to say. Stephen's experience, as the foundation of understanding and growing his information, is a progressing integrative process in which what he experiences enhances and grows as well as changes his acknowledgement.

He inspects the "state of his conscience to understand better why [he is] here in this world" (91). By toppling his prevailing viewpoint, which he identifies was flawed or at least constricted, Stephen broadens his awareness or limit of anticipations: "I was not myself as I am now, as I had to become" (205). In this novel, the world defies Stephen with numerous social, traditional and spiritual puzzles and mazes and he attempts to be conscious and recognize his confusion. Just as Stephen is not held inevitably confined within the circle of his preconceptions, or within the effects of his past, neither is he held confined within language. He "finds the necessity for escape in a series of terrible verbs, all imperative in mood: *apologize, admit, submit, obey, confess, commune, conform*. [...] These imperatives are the 'nets' which [Stephen] must fly in order to find the 'unfettered freedom'" (Tindall 57-58). Within this world, Stephen is the thinker who recognizes the world; i.e., his act of thinking and that of understanding are the ultimate act. Thus, Stephen's self-understanding is the consequence of the combination of the skylines of past and present, which results in the extension of his thoughtful awareness.

Throughout the novel, it shows a steadfast awareness of the inadequacy of language and the confinements that it forces upon Stephen's communication both inside and without the content. Therefore, readers are reliably persuaded to think about the way in which language colours Stephen's observation of the world, and thus the reader's understanding of Stephen. In his investigation of the issues of depiction, the novel mirrors the way in which

language distorts Stephen's point of view. In the initial lines of the novel, the narration begins, "Once upon a time and a very good time it was there was a moocow coming along the road" and with his usage of popular expression, basic linguistic structures and restricted clarifications, narrator reveals the perception of Stephen as an infant while narrating from the viewpoint of his father. Philip Brockbank points out that narrator's deliberation of multiple viewpoints "remind us of the modernist obsession with relativistic modes of perception" (62).

In reality, the narrator's clear recognition of the need to force plan, method, and organization onto language could be seen as redressal of the flaws of language and an acknowledgement of its ability to distort Stephen's message, and additionally propel it. This might be further upheld by narrator's choice to close this novel as a dairy entry. It may be contended that the sharp move from third-person narration to the obscure first-person dairy sections that stamp the end of the novel imply narrator paving way for Stephen's determination to discover his own particular voice.

Notwithstanding, readers should additionally think about the effective message narrator sends with such a sharp conversion of point of view and style. Narrator's approach suggests that he has paved a way for Stephen to exhibit his existence whereas the complex network of his own language as a weapon has failed the narrator and compels him to let Stephen acquire a chance to attempt a self-creation process. Kenneth Grose has termed it a "flat ending" which comprises "many trivialities and unexplained references" (qtd. in Levenson 1017).

Nonetheless, this is to overlook the meta-fictional messages that narrator interweaves into this novel. With the words "11 April: Read what I wrote last night. Vague words for a vague emotion" (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 214-15), narrator closes with a complete reversal of the forthright initial style. Thus, Stephen's rational expansion ends in a narrative frame

which shows an intensely uncertain view of language, presenting a character “trapped in the various styles of [his] own thinking” (Brockbank 61). The novel hence finishes with a prevailing acknowledgement and statement of the restrictions of any linguistic portrait, as it concurrently pursues to engage with its reader and critique the very mode of communication it uses.

In this novel, the representation of Stephen turns into a methods for narrator to speak to a perspective of self in crisis. He doesn't speak to Stephen as complete and reasonability all around the novel. Stephen is persistently seen either as rebelling against the social, political, family and religious foundation or as divided and fluid in his longings of opportunity, scholarly magnificence and agreement. Nevertheless he is unable to get them inside the existing qualities. Hence Stephen is a whirlpool where all conceivable depictions are broken down, and all his battles are not to end up in any pre-given system of life (Gunes 48). He rejects all ideological, social and religious weights and “nets” of society to communicate unreservedly, in light of the fact that these customary qualities request a feeling of character, which is restricted, altered and static with limits encompassing individuals.

Stephen in this manner disengages himself amazingly from society, which neglects to be an objective, stable acceptance to inherited structures of conviction, yet he inclines toward ‘to meet in the real world the unsubstantial image which his soul so constantly beheld’ (Joyce and Levin 222). The perspective of ‘the unsubstantial image’ upsets plainly the limits of ‘logical and coherent’ perspective of life (359). Rather than the identity and meaning built by conventional standards, Stephen strives to uncover his calling as subjective in life: he tries to figure out his own particular meaning of life by method for rational investigation, as opposed to tolerating aimlessly the “nets” of public opinion. Because of narrator's concealment and control, this novel proposes that the customary strength of Stephen disintegrates and vanishes, offering path to a perspective of way

of life as vague, unfinished, pitiful, obscure and uncertain as per the differing and complex contemporary experience. This non-closure reminds of what De Man said, "Language as rhetoric makes it impossible to place a limit on meaning in a text and so prevents closure (the fixing of meaning) in that text" (McQuillan 18-19)

Narrator not just investigates the way in which language influences Stephen's observation of the world as he likewise examines the opposite impact, demonstrating that Stephen's perspective plagues his language. This novel not just investigates the way in which narrator's weapon of language confines Stephen's viewpoint, additionally demonstrates how his standpoint is distorted by his language. With his investigation of language and the rhetoric, narrator endeavors to exhibit the force of language to acclimatize worldviews and force a frame of reference onto Stephen's perception. His conjuring of Latin mythology indicates a longing to escape such significant limits in Stephen, and imprints recognition of the smothering effect of society, upbringing and convention. The novel consequently "compels us to undertake a retrospective inquisition into our larger inheritances of language and civilization" (Brockbank 168) in its contemplation of the endeavored artistic independence of Stephen. Along these lines, novel outfits his content with a skillful consciousness to the complications of articulation in all its structures, preparing for the creative imitation and compelling portrayal.

Narrator manipulates language to express Stephen's distance to society, and the modifications in his being in the progression of becoming a young man, through a very literal and specific progress of sentence structure and language awareness and rules, in each distinct division of the novel. By emphasizing the perplexity of youth, each epiphany-like boost in understanding has a superior depth of meaning. Stephen is aware he psychologically progresses and in that sense looks to the future;

but linguistically, he becomes more conscious of retrospective confines of language – “His father told him that story: his father looked at him through a glass: he had a hairy face” (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 1) - becomes “though in deference to his reputation for essay-writing he had been elected secretary to the gymnasium” (60). In his own words –“The past is consumed in the present and the present is only living because it brings forth the future” (214). There lies Stephen’s complex connection between the language of a person’s past and as present as a viewing lens to the future.

Pressed by the immediate world to make something out of himself in the wake of having declined the offer of a job within the church Stephen’s yield is scanty and ordinary. The profound need for achievement and artistic recognition heads him to explore different avenues regarding form and narration. That is the reason at the end of all the five parts there is an inclination of triumph which never keeps going. It is a made story which is created by narrator with a specific end goal to lure readers to increase confidence in him as a craftsman. Stephen does not get affirmation of his artistic yearnings at any point or from anybody in the story. Control of reality at first turns into an important abhorrent to narrator; creation pervades progressively and Stephen’s life as he must continue clutching his dreams to turn into the incredible artist he sees himself as, regardless of frustrations and reverse discharges ventures (Fleischer 17).

However the voyage on which Stephen has set out from the minute of uncovering his calling has presented to him the life of a loner. Also “The reality Stephen encounters through his aesthetic is a projection of fantasy in which beauty consists of structures in the mind” (Brivic 75). Furthermore the bird-girl scene is a flawless illustration of this. Incomprehensibly, the keener Stephen gets to be as to reality about himself and the world, the further he is propelled into the universe of imagination, into a universe of his own. It is a state of being of which the form of the dairy is an

assertion. The writing form of the dairy involves non-conclusion and as Stephen is as of now battling he does not have the faintest idea what tomorrow may bring. That is the reason Portrait can just complete the way it does: on the note of the vision for attaining enormity.

Stephen throughout the previous twenty years of his age, he has been terribly experiencing the outcomes of different types of ill-use, he has gained from his surroundings. The novel blankets his encounters since he was five. The narrator manages Stephen as a careful investigation of a creative attempt to draw a portrait of a young man whose just turn to restore a very nearly squashed 'I' through turning into an artist. The precise unpredictable and troublesome plot is the narrator's exertion to draw the portrait in recollection of past. The narrator's intense attempt to draw a straightforward portrait dependably ends in disreputable catastrophe. His relentless utilization of the "past", "the past perfect" and the "passive" has dragged him into a murky tale can force linearity since the precise device, i.e. Language, is now dependably non-linear.

Thus estrangement of Stephen, by the past and passive, helps a bit. Stephen's "history" keeps showing up calling for the "present" and "future" structures to act (Shtawyi). Language itself increases control yet the structural creation gets comical and at ordinarily outlandish, obviously making it exceptionally disjointed and cracked. The retrospect investigation of Stephen's 'I' or self needs to disintegrate Stephen into a raw material for a portrait. The narrator spares no action to gather and organize the bits and pieces into a meaningful portrait where his focal issue is his attempt to draw a linguistic portrait and not a pictorial one. Notwithstanding, Stephen is made of language and the portrait is to be made of language and it is troublesome to manage one set of language but here there are two; one being mind or self, the other a portrait, accounting to the "the frenzy of words".

By Stephen's exceptionally being a raw material for a portrait, he is by accepted dependably away from public view. In the wake of being as a vision in the linguistic artist i.e. narrator's psyche and as of now moved in age from five to twenty, the narrator restarts the novel again to draw a portrait of what had officially happened; that is precisely why the novel starts with "Once upon a period". In drawing the linguistic portrait, the narrator, precisely like a painter retreats and hence thousand times picking and re-picking for what-to-turn into a harmonious portrait. Doing this, the narrator dependably intrudes on the generally done stream of consciousness, breaking at whatever point required.

Thus, the effectively developed vision i.e. story of the novel need to experience what the movies folks call montage (Shtawyi). According to Dictionary.com, montage is "the technique of combining in single composition pictorial elements from various sources, as parts of different photographs or fragments of printing, either to give the illusion that the elements belonged together originally or to allow each element to retain its separate identity as a means of adding interest or meaning to the composition". Thus, before the narrator starts the portrait, he already had the novelistic tale in his mind and what is seen reproduced on the pages is a montage i.e. creating a painting – a portrait. Through him, he makes the readers look upon the real story of Stephen from a distance for which he uses his weapon of language having attributes such as the past, the past perfect, and the passive. Like a painter who uses senses of sight, hearing, touching and of course of colours; narrator uses these attributes of language through which he creates the portrait of Stephen thereby creating a distance between his reality and the readers.

One single signifier<sup>3</sup> (Littlewood) when it finds the suitable environment can make a novel, or a short story. In this novel, the signifier portrait gains tremendous power to become a new linguistic and pictorial signified. The novel as a linguistic portrait have seen the remarkable complexity, ambiguity, and tension and but with the pictorial portrait as a signified, things go into the

abyss of framing. This symbolizes framing the many linguistic frames into one frame which is a portrait. To do so to Stephen, the painter-like narrator picks him up and selects him away from the various settings that are within him and outside him. In this way, he attempts to frame Stephen into first a linguistic portrait and then a pictorial portrait (Shtawyi) to distance him from his reality and the readers as well. Language is already constantly capable and supple to the extent of empowering its manipulator to do whatever he likes. Nevertheless, the signifiers, the constituents of language, are always free. The signifiers are free to the degree of total insanity.

Regardless of the estrangement and repression enforced on him by the narrator and family-school-church collision, Stephen forcefully resurfaces every time he is sidelined. Unintentionally, the enormous subduing powers do empower Stephen's 'I' and assures its existence and intimidating characteristic. As a way out, the painter-like narrator finds no other approach but to art up Stephen's 'I', thereby offering him an opportunity to survive.

There is no conclusion to Stephen's story and no probability for an eventual definition of his character yet these are not practical defects. Actually, they are the precise triumph of his effort and attempt as an artist on the grounds that he is the creative outflow of Portrait itself. To say that Stephen is doomed is to totally miscomprehend the objective of the entire novel. His is a definitive attempt of creation toward oneself. The main query is the thing what sort of artist this makes Stephen. Yet the entire novel being either a severe manipulation of reality or a complete fabrication, transforming narrator in one sense into an imposter, does not at all reduce Stephen's attempt of creation toward oneself. Fantasy shapes reality at its basis, so that the promising facet of fantasy is the source of artistic vigor and even of power and it is tough to oppose this notion. Stephen has arrived at the edge of his destination and accordingly his endeavor of creation toward oneself by attempting to become an artist appears to be accessible and achievable.

## Notes

[1] In his essay, *Blindness and Insight*, Paul de Man advocates that: Rather the 'truth value' of an interpretation can never be verified in relation to the text being read because the figural dimension of language – from which no reading can escape – always interferes with the desire to set a fixed meaning to a text. Rhetoric is a use of language that constantly refers to something other than itself. Figural language does not suppose a single meaning but makes reference to a chain of meanings, which has no one authoritative centre. Therefore, because rhetoric by definition does not refer to single and fixed meanings, the interpretation of rhetoric cannot lead to set readings with essential centres.

[2] Again in his essay, *Blindness and Insight*, Paul de Man states that since there is no clear distinction between figurative language and ordinary language, the definition of reading calls for us to read the world around us. Figurality appears in literature but also in film, art, philosophy, histories, advertising, television, biography, journalism, conversation, and so on. In so far as figurality is characteristic of all language it also determines the way we talk and the way we think. In fact perception itself cannot escape figurality. By 'reading', therefore, it means a critical challenge to perception, which refuses to accept a desire for stable or single meanings. Because we are always participants within language and we are continually interpreting and perceiving the world, there can be no end to the task ... Certainly, one will never have read enough, or, ever be able to read enough. This is the tragic linguistic predicament of the human condition.

[3] Free signifier is a term used in semiotics to denote signifiers without referents, such as a word that doesn't point to any actual object or agreed upon meaning. The concept is used in some more textual forms of postmodernism, which rejects the strict anchoring of particular signifiers to particular signified and argues against the concept that there are any ultimate determinable meanings to words or signs. For example, Jacques Derrida speaks of the "free play" of signifiers: arguing that they are not fixed to their signifieds but point beyond themselves to other signifiers in an "indefinite referral of signifier to signified".

### Works cited

- Bal, Mieke, and Christine van Boheemen. *Narratology*. 1st ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009. Print.
- Brivic, Sheldon. 'Stephen Dedalus'S Fantasies Of Reality: Zizekian View'. *James Joyce Quarterly* 41.2 (2004): 69-77. Print.
- Brockbank, Philip. 'From Genesis To Guinneses: Joyce And Literary Tradition'. *Comparative Literary Studies* 19.2 (1991): 175-194. Print.
- Brunsdale, Mitzi. *James Joyce*. 1st ed. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993. Print.
- Brunsdale, Mitzi. *James Joyce*. 1st ed. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993. Print.
- Dictionary.com,. 'The Definition Of Montage'. N. p., 2014. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Dictionary.com,. 'The Definition Of Portrait'. N. p., 2014. Web. 16 Apr. 2014.
- Dobie, Ann B. *Theory Into Practice*. 2nd ed. Boston: Michael Rosenberg, 2009. Print.
- Fernando, Lloyd. 'Language And Reality In'a Portrait Of The Artist': Joyce And Bishop Berkeley'. *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 2.1 (1971): n. pag. Print.
- Finney, Brian. 'Suture In Literary Analysis'. *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 2.2 (1990): 131--144. Print.
- Fleischer, Ralph Martin. 'CREATING STEPHEN, THE ARTIST: Reinterpreting Joyce's Portrait Through Analysis Of The Narrator'. (2012): n. pag. Print.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, Joel Weinsheimer, and Donald G Marshall. *Truth And Method*. 1st ed. London: Continuum, 2004. Print.

Gifford, Don. *Joyce Annotated*. 1st ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Print.

Gunes, Ali. 'Crisis Of Identity In A Portrait Of The Artist As A Young Man='A Portrait Of The Artist As A Young Man'roman\Inda Kimlik Bunal\Im\I'. *Dougus Universitesi Dergisi* 3.2 (2011): 37--49. Print.

Joyce, James, and Harry Levin. *The Essential James Joyce*. 1st ed. London: J. Cape, 1948. Print.

Joyce, James. *A Portrait Of The Artist As A Young Man*. 1st ed. New York: Viking Press, 1964. Print.

Kenner, Hugh. 'The "Portrait" In Perspective'. *Joyce: A Collection of Critical Essays* (1974): 29-49. Print.

Levenson, Michael. 'Stephen'S Diary In Joyce'S Portrait—The Shape Of Life'. *James Joyce's* (2003): 183--205. Print.

Littlewood, Stuart. 'Why They Call Him 'Agent' Cameron'. *deLiberation*. N. p., 2012. Web. 17 Apr. 2014.

McKeon, Michael. *Theory Of The Novel*. 1st ed. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000. Print.

McQuillan, Martin. *Paul De Man*. 1st ed. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Shtawyi, Ahmad. Lecture. Contemporary Novel. Imam University, Riyadh. 05 Mar. 2014.

Lecture.

Tindall, William York. *A Reader's Guide To James Joyce*. 1st ed. New York: Noonday Press, 1959. Print.

Zarrinjooee, Bahman, and Leila Baradaran Jamili. 'Language And Self-Understanding In James Joyce's A Portrait Of The Artist As A Young Man.'. *International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research* 26 (2011): n. pag. Print.