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ABSTRACT

LITERARY ENCODING OF MODERNIST ALIENATION IN THE
LANGUAGE AND SPACES OF JAMES JOYCE’S ULYSSES AND SADEQ
HEDAYAT’S THE BLIND OWL

NAJAFIBABANAZAR, MARYAM
Ph.D. Department of English Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Margaret J. M. Sönmez

January 2018, 213 pages

This thesis examines James Joyce’s Ulysses (1922) and Sadeq Hedayat’s The Blind Owl (1937) from the point of view of their responses to modernist alienation, that is, how these two writers construct texts that, at several levels and particularly on the levels of language, place and space, encode and express alienation. Alienation itself is a theme that has been regularly associated with modernist art, and with its history of plentiful associations and meanings alienation is here taken to refer to the indifference and/or the inability of individuals to establish a meaningful relationship to other human beings or even to themselves, or to the things or social, political, or religious institutions around them. Regarding the exceptional cases of modernism in Ireland with its colonial history and in Iran with its enforced and hasty modernization and its semi-colonial situation the effects of representing such alienation on the language and spaces of the novels will be analysed.

Alienation is encoded in these novels through modernist and avant-garde techniques such as formal experimentation that involves unconventional language use and complicated, non-linear narrative styles. The complexity caused as a result of these non-conformist styles and methods also creates the alienating effects on
the readers that are typically modernist, too. That is, the readers experience these novels as “difficult” and become to some extent alienated from such texts. In their creation of the fictional spaces and representations of places in these novels, readers also encounter the alienating aspects of liminality, which reflect the isolation, dislocation, disorientation, and alienation of the situation of the characters. The thesis shows how liminality is a characteristic of many of the spaces in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*.

In these two modernist novels, alienating spaces, non-standard and unconventional narrative styles and language uses depict directly and indirectly the alienated positions of individuals who feel excluded from or are alienated in a society filled with oppressing elements such as colonial intrusion as well as religious and political autocratic rule.

**Keywords:** Joyce, Hedayat, Modernist Alienation, Liminality, Space.
ÖZ

JAMES JOYCE’UN ULYSSES VE SADIK HİDAYET’İN KÜR BAYKUŞ’UNDAKİ DİL VE MEKÂNLARDA MODERNİST YABANCILAŞMANIN EDEBİ KODLAMASI

Najafibabanazar, Maryam
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Margaret J. M. Sönmez

Ocak 2018, 213 sayfa

Bu tez, James Joyce’un Ulysses (1922) ve Sadik Hidayet’in Kör Baykuş (1937) adlı eserlerini, modernist yabancılaşmaya verdikleri cevaplar açısından incelemektedir. Bir başka deyişle, bu iki yazarın çeşitli düzeylerde, özellikle de dil ve mekân düzeyinde yabancılaşmayı kodlayan ve ifade eden metinler inşa ettiklerini incelemektedir. Çok sayıdaki çağrışımaları ve anlamları ile yabancılaşma, bireylerin kayıtsızlıklarına ve/veya çevrelerindeki diğer insanlar, şeyler ve sosyal, siyasal veya dinsel kurumlarla anlamlı bir ilişki kurmadakı yetersizliklerine işaret etmektedir. Modernizmin istisnai durumları olarak sömürge geçmişiyle İrlanda’da ve mecburi ve hızlandırılmış/yüzeysel modernleşmesi ve yarı-sömürge durumu ile İran’da bu yabancılaşmanın temseline dili ve mekânları üzerindeki etkileri incelenektir.


Bu iki modernist romanda, sömürgeci müdahalenin yanı sıra dini ve siyasi otokratik yönetimin ezici/zulmedici faktörleri ile dolu olan bir toplumdan dışlanmış veya yabancılaşmış hissedenden bireylerin yabancılaşmış konumlarını, yabancılaştırıcı kentsel mekânlar, standart-olmayan ve konformist-olmayan anlatı tarzı ve dil betimlemektedir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Joyce, Hedayat, Modernist yabancılaşma, Liminallik, Mekân.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis presents a study of the modernist alienation in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1922) and Sadeq Hedayat’s *The Blind Owl* (1937), through detailed analyses of alienated and alienating spaces and voices in these novels. Many critics have written about the theme or plots of alienation in modernist novels, or about the isolated and alienated characters in modernist fiction. However, this thesis focusses on how two modernist writers encoded, that is, and how they constructed texts that imbued language and spaces with alienation. The aim is to demonstrate how an abstract theme, alienation, is encoded and embedded in formal and textual elements in these novels. *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* are filled with places that convey a sense of the alienation of the characters and the situations in the story as well as presenting liminal spaces which transmit a sense of suspension, non-belonging, and alienation. Moreover, other essential ways in which alienation permeates these two novels is their experimental language use and innovative and non-conformist narrative techniques which are outstanding instances of the modernists’ experimentations with form. Encoding in this thesis refers to the way alienation is embedded in the texts, specifically in the places, spaces, and language use of these two novels. Alienation is embodied in the very form of the novel, not just in character representation or the themes presented in the novels. The experimental, subversive, and inward-looking style through which alienation is imbued all over these texts are the modernist strategies Joyce and Hedayat employed in these novels.

In this thesis, alienation is used with different connotations, sometimes with shifting connotations. However, the definition of alienation in this study follows
Jaeggi’s broad explanation, which explains it as “indifference and internal division, but also powerlessness and relationlessness with respect to oneself and to a world experienced as indifferent and alien. Alienation is the inability to establish a relation to other human beings, to things, and to social institutions” (Jaeggi 3).

Another note before moving on to the following parts, would be to make a distinction between the concept of liminal that in this thesis is used only etymologically not in the ways that it has been theorized in postcolonial theory. Liminal as we will observe in this thesis refers to the threshold, the ambivalence, and the ambiguity of situations which cause uncertainty, isolation, and alienation.

This Introduction will present detailed investigations into the terms modernism and alienation, situating the focus of this thesis within existing discussions and definitions and identifying the parameters of what may be called a characteristically literary, modernist alienation. It will then introduce the methodology of the thesis, explaining its choice of novels and focus on space and language, before summarizing the contents of the following chapters.

In the following part, definitions of modernism and alienation that will be encountered in this study’s analysis of Joyce’s and Hedayat’s novels will be reviewed. In this regard, Joyce’s and Hedayat’s works will be overviewed briefly to indicate in what ways their novels represent the alienating effects of modernist perceptions of reality in very different worlds.

1.1 Modernism, Literary Modernism and Modernist Fiction

A dictionary definition of modernism mostly explains it as “any of various movements in art, architecture, literature, etc., generally characterized by a deliberate break with classical and traditional forms or methods of expression; the work or ideas of the adherents of such a movement” (OED). Evidently there can be no single definition of modernism in such an overarching and non-specific characterization. This thesis based its introductory assumption on the universal consensus that it is not possible to provide a fixed and a single definition for modernism.
Anglo-American and European modernism is the artistic and cultural reflection of a “world of rapid industrial development, advanced technology, urbanization, secularization and mass forms of social life” (Bradbury and McFarlane 57), and more universally also of a world in which many traditional certainties are perceived to be broken and destabilized. Modernism in Western art is an obvious turning away from many of the conventions of realism that were common in mainstream nineteenth century art, and this turning away from the habits of the past reflects radical changes in the concepts and forms that previously were considered as fixed and stable; it witnesses, therefore a breakdown in art forms and signs, in language, and in narrative techniques. In fact, it was not only the representation of reality that was altered, challenged and revisited, but the underlying understandings of reality itself. Perspectives on the nature of truth altered at the same time that a characteristically modernist style manifested itself in late 19th century and early 20th century works of art. In a sharp break with the dominant thinking of previous centuries, modernists argued that reality was as varied as the individuals who perceived it. While in many ways empowering, for many people such an emphasis on the individual also brought with it feelings of alienation and existential angst after centuries of shared religious certainties. (Childs 46).

How this alteration in the worldviews treating truth and individuals evolved and changed the literature that arose from it provides us with a proper standpoint as to why alienation is one of the recurring and significant themes of modernism and the modernist fiction, and at the same time help us to define a specifically modernist representation of alienation.

Modernism is often said to reflect or respond to modernity or in other words, it “has… frequently been seen as an aesthetic and cultural reaction to late modernity and modernisation” (Childs 17), or as Whitworth states it includes “processes involving reactions to modernity that were sometimes aggressive, sometimes defensive, sometimes ambivalent” (5). The word modernity is used to describe both the specific experiences and awareness of mainstream Western cultures from 17th century onwards and the less culturally embedded temporal experience of
awareness that one’s present situation differs from the past in radically different ways; a consciousness of the newness of contemporary times. This more general and universal experience of (and meaning of) modernity is witnessed in the development and adoption of modernist art in societies marginal to or even not at all connected to the Western industrialized. These other societies went through delayed, mediated or partial industrialization, or had not embarked upon full-scale industrial modernization at all, but nevertheless explored modernist art to express their own experiences of existing in a self-consciously modern world. As this thesis will show in its analyses of key modernist works from marginally industrialized cultures, Milani’s definition of key components of modernization need not apply to the European and American experiences only. He states that all manifestations of the modernization process display some common elements, including “individualism, self-scrutiny, and self-assertion,” described as being among “the pivotal necessities” which came to the forefront in society (20).

Childs also stated that the word modernity “describe[s] a way of living and of experiencing life which has arisen with the changes wrought by industrialization, urbanization, and secularization; its characteristics are disintegration and reformation, fragmentation and rapid change, ephemerality and insecurity” (16). A number of elements including economic, social, political and cultural—including artistic and literary -- changes as well as modernism’s anti-bourgeoisie tendency, mark the path of modernity.

There are no exact dates for when the artistic movement known as modernism starts or changes or ends – if it can be said to have ended. Leaving the question unanswered, modernism, according to Childs, can either be a “time-bound concept (existing between, say, 1890 and 1930) or a timeless one (including Sterne, Donne, Villon, Ronsard)” (2). Modernism is said to be bound with “period, style, genre, or a combination of the above” (Childs 5). One part of the debates about modernism’s start and end is therefore due to the fact that “the term embraces different forms of art: as well as the novel, ‘modernism’ is frequently attributed to music, architecture, painting, sculpture or poetry” (Shiach 7). In all of these arts, including literature, the word modernism is particularly associated with the avant-
guarde style that is first manifest in the last years of the nineteenth and earliest decades of the twentieth century. The earliest avant-garde artists were reacting both within and against the urgent need of the capitalist society to create new things, because they believed that

the search for newness was not simply about staying modern for its own sake. Rather, the creation of new art-forms enabled them to reflect critically on what being modern meant in the first place, and, in doing so, they attempted to resist, if only temporarily, becoming part of the commercial and cultural machine so eager to appropriate and/or denounce them. It was this desire for resistance from within, in fact, that brought the avant-garde into such close contact with mass culture at the beginning of the twentieth century. (Bulson 56)

Artists who altered and attacked the “very institution of art” (Burger 49) and resisted against any kind of “institutionalization” (liii) are considered avant-gardists. In this sense the excessive experimentation in language use in Ulysses and The Blind Owl are examples of avant-garde literature that “derives from the dichotomy between conventional, clichéd language and experimental linguistic forms that dislodge those clichés” (Shaw viii). Thus, in Joyce’s and Hedayat’s novels “to experiment is to resist consensus” (Bulson 60). The consensus here refers to the traditional, conventional literary and standard language and narrative style of fiction used by other writers in, at the advent of modernist writers. This thesis provides evidence that the advent of modernist artworks may be later in some places than in others, but the manifestations and key components of avant-garde modernism remain consistent across time and place.

Childs states that modernism “is a continuous term and should not be discussed without a sense of the literary, historical, and political debates that have accompanied its usage. The problems of definitions are such that many critics avoid providing one, even though they freely use the term” (5). This is what can be spotted easily in discussions about the debatable and multilayered concept of modernism in Iran or Ireland.
It is difficult to provide a unified definition for the concept of literary modernism in Iran or in Ireland if fluctuating uses of the word modernity are brought into the definitions. Each place has its own “requirements and constraints of periodization” and major turning points and “key moments” will differ in different “national traditions” and places (Shiach 7). Berman, as noted by Lehan, distinguished between such terms as “‘modernization’ (the process of social change), “modernity” (the way such change is experienced), and “modernism” (the cultural representation of these changes)” (Lehan 292). Nonetheless, there are common and recurrent features in most literary texts that are associated with modernism, whether in Iranian or Irish literature. These features are mostly recognised as the “elements of religious skepticism, deep introspection, technical and formal experimentation, cerebral game-playing, linguistic innovation, self-referentiality, misanthropic despair overlaid with humor, philosophical speculation, loss of faith and cultural exhaustion” (Childs 6); in addition, it is “formally radical, subjectively real and aesthetically autonomous, expressive of a world in which the present seems dislocated from the past, experience is fragmented, multiple and limitless, and previous certainties about the physical world and our selfhood within it have been swept away” (Parsons 3). Therefore, it can be said that, according to Childs, literary modernism, “was driven by a conscious desire to overturn traditional modes of representation and express the new sensibilities of their time” (4).

All of these themes are easily and frequently found in the texts to be analysed in this thesis. Indeed, the fundamental component of literary modernism that is identified by Childs as “linguistic innovation” is central to Chapter 4 (Alienation and Language), and Chapter 3 (Places and Spaces) regularly relates to one or both of the texts’ manifestations of “misanthropic despair” and “cultural exhaustion”.

Modernist writing is, then, “noted for its experimentation, its complexity, its formalism and for its attempt to create a ‘tradition of the new’” (Childs 15), which are outstanding characteristics of *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. Joyce’s *magnum opus* is famous for its modernist features, and Sadeq Hedayat’s fiction is
evidently modernist in style through-and-through, and avant-garde in its daring complications of language, content and structure that were both highly experimental and ground-breaking in terms of Iranian literary conventions at that time.

The modernist novel’s subversive and destabilizing narrative techniques and nonconformist formal construction, and its radically unconventional treatment of the concepts of time and consciousness are distinguishing factors of both Joyce’s *Ulysses* and Hedayat’s *The Blind Owl*. These characteristics of modernist fiction are reflected in and through the novels’ presentation of the main characters’ consciousnesses.

The modernist novel is usually inward-looking and often- as in Joyce’s and Hedayat’s work- aims to present a self-conscious individual’s flux and flow of consciousness, including its fleeting and almost unconscious drifts, digressions and seeming unconnectedness. In this way, alienation, as one of the themes of modern life, reverberates in the innovative narrative techniques of modernist fiction. The innovative and mostly inward-looking narrative techniques focus on individuals’ consciousness, often more so than on their actions; as found, for example, in Joyce’s modern Odyssey, which emphasizes one day of Dublin life, where nothing special happens in action, but the audience gets involved with the consciousness of the characters and their senses of alienation and fragmentation. This sense of alienation towards the spaces they live in or toward the languages they use will be analysed in these novels by Joyce and Hedayat in the analytical chapters in this thesis.

In this thesis, we will see that common features and concepts that we define as characteristics of modernist literature were established in different cultures and literatures. Hence, they come out in various different ways. *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* show how each place reflects different responses to the modern force, experiences, and changes of the early 20th century. That is to say that Joyce and Hedayat are aware of their own experiences of their settings and reflect modernism differently in their novels accordingly. For instance, one difference may be seen in Joyce’s explicit dissatisfaction with the economic problems prevalent in the colonial semi-modern Dublin, while Hedayat’s novel makes few observations about economics but is, rather, filled with a sense of doomed isolation and depicts a lack
of communication and human contact in society. These writers are conscious of the fact that the modern life experienced in their individual environments has something characteristic about it. Thus, it seems that Joyce tries to capture a flavor of Dublin’s distinct modern ways of living while Hedayat attempts to reflect a not necessarily industrialized Iran’s life in the City of Rey. Although Joyce and Hedayat venture to capture a local experience of encountering modern life, which has its own flavor, in terms of the forces underlying the modern societies they depict, their modernism is not necessarily very different from that of other places. Both Joyce and Hedayat have encoded and seeded the alienation of Dublin and Rey in their texts. In spite of that, there are distinct local elements to be found in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, and dissimilarities between the Irish and Iranian experiences and responses toward the experience of the modern.

1.1.1 James Joyce and the Modernist Novel

There is extensive scholarship on Joyce’s place and significance in modernist fiction; however, this thesis focuses on Joyce’s literary features with respect to how his novel, *Ulysses*, embedded alienation in the places and spaces of Dublin, as well as in and through his highly experimental narrative style and language. Mullin can uncontroversially claim that, with *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce “incrementally altered the landscape of the modernist, and, indeed, the modern novel” (111). Joyce’s modernism is unique in its Irish context, and it becomes more evident when he is studied in relation to colonialism and the nationalist movements in Ireland. Joyce’s contribution to Irish modernism is purely artistic and very innovative in style and form. In all his novels, Joyce is an avant-garde author in terms of form and narrative and his focus is on the individuals’ experiences and their consciousness. Besides, Joyce uses streams of consciousness and interior monologues to effect the impression of a direct exposure of the mind of individuals in his novels and he makes this his outstanding narrative style. This is in addition to extensive word-play and a distinctive usage of reported speech of different varieties, the combination of which created a very modern and, arguably, (in *Finnegans Wake*) even a postmodern style and format (Dettmar 210, Nicol 30).
Joyce’s extreme experimentalism in form and narration and his subtle concern with subjects such as nation, poverty, faith, justice, industrialization and politics create the unique features of Joycean modernism and his encounter with the modern forces in Dublin of his time can be seen in his subversive and innovative writing style. Partington believes that in *Dubliners*, among other works of Joyce which are considered modernist, the experience of the modern life, is characterised by a sense of forward impetus; an all-consuming whirlwind of capitalist expansion, industrial progress and secularization. Joyce’s short stories are a desolate picture of how Ireland could not compete with other nations in the drive to modernity – being, as it was a recipient of British modernity rather than an instigator of its own… Joyce distanced himself from the rural and aligned his writing to the urban and technological advances that characterised the beginning of the twentieth century. (377)

Joyce’s modernism, becomes complicated and complicating when the interrelationships between modernization and political and social issues in Ireland are considered. Nolan points out that in cases like Ireland’s, the experience of modern ways of living and governing is “explicitly associated with the culture of the colonial power” (xi). This association made untenable for the colonial Irish a simple choice between the acceptance and rejection of modernity: they wished naturally to accrue the benefits of modernisation, but do so on their own terms” (Nolan xii). Nolan also believes that there is ambivalence in the Irish movement towards modernisation, connected to Ireland’s postcolonial interest in issues of nationalism, “language, and popular culture, the realm of the aesthetic and the role of the artist” (xii). Kiberd refers to an interesting suggestion about the importance of *Ulysses* in the culture of Europe’s modern context in the late 19th century and early 20th century, which could be a reason for why this novel was rejected and banned when it was first published. He states that “Joyce’s is also a recognition that Europe of itself was nothing without its colonial holdings. *Ulysses* is one of the first major literary utterances of the modern period by an artist who spoke for a newly-liberated people” (Kiberd 327).

Joyce’s modernism shows itself in the innovative and avant-garde literary styles and forms in his fiction. Besides, his fiction is distinctive in its representation of various issues of the individuals like their senses of exile and alienation, in the
Dublin of the early twentieth century. Considering Joyce’s prominent place in modernist literature and his outstanding literary work, *Ulysses*, which this thesis claims encodes and embeds alienation in the text via places and language, it is an outstanding text for this study’s analyses.

### 1.1.2 Sadeq Hedayat and the Modernist Novel

One of Hedayat’s well-known literary productions is *The Blind Owl*. Katouzian observes that the modernist characteristics of this novel dwell in its techniques and framework, as well as in its western or even universal subject matter (13). Although Hedayat was very well-read in ancient and classical Persian literature, he was a cosmopolitan intellectual who was influenced by the so-called Western literature too. Katouzian indicates that “there may be ‘affinities’ with Nerval, Rilke, Poe and many others; there are occasionally resemblances of ideas and expression” (12). Marta Simidchieva similarly finds that Hedayat's work is “closely aligned with European avant-garde literature of the early twentieth century” (20).

One of the factors commonly found in Hedayat's work is the idea of alienation and a related focus on isolated characters, fragmented minds, and consciousness. Hora Yavari has remarked on these elements, presenting a psychoanalytical interpretation of Hedayat’s novels which singles out the modernist elements that have been discussed in the preceding paragraphs and she notes that

in *The Blind Owl*, arguably for the first time in the history of modern Persian literature, we see the unconscious sphere of the psyche as being structurally produced in a literary text. Hedayat embraces fragmentation, self-division, and self-alienation in *The Blind Owl*, all of which are characteristic experiences of his age, pushes them to a new extreme in Persian culture, and turns the account of his self-encounter into a mirror in which the split-in-two Iranian self of the period looks and recognizes himself. Hedayat’s ability to gaze in the face of the past – be it the personal or collective – and strip it of all its disguises brought him to enact the tragic vision of the individual as centrally significant and ultimately meaningless, one which he shared with his epoch and which in its turn left indelible marks on the evolution of modern Persian literature. (52-53)

Thus Hedayat’s notable position in Persian literature arises from the fact that he was the first Persian writer to give voice to the unconscious of an individual and to present it through a narrative technique that replicated a direct access into a
character’s mind. Hedayat’s nonconformity in his literature as in his career reflects his general political and social dissatisfaction and rebelliousness (Jahanbegloo “Hedayat and His Experience of Modernity” 140). Hedayat was not the only novelist who triggered changes in literary language and style of novel writing in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century Iran; there were other writers such as Mojtaba Minovi, Masoud Farzad, and Bozorg Alavai, Nima Yushij, among others, who were participating in modernizing Iranian literary style and language. Nonetheless, Hedayat’s distinction lies in the fact that he was the first novelist to foreground the consciousness of an individual in his fiction.

Responses to the modern conditions of life in Iran in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century are represented in Hedayat’s fiction through some recurring romantic and classical notions such as the “nobility of the soul, alienation from the environment and nostalgia for a golden past [which] – make(s) up some of the most basic elements and recurring themes of Hedayat’s psycho-fictions” (Jahanbegloo184).

Among the modernist elements that connect the fictions of Joyce and Hedayat are the recurrence of alienated and exilic figures along with the themes of isolation, pessimism, and loss of belief in conventional values and social norms. These two authors’ reactions to the oppressions prevalent in their countries, whether they stemmed from tradition, a colonizer or a despotic ruler’s tyranny, were to reflect this sense of alienation through characters in more or less modernized societies. The social changes that resulted from of the arrival of modern forces and changes (modernization), by destabilizing many traditional certainties in political and social issues, reinforced this sense of individuals’ alienation. Therefore, Joyce and Hedayat’s preoccupation with the fragmented mind of their characters, their isolation, and alienation can be seen to have accrued from what was actually going on in their countries: Ireland and Iran. Psychological, social, and political alienation can be found in Ulysses, The Blind Owl, as in the works of the other early modernist writers, internationally. However, these two novels represent characters who are unattached to their social surroundings, and are in some ways living on the margins of their societies, and they show trends of normlessness, isolation, and alienation within the communities that they describe. In their novels, this alienation is encoded
and reflected textually and through the places, and spaces of Dublin and Rey, as well as in the language Joyce and Hedayat used in these ground-breaking works of art.

1.2 Alienation in Modernist Literature

As stated by Jaeggi (3), alienation is individuals’ inability or indifference to relate to other human beings, to the society and to the things around them. Modernism reflected this and other changes and the temporal, spatial, linguistic and psychic fragmentations in individuals in the late 19th century and through to the mid twentieth century. As Levenson also notes, the individual’s changes of experience in modern society are reflected in modernist fiction and in “its changing verbal aspect, its historical limits and symbolic resources, its political dispossession, cultural displacement and psychological self-estrangement, its uneasy accommodation of mind and body, its retreat from the world and its longing for community” (Modernism and the Fate of Individuality xi). The progressive alterations of the era proved to bring about dislocation, disorientation, and alienation in individuals and this is reflected in the style as in the characters of many art works of the period. It is the particular focus on these experiences and the experimental style that is used to express them that characterize these works as ‘modernist’.

The notion of alienation covers a flexible range of meanings and associations, which makes the potential scope of this study immense, and many of these are referred to in the analyses of Joyce’s and Hedayat’s novels. Therefore, before turning to the more contemporary definitions of different types of alienation, and turning to what this thesis is referring to as modernist alienation, this section presents a short history of the different meanings to which the term alienation has been attached, including political and social alienation, psychological alienation, existential alienation, and modernist alienation. Felix Geyer states that the word alienation is an “umbrella concept” as well as a “venerable concept with its roots going back to Roman law” (388). Eric and Mary Johnson also refer to the ancient history of alienation, saying that “the word has an ancient history, being used in common discourse to identify feelings of estrangement, or of detachment from self
and others; and in law to describe the act of transferring property or ownership to another” (12). The word has had a very wide range of applications and connotations since antiquity; for instance, it has even been used as a description of mental disorder. Johnson mentions that “the older meaning in which ‘alienation’ was used was to denote an insane person; *aliene* in French, *alienado* in Spanish are older words for the psychotic, the thoroughly and absolutely alienated person. (‘Alienist’ in English, is still used for the doctor who cares for the insane)” (56). Schacht also indicates the Latin origins of the word, in the introduction to his book *Alienation*. “This noun derives its meaning from the verb *alienare* (to make something another’s, to take away, remove). *Alienare*, in turn, derives from *alienus* (belonging or pertaining to another). And *alienus* derives ultimately from *alius* (meaning “other” as an adjective, or “another” as a noun)” (1). Besides, Schacht indicates that “alienation as an interpersonal estrangement” (3), is what one may call “in any sense ordinary”; … “the verb *alienare* can mean, to cause a warm relationship with another to cool; to cause a separation to occur; to make oneself disliked” (3).

Considering the history of the concept of alienation, it seems that various later meanings of the word take their primary notions from the ancient usages. Other than the ancient meanings of detachment and transferring of property to others, in modern times, according to Johnson,

*alienation has been used by philosophers, psychologists and sociologists to refer to an extraordinary variety of psycho-social disorders, including loss of self, anxiety states, anomic, despair, depersonalization, rootlessness, apathy, social organization, loneliness, atomization, powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, pessimism, and the loss of beliefs or values. (12-13)*

He lists groups that have been described as alienated in varying degrees, including such large groups as women, artists, the young and the old (ibid). Individual characters from these many different groups of alienated types have, almost inevitably, been depicted in novels of all periods, and those of Joyce and Hedayat are no exception. For instance, the frequent appearance of extremely lonely and isolated characters in Joyce’s fiction and in Hedayat’s short stories such as “Three Drops of Blood”, “Laleh”, “Buried Alive” as well as *The Blind Owl* is an outstanding feature of these novelists’ literature. Alex Honneth in the foreword for
Jaeggi’s book on alienation states that “the concept of alienation—a product of modernity through and through—presupposes, a conception of the human essence: whatever is diagnosed as alienated must have become distanced from, and hence alien to, something that counts as the human being’s true nature or essence” (vii). This interpretation of the concept is evidently relevant to the idea of modernist alienation.

Common to all the usages mentioned above, is the term’s reference to estrangement of human beings from themselves or from other people in a society, or from anything which may give meaning and sense to the subject’s life and identity. This sense of division and split can be traced in one way or another in the various types of social, political, existential, psychological, and economic alienation that will be discussed in these pages. Considering the many varieties of alienation all together, it can be said that alienation is a matter both of subjective feelings and of social relationships. Theorized definitions of alienation range from political alienation and economic (Marxist) alienation to psychological and social alienation. Most of these are relevant to the texts that will be analysed in this thesis, or to parts of the texts under examination, but the economic theories have proved to be less immediately applicable to the language and place focus of analyses in this thesis and will therefore not be discussed in detail. In the following paragraphs an attempt is made, then, to present a summary of those definitions of alienation that have resulted in modern theories that are well known and much used in the humanities and social sciences and that are also directly applicable to the Joyce and Hedayat novels under consideration: political alienation, social alienation and anomie, psychological alienation, economic, existential and modernist alienation. The different definitions below will be seen to overlap in many aspects and in many cases, yet each nevertheless presents an individual and useful perspective on the broader concept or “umbrella” term of alienation. Some of these approaches to alienation have a more distinct relevance to one or other of the two novels of this research; notably social alienation is more evident in Ulysses and psychological and existential alienation is more evident in The Blind Owl.
1.2.1 Social Alienation

In the sociological context, alienation according to Kalekin Fishman connotes “the distancing of people from experiencing a crystallized totality both in the social world and in the self” (6). According to Seeman’s article “On the Meaning of Alienation”, the central figures of alienation in contemporary society are “the unattached, the marginal, the obsessive, the normless, and the isolated individual” (783). Thus, social alienation is manifested in and affects individuals’ interpersonal and social relationships. The protagonists of the two novels of this study represent social alienation in various situations and from different aspects. For example, Leopold Bloom of Ulysses is wandering through the city as a liminal and marginal character; and while he is living in Dublin, he is also treated as marginal in it, by virtue of being a Jew, by some of his Dublin fellow citizens. On the other hand, Stephen Dedalus is an unattached individual, also wandering around the streets and among Dubliners, who by choice or personality gradually rejects any bonds with his family, his countrymen, and his church; that is, he has rejected all sorts of institutional connections but is nevertheless still in daily contact with them. He has to work hard to maintain his social alienation, making attempts to maintain a self-estranged position in his relationships with his family and friends. In contrast, The Blind Owl’s unnamed protagonist is represented as an extremely isolated individual living beyond the norms of his household and community and obsessed with his hallucinatory dreams. He rarely encounters other living people in his narration. These characters are either marginalized or they isolate themselves from the social conditions they live in. Joyce and Hedayat textually represent and reflect these characters’ alienation in the language and places in their novels.

By employing Marx’s and Durkheim’s points of view, Seeman puts forward a theory of social alienation which consists of five different characteristics: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement (Seeman 786). Powerlessness in Seeman’s view denotes an individual’s sense of alienation as a result of “discrepancy between his expectations for control and his desire for control” (786). This sense of alienation could, as we will notice in examples in the analytical chapters, be found in Molly Bloom, Dilly Dedalus, Gerty
MacDowell, and Leopold Bloom whose expectations are not in line with their possibilities. The discussions about language and alienation and the silence of women in these two novels are related to this theory of social alienation.

Meaninglessness refers mainly to the “individual’s sensed ability to predict behavioral outcomes” (786). Seeman states that when an individual’s “minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met,” what he calls “high alienation” can occur as embodied in a sense of meaninglessness. This high alienation in an extremely lonely individual is embodied in Hedayat’s protagonist in *The Blind Owl*. He is caught between his hallucinatory dreams and unclear visions between life and death, between reality and imagination.

As for Seeman’s normlessness, it is what in Durkheim’s phraseology is referred to as “anomie.” The notion of anomie in the “traditional usage denotes a situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behavior” (787). Anomie in general refers to a state of following no rules, which becomes a rule in itself. This lack of observing the rules may occur in social and cultural relationships, resulting in a discrepancy between the individual and the social life’s regulations and norms. Hedayat’s protagonist displays anomie.

Isolation applies to individuals who “like the intellectual, assign low value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society” (Seeman 788). Finally, self-estrangement may apply to conditions in which the individual feels that he or she is estranged from an ideal situation (790). These cases of isolation and self-estrangement are best represented in the character Stephen Dedalus, since he has no respect for or belief in the artistic, religious or political values of Ireland. This is also true of what *The Blind Owl*’s protagonist expresses in his hatred and his sense of detachment from his fellowmen whom he calls “the rabble” in different occasions in the novel (15, 40, 43, 60, 70, 71). Social alienation as defined here may thus be summarized as referring to both “absence of interpersonal relationships,” and “a sense of dissociation from the norms, values, and culture of one’s society” (Schacht 157).
1.2.2 Psychological Alienation

Psychological alienation is mostly associated with the notion of alienation from the self. Karen Horney is the psychoanalyst who is famous for her theories of self-alienation, which she discusses in *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*. What Horney means by self-alienation “involves the stifling of spontaneity or spontaneous individuality” (Schacht 141). If a person’s “spontaneous individual self” has been “stunted”, “warped,” or “choked,” he is said to be in a condition of “alienation from himself” or “alienation from self” (Horney 189, 252, 278). Horney conceives of the “spontaneous individual self” in terms of the “spontaneous assertion of [one’s] individual initiatives, feelings, wishes, opinions” (252). In this sense, Hedayat’s protagonist very much reflects alienation from his self. Furthermore, although it may seem a bit far-fetched, Stephen and Bloom also show some psychological alienation when their unconscious desires or fears come to the fore in the hallucinatory episodes of Chapter 15 “Circe”, when they meet a dead mother, or a father who had committed suicide. Social and psychological alienation are frequently encountered in both *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*.

1.2.3 Existential Alienation

Existential alienation concerns itself mostly with the idea of the individual’s process of objectification. Sayers notes that “the concept is used primarily to refer to a psychological, perhaps even spiritual, kind of malaise, which is pervasive in modern society but not specific to it. Rather it is symptomatic of the human condition as such” (1). Existential alienation may convey such situations as the inadequacy of individuals to cope with their surrounding world. Modern alienation of the individual mostly concerns the isolation that individuals may experience in their conscious mind, a sense of alienation and estrangement from the surrounding environment. “The existentialist-inspired conception of alienation points to the structural obstacles to individuals’ ability to understand the world as their own and to understand themselves as subjects that shape that world” (Jaeggi 9-10). We may, in this way, interpret Bloom and the unnamed protagonist of Hedayat as being in trouble with his existence and his self, as a result he displays powerlessness, loss of
relation to his surrounding and other people, and all of these are reflected in the fragmentation of his mind and character.

1.2.4 Political Alienation

Individuals’ dissatisfaction with political systems is claimed to result in a separation and disengagement of the individual from the political system they find themselves in. According to Olsen, this leads to two different types of alienation: “political incapability” and “political discontentment.” In the first stance the alienation is caused by the environment, while in the second stance the individual chooses to get disconnected, separated and alienated.

1.2.5 Marxist Alienation

Perhaps the most famous uses of the notions of self-estrangement and alienation from self are those that appear in Marx’s writings. In this thesis Marxist alienation is not used as a focus for analysis throughout; yet, in one part of the places and spaces chapter and alienation, there are examples from Ulysses that evidently indicate related aspects of the socio-economic marginalization of certain figures. That is why this part is very briefly devoted to Marxist alienation; however, there is a certain awareness that Marxist alienation requires a whole another study if it was specifically related to the subject of this thesis.

For Marx, alienation is an immediate result of the consequences of capitalism, which causes the individuals to lose control over their “technical and social machines” (Johnson 26). Marx believes that “an immediate consequence of man’s estrangement from the product of his labor is man’s estrangement from man” (Johnson 101). Meszaros states that Marx’s theory of alienation has four main aspects that are related to the context from which a subject may become alienated. These are “(a) man is alienated from nature; (b) he is alienated from himself (from his own activity); (c) from his “species-being” (from his being as a member of the human species); (d) man is alienated from man (from other men)” (14). In the first instance, Marx’s focus is on the alienation of the individual from the objects around him whereas in the second, Marx’s concern is the alienation of the subject from the products of his labor. “This means that it is not activity itself which brings satisfaction to him, but an abstract property of it: its saleability under certain
conditions.” (Meszaros 14). The first instance is associated with “estrangement of the thing” and the second may be called “self-estrangement” (14). In the third and fourth aspects of alienation, the focus of Marx is on the alienation of man from other men and man in society in general.

What is emphasized in Marx’s theory is the economic situation, which leads to the alienation of labor by making man see himself as an object, one that may become a victim in the process of capitalization. Marx considers socio-economic elements important in the emergence of the alienation of the individual in a society.

In Hedayat’s novel there are no direct mention of economic or of Marxist connotations of alienation, while in Ulysses there are several references to the dire economic situation of Dubliners, especially in connection to the marginal and economically disadvantaged groups such as the impoverished Dedalus or Dignam family, and the prostitutes in the Nighttown episode. However, the Marxist alienation is of significance to the analyses in this thesis only as far as it involves estrangement of the individuals from their true being and the objectification of the individuals in the colonially interrupted Dublin life.

Considering the above definitions of the term alienation and its diverse types, it is convenient to conclude this section with Jaeggi’s statement that

as an expression of a crisis in contemporary consciousness…. Elevated to the “sickness of civilization par excellence,” alienation became, from the eighteenth century onward, a cipher used to communicate the “uncertainty, fragmentation, and internal division” in humans’ relations to themselves and to the world that accompanied the growth of industrialization. (6)

Modernist art and literature reflects this sense of uncertainty, fragmentation, and alienation in the unconventional and very subversive ways of representation to convey the alienating effects associated with the social changes in the modern time.

1.2.6 Exile

Exile is evidently another form of alienation; and although it is not defined, theoretically, as a particular form or type of alienation, or even within discussions of modernist artworks, the two novels analysed in this thesis draw very evident parallels between the sense of exile (being in an exilic state) and a modernist
alienation related to place and language. There are many references to exilic states in both novels. For instance, an exilic state is represented through the figure of a wandering Jew, here alluded to by the figure of Leopold Bloom. Although he is twice removed from his Jewish origins (his father having converted to Protestant Christianity, and he having converted to Catholicism to marry Molly), there are many references in the novel to his Jewish background. A sense of exile from -not places but- concepts (political and religious institutes), as in Stephen’s case, is observable in the novel too. The self-exile of Hedayat’s character from society and even from his own household represents another exilic figure. Besides the novels’ characters, such details as the forgotten or lost keys to their houses (Bloom and Stephen, respectively) convey a sense of physical exile from one’s home in *Ulysses*; and *The Blind Owl*’s protagonist, although among his own household and in his own house, is taking refuge in his room in a kind of, presumably, self-imposed physical exile. These are in addition to the spiritual exilic feelings of the protagonists from their surroundings that is reflected in their sense of separation, isolation, and non-belonging.

Exile is one of the recurrent themes of modern literature. It has very often been associated with the senses of loss and separation. The isolation resulting from exile of any kind leads to alienation of the individuals. According to Cawelti, “exile is both a central theme and a characteristic biographical pattern of artistic modernism” (38). Since exile has historical and very old implications, “the state as exile from God, the garden of Eden, the homeland, the womb, or even oneself” (Cawelti 17), it is probably one of the central themes of human civilization, one of the earliest themes within which a sense of alienation has been described and explored. Lamming declares that

[w]e are made to feel a sense of exile by our inadequacy and our irrelevance of function in a society whose past we cannot alter and whose future is always beyond us. Idleness can easily guide us into accepting this as a condition. Sooner or later, in silence or with rhetoric, we sign a contract whose epitaph reads: *to be an exile is to be alive.* (12)
In these two novels many characters come to feel irrelevant to their own societies. For instance, Bloom stays on the margins of the Dubliners’ society, although he attempts to integrate. At the early stages of his appearance in the novel, when Bloom and other characters go to Dignam’s funeral, Bloom’s charity and generous donation are mocked, although not to his face, by his companions. Elsewhere he is not considered an Irishman because of his non-Irish origins and his Jewish roots “he’s a perverted Jew, says Martin, from a place in Hungary and it was he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system. We know that in the castle” (U 438). Stephen, in contrast, has exiled himself from all national identity markers and institutions like family ties, religion and country. Hedayat’s protagonist is also exiled in his isolated room. All of these characters, we can claim, choose a self-imposed exile. However, it is not deniable that something in their situations leads them to come up with such a choice. According to Gillespie, “the reality at the heart of the matter is that exile is thrust upon individuals who can no longer sustain themselves in the lands that they have considered their homes” (5). Besides, characters like Stephen, the Blooms, and Hedayat’s protagonist, seem to be “occupying a liminal position that neither frees him from a desire for integration nor disposes him toward the necessary accommodation” (Gillespie 105). This liminal position is what causes the alienated status associated with these exilic figures, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, Places and Spaces and Alienation.

According to Ashcroft, the word exile in everyday usage communicates “the state of being sent to live in another country that is not your own, especially for political reasons, or as punishment” (86). The condition of exile involves the idea of a separation and distancing either from a literal homeland or from a cultural and ethnic origin. Furthermore, as Said stated, it can be ‘actual’, ‘metaphoric’, or ‘symbolic’. In colonial societies, like the Dublin of Ulysses, a non-physical exile may be produced because of a pressure which is exerted on many colonized people to exile themselves from their own cultures, their languages and traditions. The production of this ‘in-between’ class, ‘white but not quite,’ is often a deliberate feature of colonial practice. The possibilities shown by this class of colonially educated natives of breaking out of their position into a radical and
nationalist political strategy does not mean that they do not suffer a form of profound exile. Such conditions of localized alienation or exile may sometimes contribute to the generation of new social and cultural practices and the questioning of old traditions. (Ashcroft 86-87)

Abani suggests an interesting viewpoint on the function of exiles in the modern world. He states that “in a world that wants to control and classify its relationships with all individuals and groups, the exile is possibly the most frightening, because he or she occupies the liminal space that defies any category” (24). Thus, exile is not only associated with the idea of loss and separation, but with the idea of difference and “otherness” as well. Bloom and Stephen’s otherness and Hedayat’s character’s strangeness in these two novels cause a two-way equation for their exile and alienation. Barbour mentions that

\[\text{exile is a way of dwelling in space with a constant awareness that one is not now at home. An exile is oriented to a distant place and feels that he does not belong where he lives. Exile also involves an orientation to time, a plotting of one’s life story around a pivotal event of departure and a present condition of absence from one’s native land. Exile involves orientation, being pointed toward a distant place and time, and also disorientation, feeling lost and at odds with one’s immediate environment. (706)}\]

The condition of exile provides the exilic figure with double vision, a fresh perspective on their surroundings, having an experience of what is left behind and what is ahead. Hanne states that some authors including Salman Rushdie and George Lamming “believe exile to be a vital condition for writing, a form of alienation that produces a useful double-mindedness yet this double-consciousness, common among all ex-colonials and people of any marginalized group, requires no physical displacement to develop” (22). Exile literature, according to Ashcroft, produces a political literature of protest. Whether they strive to be writers or painters or storytellers, the main characters in The Blind Owl and Ulysses convey notions of exilic states and alienation in their narration and language, in their use of words and their techniques of storytelling.

The psychological effects of exile on individuals, in comparison with those of other types of displacements, are uniquely different because exile is involuntary and in some cases return is almost impossible. The trauma associated with the exilic and alienated conditions of almost all the major and minor characters in Ulysses
and *The Blind Owl*, implies the mental as well as physical aspects of exile to be of significance.

1.3 Methodology

This section provides a brief introduction to the main focus of the thesis, which is the analysis of the representations of a specifically modernist alienation, including exile¹, in the selected novels of the two most influential modernist authors of their countries who, perhaps not coincidentally, were self-exiled individuals: James Joyce (*Ulysses*) and Sadeq Hedayat (*The Blind Owl*). While Joyce’s novels are widely known for their modernist experimentation, the works of Hedayat are less often studied in Western academies or as parts of the modernist tradition of writing, because they were translated into a European language only from the 1950s on (1953 in French and 1957 in English), and are evidently the products of a non-European culture and, as such, may have been assumed to be the products of an altogether different ideology, perhaps even one directly antagonistic to modernism. This in spite of the fact that he was both directly and, through artistic interests, indirectly influenced by many of the same forces that underlay 20th century modernism.

Much has been said and written about the concept of the modern condition, or the effects of post-industrial modernizations on society and the individual’ in Europe and the West as well as its representations in the work of Joyce and other European and American early modernists; however, Joyce’s works were always deeply entrenched within a problematic but nevertheless all-pervasive sense of Irishness, and the matter of an individualized Irish modernism requires some consideration. Meanwhile Iran’s experience of modernization, modernism and, within that, of modernist fiction deserves further attention and study. Thus, a detailed discussion of alienation within Joyce’s and Hedayat’s modernist works will

---

¹. Another feature relating these authors is the fact that both of them left their homeland and went into self-exile.
be presented in the following chapter, which introduces readers to how modernism appeared in the Irish and in Iranian literatures.

The novels of this study are noticeable for reflecting modernist characteristics. When *Ulysses* was published in 1922, along with *The Waste Land*, it prophesied the avant-garde age for the novel, with all its subtle and innovative storytelling methods and language use. Butler states that *Ulysses* is “paradigmatically modernist” and it is a “work of allusive and encyclopaedic interconnectedness, with an immense concern for cultural changes within the life of the city” (4). Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom, together with many other Dubliners in *Ulysses* are noted for conveying senses of alienation and isolation (Duffy 49, Hobby 61) in the heart of the colonial Dublin of Joyce. *The Blind Owl* is also considered one of the avant-garde productions of modernist literature in Iran (Katouzian 13, Hillmann 10, Keddie 187). A characteristically modernist susceptibility to individual alienation is, in fact, one of the outstanding features of Hedayat’s fiction, where he “story after story depicts alienation, rejection, antipathy toward others, unhappiness, defeat, death, a deformed society, individuals deformed by fate, dysfunctional romantic and sexual relationships, and meaninglessness of life” (Hillmann “Themes, Plots and Techniques” 128). Each novel has a city (Dublin and The City of Rey) as a setting where, according to literary (Childs, Simmel, Jaeggi as we will refer to them in the Third Chapter), individuals feel more disconnected from their environment. The two cities are different in scale, population, and representation; however, in both novels the setting is designed to foreground the consciousnesses of the characters in the narrations. The alienation of the characters is depicted through the urban and non-urban spaces of the novels and the novels’ liminal spaces and situations themselves encode alienation.

In addition to examining the reasons for and effects of modernist alienation in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* through analyses of how this alienation permeates the form of the novels, the choice of novels from very different cultures allows the thesis to investigate both the universals of modernist alienation and the particular features of modernism as appropriate to a colonial, Irish setting and Iran’s enforced,
speedy, and semi-colonial/Westernized situation. The extremely unconventional and experimental linguistic styles utilized in these two novels, the technical and formal innovations, and the complexity caused by these avant-garde methods, as well as the focus of the novels on the consciousness of the individuals, make *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* optimal texts for the study of a specifically modernist alienation. In these novels, the alienating effects of avant-garde techniques upon their readers represent and also reveal alienation in the characters’ lives and minds. In other words, these two novels create a defamiliarized and alienated world for the readers, and they represent the familiar and yet alienated world of the protagonists at the same time. An alienated world “presents itself to individuals as insignificant and meaningless, as rigidified or impoverished, as a world that is not one’s own, which is to say, a world in which one is not ‘at home’ and over which one can have no influence” (Jaeggi 3).

Jaggei states that the “complexity and anonymity” of modern life results in alienation, which “sometimes is understood as an expression of ‘rootlessness’ and ‘homelessness’” (4). This chapter provided the theoretical background to modernism, modernist fiction and alienation, being a study of the experience of modernity, the theories of modernism, modernist fiction, and of the modernist alienation as these are directly found in the two novels. Since there is such an extensive and enormous amount of literary theory related to modernism and alienation, for the purposes of this study only those theories and concepts which are predominantly encountered in the two novels are examined in detail, but these nevertheless encompass a discussion of the experience of 20th century experiences of modern forces such as urban life, modernism, modernist fiction, and the term alienation from various perspectives. The relevant aspects of alienation are also introduced, focusing on various types, being social, political, existential, and psychological alienations. As a result of this selective perspective, some concepts which have been associated with alienation but which are not explored in this study of the novels, such as anomie, migration, and diaspora, are not reviewed while others which will be significant in this study -- like exile and self-exile -- remain important parts of the discussion. Additionally, characteristic features of modernist
fiction in Ireland and in Iran are introduced and explored in relation to how they might impact the novels’ reflections of creations of their own modernist alienation.

The Second Chapter, Literary Modernism in Ireland and in Iran, provides a detailed survey of the history of modernism in Ireland and Iran, as the background to and nurturing source for these two novels. Overviews of the reactions to and progressions of modernism in the literature and culture of Ireland and Iran will be introduced in this Second Chapter. The reason for this separate chapter is that the experience of modern life in Ireland and, arguably, in Iran gave rise to different types of emphases and interests within their literatures in comparison to the experiences of the modern elements of the Anglo-American and European type that has dominated many existing literary studies. However, new revisions in the history of modernity, and especially Sebastian Conrad’s (2012) research into the subject, defy earlier metanarratives that define modernity as a Western phenomenon only. Multiple modernities and the fact that modernity was written all around the world, and the argument that the West was not its sole origin is a part of the discussion of this chapter. Similarly, modernism in Ireland and in Iran did not follow the same path nor did it have the same responses as might be found in the more economically advanced countries of Europe. Ireland’s colonial history inevitably affected the country economically, socially, technologically, and politically (Shanahan 33)—and this is clearly represented in the themes, linguistic styles and places depicted in *Ulysses*. Imposition of English dominance in Ireland’s modern life, culture, and literature parallels what happened in Iran in terms of Westernization. In this sense, both countries experienced colonialism, although these were of different kinds: while Ireland experienced direct political, economic and geographic colonialism, for Iran we may detect a cultural colonialism, or a semi-colonial experience of the imposition of cultural and political reflexes of the experience of the modern elements. In Iran’s case, a forceful and speedy modernization left many alienating effects on individuals, in a society that was in a transitory phase, while the colonial intrusions in Ireland had very similar effects, as we will see in this Second Chapter.

As for the analytical chapters in this thesis, a close textual reading of the primary texts was undertaken in order to present strong and well-founded
arguments, and it is hoped that, although not every example from *Ulysses* is used (because of its length producing a very large number of such illustrations), the analysis is accurate and based on representative examples. The difference in length between these two novels cannot be ignored; *Ulysses* is bulky by any standards, and especially so in comparison to Hedayat’s slender volume *The Blind Owl*. Although Hedayat’s novel is as dense as poetry and there is a lot to say about it regarding the theme of alienation, the number of pages, examples, characters, places, and names in *Ulysses* far exceed those found in *The Blind Owl*. For this reason, the most relevant examples in *Ulysses* were selected and were compared and contrasted with *The Blind Owl*’s examples; in both cases the aim was to study how alienating situations and the alienation of characters are encoded in places, the liminal spaces, and the language and narrative style in these two texts. Thus, interaction of the characters with their external surroundings and space and how alienation reflects itself through the forms and spaces would be the area of study in Chapter Three; and in Chapter Four the focus of study will move into the more internal zones of the mind and language of characters, represented through the alienating and non-conformist narrative styles and language use in the novels.

The Third Chapter, Alienation in Places and Spaces of *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, is a study of the liminal spaces of Dublin and the City of Rey and an examination of how the alienation of individuals is encoded in liminal spaces like windows, doors, the seaside and riverbanks. Liminality reflects the ambivalent, marginal and isolating states of the characters and/or situations in the novels’ cities and, as we will study in more details in this chapter, it is used etymologically rather than in the sense that it is used in the postcolonial and postmodern studies. Through presenting the isolation and/or liminality of these spaces, Joyce depicts his Dublin individuals’ problematic economic situation as well as their marginality and social alienation. In Hedayat’s novel, the City of Rey is described by its protagonist as vacant (in contrast to *Ulysses*’ crowded Dublin); the walls of his room, and liminal spaces regularly referred to such as the windows, illustrate the extreme loneliness of his character and the doomed sense of lack of or incompetence for communication with his surroundings and society. Since one can claim that there is an active interaction between the minds of people and their surroundings, it is
possible to argue that their surroundings indicate the alienation of the characters in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. Although Joyce portrays a populated Dublin and Hedayat only depicts scattered individuals, the sense of isolation of the characters can be transmitted through the examples of the liminal spaces of these two novels, as is shown in Chapter Three.

The idea of heterotopia as the place of otherness is also studied in this chapter and it also presents an examination of enclosed spaces as loci of speculation and daydreaming, and these issues are discussed in terms of the alienation and isolation of individuals. By referring to Foucault’s ideas about places of otherness which he names heterotopia (and also utopia which is not relevant to this thesis’ aim of study), alienating situations and the alienation of characters in these two novels will be studied. Foucault states that heterotopia’s role “is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled” (8). The characters like Bloom and the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* create their own heterotopias as to compensate their senses of isolation and alienation. Bloomusalem and the brothel in *Ulysses* are good examples of heterotopias of compensation where social and psychological alienation of Bloom is embedded and depicted in other spaces he builds in his mind/hallucination and parallel to Dublin’s real places and spaces. As we will study in further details in Chapter Three, it is through the scene in brothel and the surreal dreams in “Circe” that Bloom’s and, to some extent Stephen’s, alienation is represented and revealed. Bloom builds and employs parallel spaces in his mind and dream to, at least temporally, take control and exert power on his surroundings.

The protagonist of *The Blind Owl* also has his own heterotopia and relates himself to his surroundings through the mirror on the wall of his room. In Foucault’s theorization mirror and the graveyard are also considered as heterotopias, where a connection between the real sites and the spaces of otherness could be created. It is through the heterotopia of mirror, claimed in this thesis, that the anomic, as well as psychological and existential alienation of the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* are encoded and embedded throughout the novel. In Foucault’s theorization mirror function as heterotopia because “it makes this place that I occupy at the moment
when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there” (Foucault 4). It is through representation of these kinds of heterotopias that the existential, social, and psychological alienation of the character and his isolation and anomie are encoded through the places and spaces of The Blind Owl.

Another point of focus in studying the places and spaces of Dublin and The City of Rey is based on Bachelard’s notion of enclosed spaces and places where the sense of daydreaming and introspection of individuals are activated. However, as we can see through the examples from Ulysses and The Blind Owl, many characters in Joyce’s Ulysses, such as Stephen, Dilly, and Simon Dedalus, and Leopold Bloom, and the character in Hedayat’s novel, are wandering and daydreaming outside of their houses. And it is through speculations and daydreaming that their isolation, social, and psychological alienation are embedded in the form of the novels.

Thus, as we will further study in the Third Chapter, the places and spaces in these two novels are imbued with, social, psychological, and existential alienation of the characters. It is through depiction of the liminal spaces, heterotopias, and enclosed places that the notion of alienation is encoded textually and in the form of the novels.

The Fourth Chapter, Alienation in Language and Communication in Ulysses and The Blind Owl, argues that fragmented and broken language and communication is associated with the alienation of the characters and situations. In other words, the analysis of novels in this chapter is based on the observation that one of the common characteristics of alienation is a breakdown in linguistic forms and a lack of genuine and straightforward communication. In these two novels, language is evidently employed in a complex way, which alienates the readers from the texts while also revealing the alienation of the characters via fragmentation and lack of smooth communication between them. Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom in Ulysses are presented mostly through their stream of consciousness rather than genuine dialogues with others. Hedayat’s protagonist has chosen a self-exiled
status as he does not seem to be able to connect well with his nanny, his wife, or the few other characters in the novel. On the other hand, female characters in both novels are either mainly silent, as in Hedayat’s novel, or are displayed through interior monologues or reported speeches, as in Molly Bloom or Gerty MacDowell in *Ulysses*.

The linguistic alienation of women in these two novels are encoded through the silence associated with them, as well as the fact they are not shown in many conversations or interactions, or they are mostly reported and spoken of, for instance, in *The Blind Owl*’s case, the female character is presented in no dialogues and she is being spoken of by the protagonist or reported by her nanny or her brother. Her language in *The Blind Owl* and some other female characters’ language in *Ulysses* are associated with the semiotic, that is, the poetic, the rhythmic, and the non-symbolic language as Kristeva calls it. As will be shown though examples from these two novels, the semiotic as Kristeva herself explains is not as structured as the symbolic, which is related to the fatherly language; rather semiotic is “unnamable, improbable, hybrid, anterior to naming, to the One, to the father, and consequently, maternally connoted to such an extent that it merits ”not even the rank of syllable”” (Kristeva 133). Thus, the semiotic has subversive effects on the symbolic and standard male language and it is through the silence of the female characters that their social alienation and their marginality are textually encoded in these two novels.

Molly Bloom’s interior monologue is also subversive; however, in a different way. According to the notion of *écriture feminine*, in Cixous’’s theorization of the phrase, female language and writing should be subversive of all the male repressing disciplines (879). Molly’s unstructured language in her interior monologue is considered as an example of *écriture feminine* and thus revealing of the suppressions in a male-dominated discourse.

In Chapter Four, the reasons for and the effects of the complexity of language and narrative style in these two novels will be studied, and the linguistic silence of women in these novels is discussed from the point of view of a modernist alienation, perhaps for the first time.
Modernism in Ireland and in Iran, in spite of many cultural, social, and geopolitical differences, showed some similarities in these literary works, precisely in the two areas chosen for the thesis’ main focus. That is, similarities were found firstly in their usage of non-standard language, where fragmented and broken communication further indicates socially alienated figures and characters who prefer to express themselves in interior monologues and stream of consciousness, rather than through dialogue. The second focus and area of similarity is that of the alienating urban spaces of these two novels. In short, then, the analyses and discussions in the following chapters will show how non-standard narrative style and non-conformist language combined with liminal, isolating and desolating settings depict the alienated positions of individuals who feel excluded from or are alienated in a society filled with oppressing elements such as colonial intrusion as well as religious and political autocratic rule.

The conclusion brings together and discusses the findings of the definitions, overviews and analyses that have been presented in the previous chapters and comments on the relations between modernism as an international movement in the humanities and its remarkably parallel manifestations in the literatures of two very different cultures. The conclusion also presents some suggestions for further readings of these novels and new ideas to expand and explore more details and dimensions than was possible in the present study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERARY MODERNISM IN IRELAND AND IN IRAN

While there is a general consensus that the notion of the modern is very hard to define and pin down, the problem becomes more salient in cases of colonial Ireland and fast-changing societies like that of early 20th century Iran. This chapter will be a study of how certain aspects of modernization and literary modernism were shaped and how they progressed in these two countries with the emergence of the notion of “making anew”. To achieve this end, first Ireland’s case will be scrutinized in regard to modernism, focusing on James Joyce and the late 19th and early 20th century era. Then relevant aspects of Iran’s socio-political history of the same period, which resulted in the emergence of much of the modernist literature of Iran, will be summarized. The chapter ends with a short comparative section on the similarities and differences in the processes and experiences of modernism in these two regions, reflecting also on how this procedure of adapting the modern styles and forces reflected their alienating effects in the texts of Joyce and Hedayat’s literary productions Ulysses and The Blind Owl.

2.1 The “Knotty” Problem of Modernism in Ireland

The socio-political history of late 19th century and early 20th century Ireland conveys much about the process, texture, and forms of the advent of modern forces and elements in this island; a region mostly known at the time for its political turmoil and desolate economic conditions. According to Cleary, the meanings of modernity and modernization in Ireland “have actually been an object of intellectual and cultural controversy for some considerable period” (“Toward a Materialist” 2).
One significant element in Ireland’s experience of the modern is the fact that, although it is widely examined within the scopes of “standard European versions or metanarratives” (3), it is informed and influenced by unique factors in comparison to its European neighbors. The prominent aspects of Ireland’s experience of social and cultural changes in the modern era, which Cleary sees as destructive, are due to its colonial history. This means that as parts of a “historiographical enterprise” they “come entirely from ‘above’ and ‘without’, rather than from ‘within’ or ‘below’ (3).

Some factors significant in shaping the modern history of Ireland, must, then, be kept in mind if we are to attain a comprehensible picture of Ireland’s literary modernism. One of these factors, obviously and as pointed out above, is Ireland’s prolonged colonial situation, which is known to have caused much social and political turmoil as well as desolate and dependent economic conditions. Its relation to modernization is significant because “[i]n Ireland, modernisation via colonisation preceded modernisation via industrialisation; colonisation was at least as devastating and destructive to any idea of stable organic society or to the continuity of tradition as the latter would ever be” (Cleary “Toward a Materialist-Formalist” 7). Remarkably enough, this turbulent history was the soil from which three of the most prominent international modernist literary figures of all time emerged, William Butler Yeats (1865-1939), James Joyce (1882-1939), and Samuel Beckett (1906-1982). As Cleary (Cambridge Companion to Irish Modernism) also states,

it is difficult for us to recapture any sense of how unlikely it would have seemed in 1900 that a small island more famed for its economic backwardness and calamitous history than for anything that might be considered “modern” should have produced three figures as significant to the development of modernism as any of the major writers to emerge in England, France, Germany, Russia, or the United States in the same era. (1)

In addition to the dominating presence of these three literary giants, Cleary also believes that the controversial phrase “Irish modernism” itself raises some very “knotty questions of definitions”:

Should it refer to a modernism produced by Irish artists? And what exactly would the term “Irish” encompass in an era during which Ireland
underwent a radical and continuous process of political and cultural redefinition as a territory that had historically been part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was contested by Irish nationalists and unionists, and was divided shortly after World War I into two states? “Modernism” too has always presented its own difficulties as a term because it refers to changes of very discrepant kinds to the conception and function of a wide variety of arts. (4)

It is certainly challenging to decide or define an “Irish” modernism, or literature, when most of its remarkable figures were living and producing arts outside its borders. In the long colonial history of Ireland as well as the nationalist movements that sought to establish a free state from the early 19th century (referred to by Cleary) lies much of the reason for the peripheral situation of Ireland in Europe, and the fact that many exiles and migrants were the product of that unique situation explains why so many “Irish” artists did not reside in Ireland. Scholars should, however, take heed of Cleary’s significant reminder that, although this is a

[c]urrent orthodoxy in Irish social and cultural history—which usually construes Ireland as only badly and belatedly catching up with a model of modernization immaculately completed much earlier in Europe—we need to work toward a less linear and more global and conjunctural mode of analysis that starts from the assumptions that Irish modernity comprises a particular configuration of wider global processes, and that its modernity is therefore directly coeval with other modernities. But coeval here suggests a contemporaneity that recognizes the possibility of difference. (Cleary “Toward a Materialist” 210-211)

Nonetheless, the materialistic and formalist history of Irish modernism must take into account certain differences that arose as a result of Ireland’s specific colonial situation. Notably, while, in the modern era, Western European countries like Spain, England, France, Belgium were enjoying a time of progressive development, in that geographical zone Ireland was the only country “to be subjected to a sustained, thoroughgoing, and culturally traumatic experience of colonization” (209). In other words, while other European countries were having a more prosperous experience of the changes as a result of modern forces, for Ireland the case was different and modernity meant “dispossession, subordination, and the loss of sovereignty, the collapse of its indigenous social order, the gradual disintegration of the Gaelic cultural system, and successive waves of politically or economically enforced emigration” (ibid.). The Irish experience of the modern was developed in an unstable and disturbed situation in a country which, in general,
remained backward and poor in many respects until the late twentieth century. Thus, with regard to its colonial status, Ireland can be said to remain on the periphery of European modernism.

Cleary nevertheless claims that to name Ireland’s situation a condition of “colonial periphery” does not at all mean that Ireland has developed somewhere entirely beyond the pale of metropolitan. On the contrary, to be peripheral is precisely to be compelled to develop within constraints, sets of forces, and agendas—economic, political, cultural, intellectual—that have largely been prescribed or conditioned by developments in the metropolis. (“Toward a Materialist” 210)

However, in many other colonized countries there were inevitable, one can claim, reactions from the peripheral residents toward the center of the colony, in the form of nationalistic movements or literary revolutions, as in Ireland’s case. Moreover, and in the same way, what distinguishes Irish modernism from other countries in Europe is that Ireland’s “literary modernism began so early and still managed to extend itself across several successive stages of modernist literary development, yet without ever reaching much beyond literature” (ibid. 225-226). In other words, Ireland’s modernist progress in various areas such as painting, music, architecture, etc. was not as remarkable as what happened in the literary sphere (ibid).

Keeping in mind the fact that Irish modernism was much more progressive in literature than in other spheres of art and culture, Frazier also declares that the Irish gift to modernism in the 1920s and 1930s – and it was the greatest gift of all – occurred elsewhere than in Dublin. On 2 February 1922, Shakespeare and Co. in Paris issued James Joyce’s Ulysses. Its impact on world literature was rapid and immense. (129)

Considering the many unstable political and social conditions in Ireland, prior to and contemporary to the creation of Ulysses, there emerges the question of where Joyce’s astounding modernism came from. Stewart believes that Joyce’s Dublin, in spite of the belated and pre-modern conditions of life in Ireland in general, had “one of the most advanced communication systems in Europe when he left it in 1904” (133). This is touched on in Ulysses when there is a mention of the postal services, the Press, and trams and trains (however, Joyce focuses on the slow
pace of movement in the city, as we will see in the chapter about urban spaces and alienation).

Irish modernist novelists and literary figures show very different reactions towards London’s cultural dominance or toward the social changes of modernization. A number of them such as Yeats, Synge, and Augusta Gregory, decided to “stay at home to establish Dublin as a rival cultural capital”, others like Joyce and Beckett preferred to take action by “bypassing London altogether and migrating instead to Paris, …, thereby inserting Ireland into the mainstream of European culture from which centuries of British rule were felt to have had detached it” (Cleary, “Toward a Materialist” 220-221). Whatever other reactions they showed, the artists of Ireland’s modern times reflect dislocation and fragmentation in their literature, Joyce being the most conspicuous of all. One of his responses to linguistic alienation in Ireland was the production of novels like *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, whose famed difficulty is largely due to the unconventional uses of language. However, Joyce’s dominance and centrality in the literary field of Ireland and his worldwide fame and acclamation should not “distract us from the many ways in which he spoke from the periphery of the literary culture he would come to dominate” (Mullin 99). He reflected some of the marginal and peripheral voices of a colonial-stricken city on the verge of the changes and challenges specific to the modernist era. In other words, he provides a voice for the literature of the periphery, for precarious characters, displaced and dislocated individuals; and shows the alienation of those individuals in a time of rapid modernization. Besides, by rejecting the nationalist and revivalist movements in Ireland for a “broader European modernity” (Nolan, “James Joyce and the Mutations” 102), James Joyce can now be represented as an author who

most profoundly absorbed and most memorably represented the historical experience of colonial underdevelopment, economic peripherality, and cultural trauma. Thus, Joyce is now the central figure in recent reconceptualization of modernity and modernism in Irish criticism, and has enjoyed renewed influence in other areas of contemporary Irish Studies including visual art, cinema, and philosophy. As such, he is usually regarded less as a model for other Irish writers than an essential part of the very context in which they are read. (Nolan 102)
James Joyce and his literature maintain a significant status in the history of literary modernism internationally and in Ireland. This self-exiled Irish writer’s extreme experimentation with language and with his representation of psychological aspects of human beings and their consciousness are remarkable and supremely modernist contributions to world literature.

Linguistic experimentation and a focus on the consciousness of the individual are in fact characteristic features of the literature of other prominent Irish figures from the late 19th and early 20th century, and beyond: Gregory, Synge, Beckett and Yeats. In spite of strong efforts by the Celtic League to revive Gaelic as a literary language, artists like Joyce and Beckett turned away from Gaelic, which was affiliated with “poverty, ignorance and desolation” (Keating-Miller 2), and their works exhibited a masterly skill over not only the language of the colonizer but other European languages too. Thus, we find that Irish modernism is often represented as a revolutionary linguistic reaction to the language of the colonizer. In other words, though there are modest progresses in other areas of art, such as painting, architecture, and music, Ireland’s experience of belonging to a modern world is best reflected in the literature of some of its most prominent writers such as Yeats, Joyce, and Beckett. In the following section, Joyce’s literary presentation of the alienation of individuals in the turbulent and unsteady Dublin will be introduced as necessary background to understanding the modernist alienation in Ulysses, and some of the points mentioned here will be elaborated upon in the analysis of place and language in the novel.

2.2 James Joyce and Ulysses’ Modernist Alienation

Joyce’s fiction has been the subject of much literary, psychological, political, and sociological scholarship. Joyce’s oeuvre is populated with themes of the individual’s social, psychological, political, and philosophical alienation, self-estrangement and artistic exile. With exilic figures such as Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom, Joyce created protagonists who may stand for the general alienated situation of modern humankind. Moreover, Joyce’s Ulysses is crowded with marginal characters of Dublin origin who are also, in one way or another, alienated
figures. Socially and geographically speaking, regarding the colonial situation of Dublin that is accentuated in his novel, Joyce’s Dublin and Dubliners are alienated and estranged, as is elaborated in the next chapter which focusses on the relationship between alienation and the places and spaces in the Dublin of Ulysses, and how this alienation is both reflected and encoded within the very text of the novel.

In addition to his alienated characters and marginalized places, Joyce’s language and stylistic preferences add to the exilian tinge of Ulysses’ Dublin and its inhabitants, not just within the world of the novel but also within the minds of the readers. Employing a foreign, odd, and innovative lexicon and a multiplicity of linguistic styles provides Joyce’s audience with a sense of estrangement from daily and conventionally novelistic English. The most perceptible example of this alienated and alienating writing strategy would be found in Finnegans Wake, but it is already evident in the earlier works which all display Joyce’s concern with the estrangement of style as well as of characters, both of which are alienated from the conventions of English literature.

In an article on the theme of alienation in Joyce’s Dubliners, which is definitely applicable to the Dublin depicted in Ulysses, Hobby states that as the characters in the book depict angst-ridden lives, Joyce’s stories convey a powerful sense of alienation. By quickly shifting characters and perspectives and moving through the stages of a human life—childhood, adolescence, and maturity—Joyce provides a panoramic view of turn-of-the-century Dublin as a paralyzed world. One of the three italicized words introduced to readers on the first page of the text, paralysis conveys the alienation of Joyce’s characters. (61)

This state of paralysis, the moral, social, and political ineptness of individuals prevalent in his works, is what Joyce seems to utilize to convey the sense of loneliness, separation, and estrangement of his characters in modern Dublin. These characters are like those found in many modern works, specifically in the choice of subject as “the modern disillusioned and rebellious person as described by Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud” (Hobby 61). Such modern figures shared a sense of “inner conflict and anxiety” in addition to the suppression they felt by “institution and cultural values”, which made Joyce call “attention to
the alienated state of the city dwellers” (ibid). Hobby indicates that Joyce’s Dublin contains depictions of “commerce, social mechanism, and the pace of modernity as a meaningless, cacophonous game that engulfs all and leaves individuals alone and isolated” (Hobby 66) and this, in effect, is a portrayal of the real Dubliners of Joyce’s time for whom “alienation is a shared condition after centuries of oppression—not just from the colonizing British but also from the social, political, and religious institutions that influence their lives” (Hobby 68).

Joyce’s depiction of alienated characters and exilic figures in his major fiction connotes and explores his awareness of the individual’s concern with an alienating and alienated society, a society that is in conflict with its unattached and marginal members.

2.3 Iran’s Experience of the Modern World and Literary Modernism

The processes of modernization in the countries referred to as the West are different from what happened in Iran, Hedayat’s place of origin and the setting of his novel *The Blind Owl*. The main focus of this section is, then, a discussion and review of the history of literary modernism in Iran, and of Sadeq Hedayat’s place within it. That is, it takes Hedayat as the focal point and the organizing device in its discussion of the Iranian literary modernism. One major aim of this part is to explore the elements of a seemingly everlasting clash and confrontation between, on the one hand, traditional and modern concepts in Iranian social, political, and literary history and, on the other, the existence of other viewpoints about the process of Iranian modernization and its experience of the modern world. Another concern of this chapter is to explore Hedayat’s influence, as well as his role, in this transition from traditionalism to literary modernism. In addition, some scholars reject the more traditional view of modernity in Iran, and claim that Iran’s process of becoming modern is a kind of “semicolonial modernity”. In this regard, the ideas of some literary critics, such as Dabashi and Jahanbegloo (*Iran Between Tradition*) will be considered briefly.

Iran’s history of the last 150 years is abundant in records of struggles and oscillating movements between commitments to tradition and demands for the
modern elements of the world. Nevertheless, historians and analysts such as Ajoudani, Abrahamian, Milani, Keddie, Mirsepassi, and Jahanbegloo also believe that the history of Iran’s encounter with the modernization process and its experience of the new goes back further, to the mid nineteenth century and the time of the Qajar dynasty (1794-1925). Devos and Werner declare that “the establishment of a strong centralized government, able to exert control over the country’s natural and financial resources in order to defend Iran effectively against foreign powers, had already been an essential part of the reform projects during Qajar period” (171). Mirsepassi states that the history of the “encounter of Iran with modernity is relatively long and quite extensive. Since the 1850s, Iran has invested its intellectual, cultural, economic, and political resources and desires in the hopes of transforming itself into a modern nation-state” (10). In spite of this, however, Mirsepassi believes that in the Iranian case

the modernization programs did not [...] encompass change in the political power structure, nor did they introduce cultural and political modernity. On the contrary, through the modernization process, a more structured and powerful autocratic state power was built. Thus, “modernization” in some spheres of life occurred without resulting in “modernity”. (42-43)

The primary actual encounter of Iranians with manifestations of the modern experiences of the early 20th century, including technology and secularization, started with the Constitutional Revolution, which occurred between the years 1905-1907. The Constitutional Revolution has had many outcomes, the most significant of which is the establishment of a parliament (1907) in Iran. Mafinezam claims that Iran’s constitutional revolution, the first of its kind in the Muslim world and among the first in Asia, was one of the most momentous events in the country’s history as it created the country’s first modern constitution and parliament, its first political parties, and laid the basis for the establishment of a modern public sphere in Iran. (3)

Ajoudani believes that having a parliament should be considered a turning point in the history of a country ruled and governed by tribal convention or an aristocratic system, where the common people had primarily been on the periphery of the governing customs, owning no vote for themselves (interview on BBC
What Ajoudani refers to is the traditional ruling system of Qajar dynasty and of previous kingdoms, where the king was the main decision maker and the individual’s vote was not taken into consideration, since there was no parliament.

The Constitutional Revolution period was seen as a leap towards modernization. The climax of the revolutionary movement was the establishment of the first parliament (1907) in Iran, which was itself a movement towards industrialization, secularization, urbanization, and modernization, because it marked the inauguration of a process of changing the traditional ways of ruling the country into a more democratic one, hence, hoping for a more modern one. However, the establishment of the parliament did not seem to start the movement towards democracy and a liberal ruling of the country immediately, because the Shah retained an arbitrary system of governing the country and imposing sudden modernization decisions. Nonetheless, modernization and alterations continued and were enhanced during Reza Shah’s reign of 1925-1941. The independent Parliament could have had an immense function and role in Iran’s movement towards a modern system of governing, but the autocratic ruling of Reza Shah did not, it seems, let it occur in the first place. Hence it was Reza Shah’s “autocratic and authoritarian modernization” (Werner 1-2) that indeed ruled over the new parliamentary system. At the same time as these changes, as Keddie contends, “the growth of the army and the bureaucracy contributed to urbanization, and Tehran’s population grew greatly” (89). Thus, the change happened in many fields, including the social and political, and the scientific and urban sectors as well. All these changes rendered a progressive movement on the surface of the nation-state; however, the individuals did not seem to be included in the process very actively and were alienated from the whole procedure to a great extent.

One reason for an increase in individuals’ alienation from the governing system in Iran was that, even though the parliament was established, the ruling system did not change enormously. There was an ancient and old-fashioned distance between the state and the parliament: “the constitution of 1906 did not end

---

1 http://www.bbc.com/persian/arts/story/2005/05/050513_pm-cy-ajoudani.shtml
the ancient sense of alienation of the society from the state – of mellat\(^3\) from dawlat\(^4\); it simply gave it a respectable legal definition and institutional dressing” (Katouzian *Iranian History and Politics* 150). Furthermore, when an arbitrary system of rule survives through force and fear, it results in individuals’ alienation and depression. This is what Dabashi also expresses about the outcomes of the dictatorship of Reza Shah’s system in ordinary people’s lives, which will be referred to in the next few paragraphs in more detail (116-117). Katouzian thus reveals that both the “systemic arbitrariness (*Estebdad*) and the resulting individual examples of injustice (*zolm*) create an acute sense of fear and insecurity, mistrust, disbelief, frustration, resentment and alienation” (Katouzian *Iranian History and Politics* 261).

Both Dabashi and Katouzian mention and take into consideration the fact that an oppressive modernization system could create and impose some negative effects on individuals’ lives, including damaging elements such as the alienation and dislocation that are central themes in this thesis. The kind of alienation which Hedayat expresses in and through *The Blind Owl* may thus be postulated as the response of individuals to an oppressive ruling system.

In the early nineteen twenties, while Iran was in a transitory shift from traditionalism to becoming a modern country, Iran experienced this modernization as a collection of social and political changes that took place at different times. Analyses of Iranian culture such as Mirsepassi’s suggest three phases of particular importance in the Iranian path towards modernity:

1. an uncritical embrace of modernity as a Western model designed to totally replace Iranian culture;  
2. a shift to a leftist paradigm of modernity critiquing imperialism and capitalism; and  
3. the turn towards Islamist discourses of authenticity. (Mirsepassi *Intellectual Discourses* 13)

Those who belonged uncritically to the first phase of modernity would be labeled and accused of being “Westoxicated”; critics described as typical of the second phase viewed the West and modernity as an “undesirable other” while those

\(^3\) Nation  
\(^4\) State
promoting the third phase could be called the Islamic intellectuals. Taking these different responses into consideration, modernity is evidently a politically contentious issue in contemporary Iranian scholarship, perhaps in a way that it is not in contemporary Western commentaries. Along with Mirsepassi, Devos, Jahanbegloo, and Keddie one can thus say that, while modernization alters the temporal, spatial, and identity needs of a society, modernity is mostly a long-term sociological process, which takes time to manifest itself and progress to a stage of completion. The latter happened in a defective manner in Iran, since it did not include the individual in a seemingly democratic progressive shift; thus creating and enforcing a sense of dislocation and alienation of the individual from the state.

In addition to these categorizations of Iranian phases of modernization, studies that theorize modernity on the world stage suggest other kinds of modernity that are, as Childs calls them, “countermodernities.” These, he continues, are based on “colonial or post-colonial models that have been made by critics such as Homi Bhabha (1991) and Paul Gilroy (1993)” (18). In contemporary Iran, the scholars Jahanbegloo and Dabashi voice counter-modernities of this kind, which they refer to as a “semincolonial modernity” (Jahanbegloo Iran Between Tradition and Modernity). Jahanbegloo, in the following rather long quotation, explains and comments on the notion of semicolonial modernity and perceived clashes between tradition and modernity in an Iran on the verge of transition.

Religious or secular, for Iranian intellectuals the predicament of modernity is circumstantial to their peripheral situation. Ours is the modernity of the once semicolonized. Maybe that is why the same historical process that has taught us to accept and to cherish the positive values of modernity has also made us the victims of modernity. The crisis of modernity is also part of our heritage. Whatever its other promises, the delegitimation of modernity, not at the level of the efficacy of modern instruments but of the ultimate beneficence and morality of the project itself, has undoubtedly created a different agenda for a dialogue between "tradition" and "modernity." Our attitude toward modernity therefore cannot be other than deeply ambiguous. This is reflected in the way our experiences with modernity have taken place in the last 150 years, from mid-nineteenth-century Iran to contemporary Iran. This ambiguity does not stem from any uncertainty about whether to be for or against modernity. Rather, the uncertainty occurs because we know that to create a dialogue between our traditions and modernity, we need to have the courage not only to struggle for truth but to examine and question our old concepts and values. Today,
in the age of the global village, perhaps the time has come once more to mobilize that courage. (xi)

Jahanbegloo’s ideas render a clear depiction of Iran’s reaction towards a procedure which was both desirable and had evil effects in the society at the same time. Iran’s social, cultural, and literary reactions to the then current procedure of modernization and the effects of modernity (the way these social changes were being experienced in Iran) show that different local responses to the modern shifts were being shown around the world.

One can claim that Iranian society’s response to these modern forces and alterations, like many other nations’ responses, was indeed a reaction to, as Childs writes about modern experiences in general not actually about what happened in Iran, “industrialization, urban society, war, technological change, and new philosophical ideas” (Childs 21). Although Childs is not referring to Iran’s experience of the modern, this is the background to Hedayat’s response to the changes in early 20th century Iran. As an avant-garde literary artist, he was to represent “alienation, plight, chaos, unreason, depression” (Childs 21) in his literary work, a genuine reaction to the modern social and cultural changes in process. In Hedayat’s fiction, there are “uncomprehending individual[s]” (Childs 21), who feel alienated and dislocated in a transforming society. This is what will be found depicted in the mind of the protagonist of Hedayat’s 1937 novel The Blind Owl, and this in turn is why Katouzian pronounces Hedayat as “the founder of modernism in Persian fiction” (1).

The modernization process under Reza Shah’s rules influenced many areas of Iranian life and society but, as Keddie states, although the economy and society of Iran were significantly changed at this time, and even though in principle there remained the moderating devices of a constitution and “majles elections5,” the Shah was, in effect, ruling single-handedly and even despotically. As a result, she concludes, “political life under Reza Shah was extremely limited” (88). Werner and Devos also indicate these features of Iranian politics in this period, calling the Shah’s actions “autocratic” and “authoritarian modernization” (1-2).

---

5 Parliamentary elections
Notwithstanding the autocracy of that period, during Reza Shah’s reign progress in different areas of Iranian life had wide-ranging effects, according to Dabashi. These included but were not limited to

the modernization of the army, the formation of a centralized administrative bureaucracy, the establishment of a far-reaching public health system, the creation of a modern judiciary and educational system, and above all the incorporation of women into the workforce were crucial developments in this period—all of them necessary to make Iran’s economy, society, and polity compatible with its subservient role as a *locus desideratus* for global capitalism. (116)

Consequently, there were many positive alterations and adaptations made to the ruling of Iran at the beginning of this period, and Iran is still benefitting from some of these, such as, primarily, the establishment of the railway in 1939 and the first Iranian University which accepted both men and women in 1934.

It appears that the opportunity for a deeper-rooted and longer-lasting modernization was lost for the sake of imposed and quick decision-making in the reign of Reza Shah. Devos and Werner also state that although these were not long-term and lasting projects, progress in various fields nevertheless happened, like

the development of an Iranian system of higher education, the efforts for the protection of national heritage, the introduction of Western forms of music or sports, the establishment of a public health service, a modern transport system, or even of official censorship[which] are examples of pragmatic cultural politics (5).

The imposed modernization extended, quite naturally, to the abrupt cultural and literary reforms of the period. In Reza Shah’s time, the boosting of economic and social standards influenced the growth of the publishing industry and the advancement of journalism and, consequently, cultural and literary progress as well. In this way, mass publication of books and magazines allowed authors and intellectuals to write and speak to a wider range of the public on extensive issues. Young literati of the time, including Hedayat and Alavi, benefitting from the ripe, secular, cultural situation, strove to alter the literary tradition of the time through innovations in style and language use. Milani claims that some of these literary figures, like Hedayat, were “modern in style, veritably postmodern in philosophy and thought” (20). These young literati had travelled to the West and had witnessed the backwardness of Iran, specifically in technology, vis-à-vis the West. Thus,
they were concerned about introducing or encouraging improvements of every kind in traditional Iran. Abrahamian provides a list of the pioneers making possible a modern Iran in various areas of the humanities and intellectual life:

Sadeq Hedayat, Bozorg Alavi, and Sadeq Chubak, the three leading lights of modern prose writing; Ahmad Shamlu and Nima Yushej, the two path-blazers of modern poetry; Bahar, the poet laureate of traditional literature; Said Nafisi, Mehdi Bamdad, Muhammad Tamaddon, Morteza Ravandi, Yahyi Arianpour – five leading historians; Noshin, Loreta, and Hussein Khair-Khaw, the founders of modern theater; Ghulam-Hussein Saedi, the playwright; Jalal al-e Ahmad and Behazin, two well-known essayists; Golestan, one of Iran’s first film directors; and such literary figures as Parviz Khanlari, Nader Naderpour, Muhammad Tafazolli, Muhammad Mo’in, Fereidun Tavalolli, Fereidun Tankubani, and Siavesh Kasrai. (110)

2.3.1 Literary Modernism in Iranian Literature

One of the features considered as a modern literary practice, and that was used by modernist Iranian authors of the early 20th century, was employing the language of the common people in literary products. Milani asserts that “in a modernization process, either in [the] West or [in] Iran, paying attention to the colloquial language of common people and utilizing folk language in literary works [is] associated [with] the fact that the history of ordinary people comes under the light of scrutiny as well as coming to the heart of studies” (110). This is what Hedayat purposefully started in his short stories “Dash Akol” and “The Stray Dog”. Hedayat ignored the flowery language of Iran’s established literary tradition; instead, he wrote in the language of the ordinary people of the street, something that had no precedent in the literature of Iran. By employing the common and daily language, rather than a flowery and didactic one, the role of individual, rather than types, could come to the fore in literature. This reflects the spirit of modern times insofar as

it is a time when the individual’s life becomes of great importance... their life is given a chance to be performed and presented in painting canvases, in movie theatres, and at last, in the novels, the significant literary outcome of modernity in our contemporary life. In other words, the language of ordinary people is allowed to enter literary scenes. (Milani 148)

In this sense, Hedayat is definitely a modern fiction writer, because he let the individuals speak their ordinary and colloquial language in his texts while he provided a stage for their presence in his novels and short stories.
Perhaps that led to the desire of the individuals to search for a new identity and origin in the background in the presence of the new modes and styles in literary and cultural spheres. In an interview, Ajoudani claimed that “it is through the beginning of the experience of modernity in Iran that we, as Iranians, started to identify ourselves anew. In other words, we started to search for new definitions of ourselves based on what we used to be, and where we did come from actually”.6 This is in fact a reaction to the presence of the new ways of living, which caused Iranians to search for their origins and to ascertain themselves of a pure and developed past, in order to be able to let the modern style in. Young literati of the time like Hedayat had a great share in the process of cultural and literary modernism through their innovative use of language and engagement of universal subject matters in their literature. It should be noted, however, that many racial, cultural, and literary exclusions, regarding various Kurd, Turk, Baloch, and Arab ethnic populations’ languages and cultures occurred during this period, the result of which is still apparent in Iran today.

Literary figures working within the established literary practice of Iran were quite different from the early twentieth century young literati of Iran, such as the members of the group of seven (as they called themselves). The most famous of the seven were Hedayat and Alavi, and they were known as “social and cultural rebels” (Dehdarian 235). At the same time, in an interview Alavi said that he considered the “years between 1930 and 1936 as one of the richest periods…, highly fruitful, even revolutionary, for the development of modern Persian literature” (Dehdarian 232). For instance, Hedayat wrote and published most of his well-known works during this period. Nevertheless, in Alavi’s words the young literati of the time were like “newly hatched chickens” who had to grope their way towards modern ways of expression different from those of the established and accepted style. In addition to voicing an independence from the traditional literary strategies of the time, some of these literati, such as Hedayat, “felt a deep antipathy towards the government of Reza Shah, as well as towards the traditional power of religion;
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…, these young writers exposed nationwide social and political ills, and their critical attitude is reflected in their works” (Dehdarian 238). In fact, what one can call a rebellion against the religious restrictions and hypocrisies will be encountered in the language and alienation chapter below.

The harsh criticism of writers like Hedayat and Alavi was aimed at literary dogmatism as well as at the social injustice of the autocratic ruling system of Reza Shah. Dehdarian mentions that the reflection of such criticism can be found in Hedayat’s *Vagh Vagh Sahib* (*Mister Bow Wow* 1934) and Alavi’s novel *Chamedan* (*The Suitcase* 1935), for instance. Moreover, Dehdarian indicates that Alavi, “like Hedayat, selected his subjects from the milieu of social outcasts and focused his attention on those who had been left behind by modernization. Furthermore, he is also interested in the emotional lives of his protagonists, who completely unsettle the illusion of successful modernization” (238). It seems thus, that although there was an attempt among the young intellectuals and literati of early twentieth century Iran to fight for a modern society and for modernist literary techniques of expression, they were equally critical of the autocracy and oppression of the modernization operated by the government. This group was trying to maintain a sense of patriotism as well as to gain a developed and advanced nation-state, and their efforts were rendered all the more complex by their experiences of living in the West- the seeming bedrock of modernity’s origins. Dehdarian believes that “between 1930 and 1935 the young writers reached the peak of their literary activity and were amongst those who profited from the secularization of public life” (245). They showed eagerness to “experiment [with] their new literary forms, ‘assimilating Western ideas and literary genres with [their own] indigenous forms of thought and expression’ (Raffat 63)” (Dehdarian 245). Katouzian also observes that Iranian modern fiction “owes a great deal to modern Western fiction” (12). *The Blind Owl* is known as a modernist novel because it displays some of the most significant modernist features such as an experimental narrative style and structure, a psychologically debatable subject matter, and a sense of depression, isolation, and alienation spread throughout the story. Katouzian believes that *The Blind Owl* contributes not only to the Persian literary world but also to the universal literary world. It was in this way that these authors “formed the nucleus of the trend-setting
literary movement in Iran” (Dehdarian 245). It was Yushij in poetry and Hedayat in fiction who were the pioneers of a literary renovation; in addition to them, many other literary figures of the time were also influential, including the fiction writers Alavi, Jamalzade, and the poets Shamloo and Farrokhzad. It cannot be said that all the technological, social, cultural, political, and literary dimensions of this progress were going ahead hand in hand; however, the role of the middle class and the enforcement of the government were effective in some advancement. In the meantime, some old and obsolete systems, including the “insufficient literary themes of past”, were being replaced by “noble and useful themes” (Folmer 305).

Although Reza Shah was criticized for his despotic and oppressive measures in enforcing the modernization process and for being concerned with an “overcentralized, elitist, and concentrating on governmental needs,” which caused the education system not to expand at all levels equally, (Keddie 99), the Shah’s reign marks an outstanding expansion in literacy and education. Young and innovative literati of the era—like Hedayat—both benefited from and contributed to the whole process of this social, educational, and literary alteration of the day. These literati of the time were very critical of the despotic and autocratic stance of Reza Shah and felt sympathy for common people who were being doubly oppressed under the modernization regime. Hedayat was among those authors who were attempting to give voice to the despair of the common people and to criticize what was impeding real progress. Keddie states that “Sadeq Hedayat, generally considered the greatest modern Iranian prose writer, wrote in a variety of styles, optimistic and pessimistic, realistic and mystical-paranoid, which can be tied both to Iran’s political state and his own fragile mental state” (187). Keddie also believes that what Hedayat was trying to represent in the “realistic-satirical genre” of Haji Agha (Hedayat’s masterpiece in Keddie’s opinion), is “an exposition of political, financial, personal, and religious hypocrisy in which Hedayat presents in the person of his title character many of the main faults that have kept Iran from progressing soundly” (183). This is the way in which Hedayat contributed to the history of the modern time; he recorded a part of history in the form of social criticism. Besides, in order to get rid of the tyrannical reign of classical prosody it was necessary to practice new strategies, as Yushij did in his poetry like Afsaneh (Myth) (1922), and
Hedayat practiced in his fiction. Hillman states that the change in the forms of Persian literature was the inauguration of literary modernism and literary forms themselves are a first and most pervasive aspect of modernism in Persian literary works from the formal beginnings of modernism in Nima Yushij’s poem *Afsaneh (legend)* (1922) and Mohammad Ali Jamalzadeh’s collection of anecdotal tales called *Yeki Bud Yeki Nabud [once upon a Time]* (1921). In both cases, the authors felt it was time that Persian literature set aside the court—nurtured past of tradition in which types and not individuals were presented, addressed, and depicted, and that literature attempted direct communication with the population at large and not just an intellectual elite. (10)

Thus, the main shift in the transition between classical and modern literature in Persian literature of the early twentieth century revealed itself in changes in form, language, and subject matters. Both formal and content alterations indicated an attempt to create a distance between the social, political and literary tyrannical forces dominant in the cultural spheres.

### 2.4 Sadeq Hedayat, Modernist Alienation, and *The Blind Owl’s Isolation*  

Sadeq Hedayat retains a unique and distinguished place in the modernist literature of Iran for many reasons. A well-read writer who had studied in France during his youth, Hedayat was familiar with modern western texts. Katouzian remarks that in the essay titled *Payam-e Kafka, The Message of Kafka* “which is largely his own sober, measured and studied message in the guise of a review of Kafka’s life and literature, there is neither a mention nor even an allusion to Iran and the Iranians” [and] the message is “global, even universal” (5). *The Message of Kafka*, which is a “remarkable analytical critique,” could be considered as one of the first “examples in Persian modern literary criticism in the Western sense” (Parsinejad 254). In this piece of literary critique, Hedayat introduces Kafka’s worldview in his (Hedayat’s) own words and opinions. Hedayat believes that Kafka’s writing style is both excellent and very new; it focuses on the subject matter and attracts the attention of the reader from the start. Parsinejad also states that for
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7 Whenever there is a mention of Iranian or Persian literature in this thesis, it is referred to the fiction or literature written in Farsi language. While, Persian literature is the literature of that geographic, historical and cultural area and it contains works in more languages than just Farsi.
Hedayat Kafka’s most important contribution is that he was one of the “very few writers who manage in their lifetime to introduce a new style or idea or viewpoint and thus he was one of the especially few who succeeded in giving a new meaning to life, hitherto nonexistent. Kafka is one of the most gifted of the lot” (255). Related to this claim of Katouzian and Parsinejad, Rahimieh believes that “in Kafka’s texts Hedayat found the fragility and the vulnerability of the modern which corresponded to his own anxieties” (Rahimieh127). In other words, Hedayat would find a new perspective to express his literary viewpoints by reading and introducing the leading modernist writers of the early twentieth century such as Kafka and Sartre into the world of Farsi literature. Thus, it is not a far-fetched claim to say that Hedayat can be considered a modern writer influenced by Western literature and texts, and therefore, his work represents and depicts a universal and common reaction to the modern context of his time, albeit in a local background. Therefore, the translated work by Hedayat of authors such as Kafka and Sartre are taken as part of the “sources and documents of Iranian literary modernity and self-portraits of a modern Iranian writer” for Hedayat to become familiar with the modern and avant-garde thought in the West (Rahimieh 133). Jahanbegloo observes that Hedayat’s position among his contemporary artists and authors is one of isolation, and that Hedayat’s [s]ecular modernism and exilic flanerie are often echoed in his psycho-fiction as well as his letters. The exilic and alienated may be especially observed through the pages of The Blind Owl where the narrator makes some very angry and scathing observations on most of the people who occupy his space. (“Hedayat and Experience of Modernity”140)

Perhaps Jahanbegloo’s further observations may be used to summarize Hedayat’s modern style and his literary unconventional experiments that is

[not] just an elaboration of anxiety and depression, but also the expression of the mood of a heroic actor who lives through modernity by giving it a weight of experience. By pushing his secular pessimism to its limits, Hedayat allowed his experience of modernity to suspend itself between our past and our future. (142)

By regarding these kinds of comments about the history of Iran and its modernization with Hedayat at its focal point (which may be observed in Katouzian, Jahanbegloo, Rahimieh, Dehdarian, Devos, Keddie, and Ajoudani), the relation and relevance of Iran’s process of moving from the old to new may be seen to have
found its literary manifestation above all in Hedayat’s work, as will be scrutinized in the analysis of his most well-known novel, *The Blind Owl* and various manifestations of alienation in it.

There is a sense of alienation of the individual reflected in all of Hedayat’s literary work, and *The Blind Owl* is no exception. Dabashi and Mirsepassi agree that the authoritarian decision-makings in Reza Shah’s Iran resulted in the individual’s isolation and alienation. In the process of sociopolitical changes, individuals were left aside, even ignored, by the ruling system because the Shah “viewed the reform programs as “his” plan and “his” policy” (Mirsepassi *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics* 46). Consequently, “the economic and social relations of the society were changing without the participation of the people affected by these changes. In many cases, even the state elite did not have a say in policy making” (45). Mirsepassi emphasizes the point that large numbers of people affected by the “modernization programs and policies [...] were] alienated from the processes, and in many respects an attitude of resistance to and even hostility toward modernization developed” (47). This is what may have caused the “crisis of urban life” (ibid.), which is revealed in some parts in *The Blind Owl*, where (for instance) the protagonist depicts houses as strangely shaped, as if vacant, and even threatening. Hedayat was also concerned with modernization’s alienating effects on those made outcasts by the social conditions of the time, and he showed it in the painful isolation of his protagonists and characters. Dabashi states that *The Blind Owl* “is the repressed monstrosity underlying the Pahlavi modernization schemes, a mockery of their purposefulness” (116-117). He believes there is “lyrical violence about Hedayat’s prose in *The Blind Owl* that would remain characteristic of Persian literary modernity throughout the twentieth century” (117) and this stylistic violence itself could be a sign of the forced and hasty modernization in Iran.

Hedayat’s tone and style remains outstanding in Iran’s literature of the early decades of the 20th century. Hedayat’s innovative and experimental writing style, language use and tone, and even the choice of subject matters psychological and mental world of individuals rather than didactic approach to his audience, distinguish him from his contemporaries, making him one of the most renowned
Iranian modernist authors. He was experiencing the anxiety of the transition from traditional to modern and expressed this depression and anxiety in his artwork, such as the fragmented text of *The Blind Owl*.

Hedayat’s intellectual position in an Iran of transience—between traditionalism and modernism—highlights his pioneering role in contemporary Iranian literature. His place as an intellectual even among the Iranian elite of the time was exilic, because he did not seem to be a conformist in any possible way, that is to any of the traditional literary styles of Iranian literature and/or to the political parties popular in his time. Thus, he was both a spiritual and a physical exile in, and sometimes out of, his homeland. This sense of alienation is reflected and depicted in his fiction very well. Katouzian uses Hedayat’s letters to show that Hedayat’s alienation was psychological as well as social and political; Katouzian believes that through Hedayat’s letters “one may see the three faces of his predicament: the personal tragedy, the social isolation and the universal alienation” (5). Hedayat’s cynical viewpoint condemned “all religions, all politics, all existence” (6).

Hedayat remains an isolated figure who resists easy categorization in the modern history of Iran’s literature. He influenced literary modernism in Iran in different ways. For instance, he innovatively introduced brave and unconventional subjects in his stories, employing fragmentary modes and styles in his writing, with an innovative use of language. These are all in addition to Hedayat’s avant-garde and modern introduction of individuals (rather than types) as characters in his literature. Hedayat reflects a sense of alienation and isolation in his works like *The Blind Owl*, which are prime examples of Iran’s modern fiction.

2.5 Ireland and Iran’s Disturbed Experience of the Modern

The experiences of modern elements and forces in Ireland and Iran as studied in this chapter are definitely specific to their geopolitical situations. The modernization in Ireland occurred through colonization and it was delayed in comparison to what was going on in the neighboring countries. In Iran, on the other hand, a speedy modernization happened through a domestic autocrat. Accordingly,
the colonial situation of Ireland and Iran’s semi-colonial situation, have caused the presence of alienating effects of such societies on individuals to be revealed in the literature of that time. In the literary sphere, as in many other countries, there was a reaction to the traditional standard language and a more innovative and revolutionary linguistic response is evident in the literature of Joyce and Hedayat and their contemporaries.

As for literary modernism in Ireland and Iran, radical experimentation with narrative techniques and non-standard language is found in their fiction. Thus, the experimental use of language in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, while making the novels more complicated for the readers to approach, also render a sense of the narrators’, characters’, and even biographical authors’ alienation and displacement in the societies from which they emerged.

In the following chapter, the relationship between places and spaces of these two novels, including their liminal and public spaces and the characters’ alienation will be studied.
**CHAPTER 3**

**ALIENATION IN PLACES AND SPACES IN ULYSSES AND THE BLIND OWL**

There are many different ways in which the main characters of *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* are shown as alienated from their societies, and how the narrator-protagonists in the novels directly and indirectly communicate and express their senses of isolation and disconnection from their communities. This chapter examines what is modernist about the places and (urban and non-urban) spaces in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, and investigates in what ways they are alienated or alienating, and how this alienation is encoded and reflected in these two texts. This chapter will thus start with a discussion of spatial alienation and urban life in the city which seems significant in modernist literature. Then, because the spaces in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* are very frequently liminal spaces, particular attention is paid to liminality. Liminality by definition talks about two sides, one leading in, and one leading out. Thus, we are dealing with familiarity and integration, as well as alienation and possible rejection or exile. Both of them are indicated by the spaces dominant in the novels of this study.

It is also possible to observe Dublin and the City of Rey in terms of liminal stages and transitional spaces that exist in between being modern or non-modern. These novels represent this state of in-between-ness and uncertainty as causing alienation and a sense of separation from their surroundings in the characters, as a result of the peripherality of their geographical situation. First, these issues will be studied in *Ulysses* and then *The Blind Owl* will be discussed.

It is important to note that, this chapter does not enter the debates about precise definitions of space and place. For the purpose of this research, a definite
distinction is made between the notion of place, as a physical entity, like city, building, house, room, kitchen, etc.; a “static sense of location, of being, of dwelling,” and space, which usually refers to something more abstract (Thacker 13). Space, and liminal spaces, in this study refer to the conceived spaces rather than to a concrete concept. Liminal spaces like the thresholds of windows and doorways, as well as spaces like heterotopias are, oftentimes, mentally constructed.

The focus on city, urban life, and urban consciousness is part of the common characteristics of modernist literature and modernist fiction in particular (Childs 19). Whitworth also states that “modernist literature depicts modern life, especially urban life;” (11) and it is in the metropolis that according to Simmel “a different amount of consciousness” (184) of human being is extracted when compared to rural life. In other words,

the metropolitan type of man – which, of course, exists in a thousand individual variants – develops an organ protecting him against the threatening currents and discrepancies of his external environment which would uproot him. He reacts with his head instead of his heart. In this an increased awareness assumes the psychic prerogative. Metropolitan life, thus, underlies a heightened awareness and a predominance of intelligence in metropolitan man. (Simmel 184)

Thus, when the focus is on the consciousness of the individuals in modernist fiction in a modern (urban) location, studying how urban places would or could reflect the alienation of the characters is a suitable strategy for the study of texts like Ulysses and The Blind Owl which are set in Dublin and The City of Rey. On the other hand, the places in these two novels, whether they are urban, as what we see in Dublin or neither fully urban not fully rural, as we see in The City of Rey, could reveal political and social characteristics of Dublin and the City of Rey as we will observe. These social and political characteristics- the colonial and semicolonial conditions in Ireland and in Iran for instance- are themselves alienating and have estrangement effects on the individuals in these novels. The significant issue in studying place, space, and individuals’ consciousness in modernist literature would be to state that “considerations of the city and modernism have increasingly been framed by the idea that space does not have an independent existence, but is socially constructed” (Simmel 199). These social constructions cause alienation for the characters, as we will see in Ulysses and The Blind Owl, and in our focus on the textual
representations of alienation and how Joyce and Hedayat have embedded alienation in these texts.

3.1 Liminality and Alienation

Liminality embodies ambivalence and ambiguity and thus complicates any sense of purpose or direction, and in this it resembles some characteristics of modernism, for “[a] tendency towards ambiguity, paradox and an uncertain surface structure is also peculiar to some of the characteristic aims of modernist literature” (Drewery 48). Experiencing this state of uncertainty, feeling embedded or trapped in a liminal space, can cause a sense of alienation and isolation. The state of liminality having a multidirectional relationship, each direction feeding off each other, could be the primary reason for the perplexity and emotional dangling of characters; thus belonging to all or no “sides” in itself causes a situation that demonstrates a kind of alienation. Liminality relates essentially to a transitory state, a threshold, and something at a boundary, a state of in-between-ness. The uncertainty that is embedded in the concept of liminality is what makes it related to the modern experience as also to postmodernity. This is cogently summarized by Thomassen, who writes that “there are evident reasons that discussion of liminality in contemporary [literature] almost inevitably leads to the core of the modern project which is one of constant overcoming of boundaries and questioning of authorities and the taken-for-granted” (3). Thus, boundary-transgressing issues, which are central in liminality and liminal situations, are also encountered in the modern context. Thomassen further states that liminality in essence deals with “dissolving any fixity of position, dissolving the modern into permanent hybridity” (8). Considering the general agreement that being modern is “essentially about rationalizing, measuring, and categorizing” (9-10), being modern can be seen to value boundaries, and this may be why liminality is so particularly alienating in modernist fiction; this is quite different from the conception of liminality in postmodernity and its fiction, which is concerned with “the liberation of genres and going beyond the boundaries” (9). For modernists, what we now perceive of as
liminality (a word and concept they, themselves, did not theorize)\(^8\) is thus about the problem of leaky and fuzzy boundaries that are perceived as necessary for “rationalizing, measuring, and categorizing (Thomassen 9), and therefore in spite of the blurriness of in-between spaces, they are often represented in concrete images such as entrances and exits, borders and crossings, which in fact relate to their etymological origins (from Latin \textit{limen}, “threshold”). The state of liminality and instability that causes dislocation, displacement and alienation of the individual in a modern/modernist context has also been incorporated in a postmodern worldview, where it deals with an unavoidable state of flux, of going backwards and forwards across boundaries.

Making a distinction between some phrases which connate ambiguity, uncertainty and in-between-ness, in different contexts, prevents misconceptions of the notions of liminality and liminal situations, as they will be referred to in this thesis, and for this purpose Drewery’s explanation below is sufficient. Drewery indicates a distinction between marginality, inferiority, and liminality by stating that marginality is

a condition of being peripheral or minor, exists at the edges of social structure, whilst inferiority implies disempowerment and is situated beneath it. Liminality differs in that it exists \textit{within} social structures itself, but in its interstices; the cracks falling between pre-existing social norms, classifications, and conventions. (3)

Some common liminal images and spaces usually include doors, windows, mirrors, candles, curtains, gateways, shorelines and the tomb (Drewery 11). These liminal spaces and images are the ones which will be encountered and analysed in the novels of this study and the focus will be on how these images of liminality and alienation are reflected textually by the authors.

---

\(^8\) Although T. S. Eliot’s \textit{The Waste Land} could be argued to be the Modernist poetic analysis of liminality in most of its aspects.
3.1.1 Dublin and Dubliners on the Threshold

Although representation of alienation is an expected part of modernist texts, the actual urban spaces that appear in the images of *Ulysses* point more towards liminality than mere exclusion or alienation. Both of the major characters in *Ulysses*, Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus, are physical and metaphoric exiles in their own hometown. Stephen is in a state of rejection of every authoritative ruling political and religious institution, and is trying to define a new identity for himself. Stephen feels alienated by the estranging social effects in Dublin, such as the political movements he does not feel he belongs to, or the Catholic Church he defies. Based on Seeman’s notion of social alienation Stephen is an unattached and isolated individual in Dublin society (738). Bloom on the other hand is an isolated and vigorous Jew in conservative Dublin; as a Jewish character he represents those alienated from Jerusalem, and the promised land, and as a Christian and (later) Catholic convert he is also twice alienated from his ancestral religion. Wandering the streets of Dublin and haunted by his wife’s infidelity and their child’s death, he feels separated and alienated from his matrimonial and parental roles. Bloom is alienated from social life situations as well as personal individual levels in Dublin. Nevertheless, this need not mark him as more alienated than others in his city; Duffy believes that “Dublin in *Ulysses* is a place without any center of viable political power and hence (as no real alternative sites of contestation are suggested in the novel) without any real possibility that the city could exist as the site of viable community” (49). He goes on, controversially, to envisage Bloom as exhibiting a “self-cultivated marginality,” and if we accept this interpretation then we can also agree with his further argument that this marginality “is a normalizing, rather than an othering strategy: his ostracized solitariness is the condition of every citizen in the city (Duffy 49). The many reasons for Bloom’s alienation given above do not, however, conform to the idea of a self-cultivated alienation; Duffy’s concept of Bloom’s marginalization is evidently more about Bloom’s response to his situation than a definition of his actual situation as a wandering and apostate Jew, betrayed husband and bereft father. There is nothing self-cultivated about these elements. Adding these parts of Bloom’s identity to the comments made by Duffy, then, we
may say that Bloom is an extraordinarily alienated character living in a city of “ostracized” and solitary people.

The peculiarly isolated state of Dubliners was also mentioned in Chapter One, with reference to Hobby (61-68). Both Hobby and Duffy thus indicate the inner anxiety and solitariness of characters in Joyce’s Dublin, as well as the oppressive social, cultural, and political ruling institutions which imposed alienating effects on them as individuals. Protagonists like Bloom and Stephen are therefore inevitably alienated and dislocated, by virtue of living in that city. These two characters are metaphoric and physical exiles- Stephen refuses to return to his father’s house and Bloom is avoiding his own house because of Molly’s tryst with Boylan. They are living in between many places and situations, displaying liminality in their lives and communicating a sense of non-belonging which is a form of liminal identity formation. The liminal situation of these two protagonists is embedded and reflected in the places they frequent or travel in Dublin: The Martello Tower, bars and cafes, hospital, newspaper office, and the brothel. These places and spaces are frequently referred to, and their alienating effects are everywhere reflected in the text also through other places. The Dublin of Ulysses is, furthermore, filled with physical spaces that represent liminality and its concomitant uncertainty. These places and spaces themselves may be seen as reflecting the isolated and/or alienated situation of the entire population, which represents Joyce’s vision of 1904 Dublin.

The narrative focuses on liminal features and landscapes in Dublin: there are countless doors, doorways, windows, and scenes of the seashore or riverbank. These are in addition to the presence of the Martello tower, a symbol of colonialism and would-be imperialism (built by the British in early 19th century to protect the city from Napoleonic invasions), with which the story of Ulysses opens. “Joyce writes as the native of a colonized country. His city is a deeply meaningful social space, permeated by relations of power and by competing ideologies and constructed by a multiplicity of social practices,” (65) as Hampson says. The Martello tower is located on the seashore and creates a literally liminal space, looking both into and out of Dublin, both in to land and out to sea. Moreover, the
public transportation system, roads, and streets of Dublin are of great significance because many of the encounters, events and protagonists’ time passes in these spaces as we will discuss in the following parts.

Embedded in the discussion of the alienation and urban spaces of *Ulysses* a separate issue, which almost inevitably arises, is worth noticing. Joyce’s descriptions and images of Dublin do not appear as depictions of an ideal modernized city. For instance, trams are relatively modern, but they are all “heavy” (*U* 90) and “slow” (*U* 90, 292) and there are several descriptions of old and dirty streets and buildings in the town that he calls “dear dirty Dublin” (*U* 183). We can take Joyce’s slow, “dirty”, and old in the literal sense as descriptions of an underdeveloped city. Accordingly, Lanigan and some other critics including Thacker and Gibbons believe that in some ways Dublin is an “inadequate subject for the task of representing urban modernity’ (Lanigan *James Joyce, Urban Planning* 38). However, there is no doubt that Joyce, all over his text, touches very subtly upon the modern urban features of Dublin, as well as the isolation and alienation of his characters alongside the isolation of Ireland and Dublin in Europe. Perhaps, as Thacker states, Joyce is concerned with “how far… the urban space of Dublin [is] capable of grasping the elation of rapid motion while remaining a colonial city” (116). This partial non-modern state of Joyce’s urban Dublin is somehow similar to what we will witness in Hedayat’s depiction of the City of Rey in *The Blind Owl*.

3.2 “Dear Dirty” Dublin’s Liminal Spaces

3.2.1 The Martello Tower

As we enter the life of characters in *Ulysses* we can identify places where they feel they are not at home. The story opens in the Martello Tower, an old edifice built during 1803-6, to defend Dublin against a possible Napoleonic invasion. Or, as Mulligan puts it to Haines, who does not know this, “Billy [William] Pitt had them built, when the French were on the sea”, continuing that Mulligan’s name for this tower is “the omphalos”, or navel of the world (*U* 20). The Martello Tower is located at a key point of the Dublin coast; it is not exactly within Dublin, being on
its margins, however, it is still part of the urban space of Dublin city. It is a solitary monument, looking both into and out of Dublin. Stephen Dedalus has rented a room in the tower where we understand he does not feel at home at all, especially since the time his friend Buck Mulligan (a medical student) brought a guest, Haines the English medical student, to stay with them. In the opening pages of the novel, while Mulligan and Stephen are speaking about Haines, we are made to understand Stephen’s dissatisfaction with Haines’ staying there. Mulligan quite boldly tells Stephen that Haines thinks Stephen is not a “gentleman” (U 3). Moreover, Haines has been talking about killing a panther the previous night and Stephen states that he does not wish to be “out here in the dark with a man I don't know raving and moaning to himself about shooting a black panther. You saved men from drowning. I'm not a hero, however. If he stays on here I am off” (U 3). This makes Stephen more alienated and exilic, as does Haines’s Englishness, for he and his native speech belong to the colonizing nation. Now they seem to be colonizing even Stephen’s domestic space. He nevertheless says “Let him stay. There’s nothing wrong with him except at night” (U 7). Stephen does not want to return to his father’s house and will not, now, stay at his own rented place either. He believes that he is not living a free life and laments “I am another now and yet the same. A servant too. A server of a servant” (U 12). Stephen’s sense of political isolation and his disbelief in conformism and compliance is observable in his attitude towards Haines as the colonial power’s representative. The presence of this Englishman in a tower named after a Corsican fort and placed there by the English to ward off the French is a mute comment on the historic and continuing strength of the colonizers in Ireland, for there is nothing at all Irish about the tower beyond its geographical location, which is liminal, as we have seen. The Martello Tower is circular, and a circle has no beginning and no end, thus creating a directionless space within, and it is within this circle that Stephen – a far more self-isolated and purposely alienated character than Bloom - has fixed his temporary abode.

Haines observes that the Martello Tower must be “rather bleak in wintertime” (20) and for Stephen in Dublin only “the cold domed room of the tower waits” (55). From outside, the tower is depicted as a dull and cold place, which actually reflects Stephen Dedalus’ mood. Since Stephen does not seem to feel at
home there and feels separated and isolated from its other inhabitants, he decides not to go back to the tower. Although it provides a way out of the city and looks towards the open sea, Stephen chooses to return into Dublin on June 16. The liminal position of the Martello Tower and the moving waves, “they are coming, waves. The whitemaned seahorses” (U 47) will not help Stephen. What he turns to is “houses of decay, mine, his and all” (U 49), as he takes the “rocky road to Dublin” (U 38). Although, later on, we understand that Stephen will not fit well into Dublin society either, he puts behind him the seashore-- whose dirtiness is described when he passes by, for it is full of trash (U 50), --- and moves towards Dublin. Both Stephen and the Martello tower are on the threshold of Dublin, they are signifiers of liminality, connoting both separation and/or incorporation.

The tower is a constructed space which is very old, with “heavy doors” which are set “ajar” by Haines (U 12), another form of simultaneous contradiction, being both strongly defended and yet opened by a representative of the colonizers. The tower is the liminal space where Stephen took refuge in Dublin, gradually isolating himself from the confining institutions. Both Stephen and the tower are located on the verge of the community of Dublin and the question “where” to go (U 10) from the “gloomy living room of the tower” (U 12) in the opening pages of *Ulysses* indicates the oscillating and transitory condition of both the tower and Stephen. However, the rented and bleak tower is a site for Stephen’s daydreaming and his unattached and alienated sensitivity in search of a new identity, beyond the restrictions caused by the conventions society imposes on him. The situation of the Martello Tower reflects Stephen’s own situation among Dubliners, in the sense that both of them are shown to be present and at the same time, aloof and detached from the city. Stephen leaves the Martello Tower and walks into Dublin, where he remains the critical intellectual wanderer in Dublin streets; a flaneur in a way. “I will not sleep here tonight. Home also I cannot go” (U 28). What makes Stephen’s point of view about the place more distinctive is Mulligan’s calling the tower the “omphalos” (U 20) or the central part, whereas, for Stephen the tower has become a dull and unpleasant place to which he will not return.

In the same way, Bloom does not return home and has forgotten the keys to his own place. He is also wandering in a Dublin whose anti-Semitism and perceived
hostility constantly remind him of his displacement and dislocation, both from his own household and from his dreams for a lost homeland that he calls “Bloomusalem”, (U 606). The unstable and liminal physical conditions of these two protagonists represent a striving to determine an identity, through a desire for an unreachable integration (in Bloom’s case) or through a typically alienated state of mind (in Stephen’s case). Both of these also, in a broader sense, refer to colonial Dublin’s/Ireland’s situation on the margins of Europe. What Joyce subtly does here is to embed this sense of alienation and non-belonging indirectly in the shape of his writing, via the physical settings of his novel. It opens on the margins of Dublin and in a symbolic colonial building. It is not just the place, but the liminal state that it owns reflects the sense of marginality of the city, its people, and introduces the alienating situation of home in the very text of the novel. The streets, doorways and windows of Dublin are all, also, liminal by definition; and these are the locations in which we find Bloom.

The notion of home is familiar and at the same time foreign to both Bloom and Stephen. Although these two characters have chosen forms of self-exile, this unfamiliarity has its roots in a sense of alienation from their immediate, actual environments. Part of this alienation and displacement resulted from breaking away from or out of institutions and conventions like family, church, nation or even literary rules. Bloom also experiences self-exile when he chooses not to go home during the day and avoids his wife’s afternoon tryst with Boylan. Besides, he reflects in some senses the image of the wandering Jew in Dublin; he is being bullied by some Dubliners, not only because he is a Jew but because he is a Jew in a Dublin which is struggling with establishing an independent identity, and thus, ostracizes anything that is foreign. Bloom is also on a transitory edge, between integration in and rejection by the society he lives in; however, while his own intentions to integrate are more numerous, the forces of alienation are more powerful: he is alienated by forces such as racism and nationalism, as shown in Chapter 12 “Cyclops”. In Ulysses, both these protagonists escape from the reality around them by taking refuge in their daydreams (Stephen’s of his mother’s ghost and Bloom’s of his father and son’s ghosts), which further cuts them off from their surroundings, as shown in Chapter 15 “Circe”. The notion of introspection in
daydreams will be elaborated upon in the following paragraphs while discussing the enclosed spaces of *Ulysses*.

### 3.2.2 Windows, Doors, and Doorways as Liminal Spaces in Dublin

Doors and windows as apertures of buildings can serve to reveal secluded parts of a house and its inhabitants, and the public world outside too. They look both inwards and outwards, and they are both etymologically and symbolically sites of the liminal. In *Ulysses* the windows of Dublin are depicted in various ways to convey different meanings. In Chapter 2, “Calypso”, when Bloom first appears in the narrative, he wanders past “parlour windows plastered with bills, plasters on a sore eye” (*U* 73), which could indicate that the windows are somehow afflicted by the sight of the Dublin life they look out upon, and it is best to block that view from sight. Later on, when there are images of funerals, poverty, stranded children begging for money, and miserable women in labor, the affliction and pains of the life in the city become more obvious. Through Bloom’s perceptions one can see that although a few of these windows are not transparent enough to see the other side, through another window one can “smell the gentle smoke of tea, fume of the pan, sizzling butter” (*U* 74). In these scenes the windows are depicted as a means of showing fragments of people’s normal daily and family lives. These windows foreshadow Bloom’s concerns with his problematic domestic life, while in his stream of consciousness the reader is informed (to a small extent) about the daily routines occurring on the other side of the windows. Therefore, Bloom appears to be a lonely and isolated figure on the outer side of the windows, and the liminal space between Bloom on the outside and the families on the inside is the site of his sense of alienation. Bloom’s social alienation here is revealed as his feelings of the “absence of interpersonal” (Schacht 157) relationships.

In another example of the liminality of windows, when Bloom passes by Saint Joseph’s National School, he observes ironically and with a bitter sense of humor: “windows open. Fresh air helps memory” (70). When Bloom hears students from outside the school window, “brat’s clamour. … Boys are they? Yes.” (*U* 70), he remembers his son who would have been in school if he had not died young. The liminality, in and out of the window, represents Bloom’s situation once again, and
his feelings of dissatisfaction and loneliness. He is both a father and not a father any more. He does not seem to have a warm family life or married, sexual relationship, [Molly also refers to their unexciting married life (U 925)]; and he is wandering in Dublin streets to avoid his wife’s tryst that afternoon, indicating that his married situation is liminal too – married to her but excluded from the physical comforts that she shares with others. Bloom has not enjoyed true closeness with Molly since the death of their newborn son eleven years ago, the son that Bloom imagines among the schoolchildren on the other side of the windows. Between Molly and Leopold Bloom there has been a “limitation to fertility” and “there remained a [sorely counted] period of 10 years, 5 months and 18 days during which carnal intercourse had been incomplete” (U 869). The sense of self-estrangement Bloom experiences is thus related to and perhaps rooted in his feelings of “estrangement from the ideal situation” (Johnson 790). These windows and the warmth, the light, and lively schoolchildren’s voices spilling out of them, so close and yet so unattainable to him, are among the many liminal spaces of the novel that represent and depict Bloom’s alienation and isolation, his sense of estrangement.

Bloom is further alienated from Molly on this day by the fact that she has received a letter from her lover, which he passed on to her: “a card to you. And a letter for you” (74), while his letter (that he picks up from the post office (U 88) in Chapter 4) is from a correspondent whom he has never met. Many of the events and noises Bloom sees and hears through windows can be a reminder of his alienation and isolation in his daily life. He feels lonely and isolated from his family and wife, mourns secretly for a lost son, grieves over his wife’s infidelity, and feels the hostility of other Dubliners such as the anti-Semitic remarks of the Citizen; descriptions of the windows and sounds coming out of school and other people’s houses remind him of his losses. While Bloom’s stream of consciousness is presented it is possible to say that the descriptions of these liminal spaces indicate inner conflicts and fragmentations that result from the solitary condition of the character, and reveal his social alienation and isolation. All these spaces indirectly but powerfully, through their very existence in the text reveal his sense of alienation; in other words, Bloom is not only depicted as an isolated and alienated
character, the mere idea of alienation is shaped through the spaces and places he moves in or passes by.

Stephen Dedalus’ perspective, on the other hand, reveals another angle of Dublin life appearing from inside the windows he passes by. Stephen in these scenes is shown as experiencing the sort of alienation known as isolation, which is attributed to individuals who “assign low values to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society” (Seeman 788). Stephen’s perspective is affected by his lonely and critical mind and moods, in addition to the sad fact that the Dedalus’ family life is crumbling. The Dedalus family depends economically on pawning their furniture; even Stephen’s books are put up for pawn: “I suppose all my books are gone” (U 312), he says. Unsurprisingly, Stephen has a jaundiced perspective of what he sees when, while walking along the Dublin streets, he peers into a pawnshop’s window and sees a

webbed window..., dust webbed the windows and the show trays. Dust darkened the toiling fingers with their vulture nails. Dust slept on dull coils of bronze and silver, lozenges of cinnabar, on rubies, leprous and wined ark stones. Born in the dark wormy earth, cold specks of fire, evil lights shining in the darkness. (310)

The webbed and dusty windows emitting an evil light reflect his own dissatisfaction with what is happening at home. Stephen’s description is full of words that reveal his miserable mood; adjectives like, dark, dusty, leprous and evil disclose his extreme dislike of his family’s economic conditions and his association of this with all of Dublin. Moreover, Stephen is saddened by the loss of his mother and dissatisfied with his father’s ill management of family life. Simon Dedalus, when asked by Dilly to give her some money for household food expenses, says “there is no-one in Dublin would lend me fourpence” (305), so it seems that Simon, has become economically alienated and isolated from his society. Meanwhile, Stephen has alienated and isolated himself from his family life for different reasons. Both Stephen and Bloom look on family life and other indoor scenes from the outside, through windows; both of their perceptions are strongly coloured by and revealed to readers through their awareness of their own liminal and isolated positions.

After his mother’s death Stephen’s home has grown even more miserable. In Chapter10 of Ulysses “Wandering Rocks”, we discover that Stephen’s younger
sister, Dilly Dedalus, has put almost the last remaining parts of their furnishing, the curtains, into an auction just to get money for the family’s food. Stephen feels heartbroken and devastated, “she is drowning. Agenbite. Save her. Agenbite. All against us…. Misery! Misery!” (U 313). Later on we read “Dilly Dedalus, listening by the curbstone, heard the beats of the bell, the cries of the auctioneer within. Four and nine. Those lovely curtains. Selling now at two guineas. Any advance on five shillings? Going for five shillings” (U 304). Stephen, symbolically because he has already left home, and Dilly are now deprived of the cozy curtains covering the windows of a family household; they are physically as well as emotionally exposed and the loss of the curtains represents the last layer of the shelter associated with home in the earlier part of their life when their mother was alive and they were in a better economic situation. Dilly is inside the broken house struggling to survive, whereas Stephen is detaching and isolating himself from the situation, making liminal places as well as his own liminality into his home, this being perhaps another way to survive. Stephen feels estranged from both inside and outside his home, in and out of the windows, even inside his rented tower. In sharp contrast to the Dedalus’ house, Stephen can see happy places, such as “Mr. Lewis Werner’s cheerful windows” (U 321). The Dedalus’ house could also be considered a liminal space, a domestic space associated with happier times as well as misery and lost happiness, now tending towards more misery. Stephen and Simon Dedalus are both Dublin wanderers, whereas little Dilly struggles to save the domestic space after the mother is gone. Most of the Dedalus family members are alienated characters in one way or another.

While they are walking through the urban spaces of Dublin, characters’ perspectives and viewpoints of liminal spaces like windows reflect their inner thoughts and concerns, as the examples given above have shown. In Ulysses, the alienated states of Stephen and Bloom are pointedly represented by them passing by windows and other liminal spaces. Stephen and Bloom’s senses of alienation are indicated by their perceptions of what is coming out of these liminal places, and what they are therefore excluded from. For the people who are living within those buildings, the window is the threshold that keeps their family life and personal territory safe on the inside; whereas, for Bloom and Stephen, the window is the
threshold behind which they have nothing pleasant and in front of which stretches
the impersonal public space of all of dirty Dublin. Bloom and Stephen, as well as
Simon and Dilly Dedalus are depicted as wandering, precarious characters in search
of happiness and acceptance (Bloom and Stephen), and money (Simon and Dilly).
This alienation, isolation, and loneliness of characters are embedded and shown
subtly in the spaces and places of their existence; and Joyce seems to have seeded
this sense of estrangement of the characters and the alienating effects of locations
in the very form he is employing in these scenes.

Another, similar liminal space around which many dialogues and events
happen in the novel is the doorway. There are various examples, from the first
chapter when the figure of the milk woman appears in the heavy but marginally
opened doorway of the Martello Tower to the mention of many other doorways in
Chapter 15, Nighttown, “Circe”, which could be interpreted as the liminal and
significant spaces in the life of marginal Dubliners (like the whores and the directors
of Nighttown) of the novel. There are over 30 examples of dialogues in such places,
and a direct mention of the doorway as the space of conversation. Some of the most
relevant examples will be examined here in more detail, while other examples
deserve a mention at least; however, time and space do not allow a complete
description of each example here.

The beginning of the first chapter of the novel includes conversations
between Stephen, Mulligan, and Haines that reveal the underlying conflict between
these three, and Stephen’s dissatisfaction with Haines’ staying as a guest, as also
with Mulligan who has deeply offended him; Mulligan refers to the death of
Stephen’s mother as “beastly dead” and Stephen overhears it and tells Mulligan he
heard that (U 8), and who he perceives as a “Usurper” (U 28). Keys to the tower,
which will later explain Stephen’s identification of Mulligan as a usurper and “mine
enemy” (U 252), feature in two of their three-way conversations, and are important
motifs of the paradox of doorways, that are both entrances and defenses against
intrusion. The first of these keys discussions occurs when Stephen and Mulligan
are on the flat top of the tower, by the gun-rest, and Mulligan has finished shaving.
Haines, from downstairs, asks for the keys to open the door of the balcony.
Stephen laid the shaving bowl on the locker. A tall figure rose from the hammock where it had been sitting, went to the doorway and pulled open the inner doors.

- Have you the key? a voice asked.

- Dedalus has it, Buck Mulligan said. Janey Mack, I'm choked. He howled without looking up from the fire:

- Kinch!

- It's in the lock, Stephen said, coming forward.

The key scraped round harshly twice and, when the heavy door had been set ajar, welcome light and bright air entered. Haines stood at the doorway, looking out. (12)

In this short conversation, Haines is dealing with keys and closed doors, and he is standing in by a doorway while he is asking for the keys and when he opens it to let the fresh air in. It is Haines who feels free to ask for the keys to open the doors and Stephen feels uneasy and dislocated in his own home (because of the unwanted guest of Mulligan); the place that he has rented and pays for but where the keys are not truly his. Haines seems to be unaware that he is speaking from a liminal space where he is not welcomed at all, the doorway, which can represent the liminality and the precariousness of the whole house for Stephen and for Haines; it is a house where the guest feels comfortable enough to stay while the host deems himself excluded and alienated. In this respect the tower represents Ireland, and the liminality of the colonized experience. Furthermore, not only is Stephen’s alienation reflected in the liminality of the locations he is associated with, but the liminality of the house is represented in Stephen’s sense of dislocation and non-belonging and the uncertainty and alienation that occur as a result.

The sense of liminality that is associated with all the alienation and estrangements of the novel is thus revealed in the first page of the novel and specifically in the places that the novel provides as settings. The very location of the Tower is liminal, as is the identity of Ireland as a colonized country, and all these things are ingrained in Stephen’s dissatisfaction and detached, alienated approach as well as in the social interstices in which Stephen feels unable whether to remain in or to transgress; actually, those interstices, home(s) he does not feel attached to, are thresholds that most poignantly reveal his isolation and alienation. Stephen feels a distance from his Irish friend as well when he calls Mulligan a
usurper. Mulligan asks for the keys to the Tower when Stephen wants to leave and also money for a drink. Although Mulligan says he pays “twelve quid” (U 20) for the rent to Stephen, it seems that he borrows money from Stephen constantly. Later on, Stephen mentions that he himself is paying the rent not Mulligan.

Stephen turned away.

- I'm going, Mulligan, he said.

- Give us that key, Kinch, Buck Mulligan said, to keep my chemise flat.

Stephen handed him the key. Buck Mulligan laid it across his heaped clothes.

- And twopence, he said, for a pint. Throw it there. (27)

A few lines further when Stephen has left the Tower we read: A voice, sweettoned and sustained, called to him from the sea. Turning the curve he waved his hand. It called again. A sleek brown head, a seal's, far out on the water, round. Usurper” (28). Stephen gives away the keys to Mulligan and Haines, and decides not to return to his home. The symbolic function of the keys in these scenes reflects Stephen’s sense of estrangement and alienation in and also from his surroundings.

Before moving to the other doorway example in the Martello Tower, it is worth mentioning that there are several examples of keys encoding in themselves images representing liminal conditions of the characters as well as their exilic social status and isolation. The keys as the means of opening, entering or closing the doors and passing doorways are ascribed to different images of alienation and liminality in the novel. In the penultimate chapter, “Ithaca” the two major characters are called “keyless couple” (U 779). Bloom invites Stephen to his home for a cup of tea, but when they arrive at his house, they realize that Bloom has forgotten his keys. Earlier that day we have seen Mulligan taking Stephen’s keys and then Stephen reveals in his stream of consciousness that he will not go back to that house again: “He has the key. I will not sleep there when this night comes” (U 55). In the same chapter, “Ithaca”, Bloom is referred to as the “keyless citizen” (U 818) this time. In Bloom’s conversations and the things that happen to him during the day there are many images of key. In the early pages of Chapter Four “Calypso”, when Bloom wants to leave home to go shopping for breakfast and to pick up his mail from the post office, he realizes that he has forgotten his keys. However, he does
not go upstairs to take them because of the “Creaky wardrobe. No use disturbing her. She turned over sleepily that time. He pulled the halldoor to after him very quietly, more, till the footleaf dropped gently over the threshold, a limp lid. Looked shut. All right till I come back anyhow” (U 67). Bloom does not close the door behind himself completely because he does not expect Molly to open the door for him when he returns. When Bloom comes back and gives Molly the letter from Boylan, he notices Molly’s tryst with Boylan the same afternoon. Later on he leaves home to go to Dignam’s funeral and realizes that he has forgotten the keys again; yet he does not go back to take them, “O, and I forgot that latchkey too. Bore this funeral affair. O well, poor fellow, it’s not his fault” (U 103).

The forgotten keys could denote Bloom’s alienation from and his isolation in his household and marital life. Molly does not expect him seemingly and he does not expect Molly to be there to open the doors for him. Later that night, when the two men reach Bloom’s house, they realize that Bloom has forgotten the key to his house, he needs to enter his own house from the kitchen window, like a burglar. Afterwards, Bloom opens the door and Stephen observes him “in the open space of the doorway [. . .] reappear[ing] without his hat, with his candle” (781). Bloom receives Stephen and shows him the way in, and his figuring in the doorway with a candle presents him like a surrogate father, welcoming the young man (perhaps the prodigal son) home, as a father may do. The physical threshold is again a liminal space in which a state or act of liminality that reflects alienation takes place, for Bloom is the owner of the house, not a burglar; and they are not father and son, however much Bloom yearns for his son and Stephen seeks a father figure; and it is not Stephen’s house although both, a proxy-family relationship and domestic shelter, are (temporarily) offered to him in this doorway. The uncertainty of the situation and the hesitation of the characters in this scene nevertheless reflect their sense of alienation from each other and from their own families.

One of the dominant images of the keys, although a play on names as Bloom himself mentions that, is the House of Keys ad that Bloom has been ordered to arrange a two-month print in the Freeman’s Journal. Gifford notes that House of Keys was “the lower house of the Parliament of the Isle of Man. The island was governed by the king or queen in council, the governor in council, and the House
of Keys; in other words, the island enjoyed (as Ireland did not) a qualified home rule” (131). The emblem of the House is the image of two crossed keys as Bloom describes it to the director in the newspaper office. “Two crossed keys here. A circle. Then here the name Alexander Keyes, tea, wine and spirit merchant” (U 153). The House of Keys ad here contains symbolic issues prevalent in the Dublin of Ulysses in those days, such as the struggle and conflict for home rule and independence; references to the wine and the tea merchant and prosperity go accompanied with independence supposedly. In the images associated with the House of Keys there are allusions to the economic and political difficulties of the individuals and Dublin/Ireland in general. The depiction and the references are weaved into the text of the novel through images of doors and keys, denoting the alienation of the characters and the places and spaces. The fact that Bloom’s job is to renew the ad and he has to go to different newspaper offices, as Mr. Keys wanted a one-month ad in the Telegraph too, is symbolic so far as to the point that Bloom is shown in different social connections, however, he is referred to as “keyless citizen” (U 818) later on.

As it appears later on in “Circe” Chapter 15, the keys and keyhole have a dominant presence in Bloom’s hallucinatory images and he is referred to as “keyless citizen” perhaps to symbolically refer to his powerlessness and isolation on a deeper level. As it will be discussed in the enclosed spaces of Dublin in the following section of this chapter, in Bloom’s hallucinatory dreams he is given the Dublin keys when he is chosen to rule Ireland and Bloomusalem (U 606). Another image through which Bloom’s sense of psychological alienation is encoded is the scene where he is watching Boylan and Molly having sex in the dream-like hallucinatory “Circe” Chapter. Boylan asks Bloom to watch him through the keyhole while he is having sex with Molly. Bloom submissively accepts, “Thank you, sir, I will, sir. May I bring two men chums to witness the deed and take a snapshot?” (U 670). Bloom is shown psychologically alienated (based on Horney’s theory of psychological alienation 252) in this scene, because he seems not to come to assert or encounter with his feelings while he knows Molly is visiting Boylan that afternoon. The keyhole is the liminal space through which this rather painful
experience of Bloom - even though it seems sexually releasing too, is reflected and embedded as an alienating situation in his life.

A further instance of the highlighting of the tower and its doorway as liminal places occurs while Haines is looking out of the window and he notices the approach of the old woman who sells milk (U 13). Her entrance is announced with these words: “the doorway was darkened by an entering form” (U 15). Then an important conversation about the Irish language occurs. Haines assumes that Irish people speak Irish/Gaelic in Ireland, while the old woman does not know any Gaelic (U 16). The importance of this encounter is examined thoroughly in the fourth chapter, when dealing with the relationship between language and alienation. The significance of this dialogue on the threshold is more powerfully revealed when the encoding of alienation within language(s) is discussed, in the next chapter of this thesis.

Many of the greetings of the Dubliners in Ulysses happen at doorways, while someone is passing by. For instance, while Bloom is on his way to the newspaper office, he notices Mr. O’Rourke and feels obliged to start a small conversation, even if it is just about Dignam’s death or the weather; thus,

> - Good day, Mr O’Rourke.
> - Good day to you.
> - Lovely weather, sir.
> - Tis all that. (69)

Or in another scene “Father Conmee began to walk along the North Strand road and was saluted by Mr William Gallagher who stood in the doorway of his shop” (283). Or the deaf waiter in the bar is shown standing or passing through doorways when he appears in the story, “Bald Pat in the doorway met tealess gold returning” (U 344), or “By deaf Pat in the doorway, straining ear, Bloom passed” (U 370). In cases like these it seems that greetings that are happening across doorways could represent a lack of genuine communication which remains on the surface and does not proceed to any specific depth; this kind of conversation indicates the alienation of the individuals from each other socially. The deafness of Pat is significant here,
since it affects communication, and renders it not as fruitful if there was a listener there and no deafness.

Doorways become more significant in terms of liminality when they appear in Chapter 15, “Circe”, in Nighttown, the red-light district of Dublin, which itself can be considered not only a liminal neighborhood but also an alienated one, because it remains on the interstices of social structures (both part of the community of Dublin and rejected by that wider community), and is at the same time a location alienated from the rest of Dublin, with respect to the discourse of those parts of town that consider themselves respectable.

Stephen’s incursion in this liminal space is, once more, associated with a linguistic alienation. Here, even more than in the rest of Bloom’s Dublin, almost all conversations and agreements take place on thresholds, in between the outside and the inside, in the prototypical liminal space. Additionally, however, when Stephen rushes into this neighborhood he is too drunk to even understand which language he is speaking, and he starts babbling in Latin. Furthermore, the bawd’s invitation from the threshold is phrased in terms that refer to bodily liminality: “(The famished snaggletusks of an elderly bawd protrude from a doorway)”, … (Her voice whispering huskily) Sst! Come here till I tell you. Maidenhead inside. Sst” (U 564 italics original). Whispering is neither full speech nor full silence, for only the unvoiced parts of words are fully uttered. In addition, her words “Maidenhead inside” remind us of the liminal spaces of the body, and present the sexual act as one that takes place in such a liminal space.

For the same reason as the red-light district can be considered liminal, so can its inhabitants be seen as alienated, for they are all socially marginalized (although not necessarily within their community). Their literary representation overtly identifies them as marginalized in a way that peculiarly places them between boundaries of definition, for as “dollwomen” they are uncomfortably dual beings, both nonhuman and human, childish and adult (dolls as well as women). The liminality of both their social and their material positions is marked by the text by them being invariably set within physically liminal places, that present them as potentially alienated individuals too: “Gaudy dollwomen loll in the lighted
Taking into consideration other aspects of their liminality and marginalization, the sex workers of this neighborhood, lingering in their doorways and at their windows are among the most alienated of the characters in this novel, not belonging to the city center but providing services for it, and depending upon the social and moral liminality of their situation for their livelihood. For “prostitution is sex outside of those relationships where sex is usually permitted” and it can only be understood in relation to the monogamous intimacy of marriage (Permanent Revolution, 15, emphasis added) that it temporarily mimics while declaring its outlawed distance from it. Sex workers are also Marx’s prime example of the alienation of workers, “[p]rostitution [being] only a specific expression of the general prostitution of the labourer” (Marx 99). In this example, Marx’s socio-economic elements are significant in causing alienation; self-estrangement and separation of the individuals, and the liminal status of the place they work/live in, as well as their economic dependence upon brothel keepers, reinforce as well as symbolize that alienation; except for the owner of the brothel, Mrs. Cohen, who sends her son to Oxford by the money she gains from her business (U 599).

Bloom’s behavior on encountering two prostitutes sitting in a doorway, waiting for customers, represents his confusion about how to treat this group. “(Zoe and Bloom reach the doorway where two sister whores are seated. They examine him curiously from under their pencilled brows and smile to his hasty bow. He trips awkwardly.)” (620). Bloom has not visited Nighttown for illegal sex; he is there to find Stephen to save him from companions he suggests to Stephen not to trust (714) while he is totally drunk; however, Bloom’s situation (sitting in a doorway) and clumsy behavior in that liminal space also indicate consciousness of his own marginality, for while other people are engaging in the sexual act on the other side of the doorway, he is hallucinating and unleashing his repressed sexual desires, as shown in his imagining Molly and Boylan together: “BLOOM: (His eyes wildly dilated, clasps himself) Show! Hide! Show! Plough her! More! Shoot!” (671). Furthermore, he thinks of his generational liminality, and how he is alienated even from his line of descendence as the son of a dead father and the father of a dead son. Additionally, he is caught between his desires and the conventional behavioral
patterns of his upbringing, when he finds himself unsure whether or not to enter the building:

Z O E: * (Her lucky hand instantly saving him) Hoopsa! Don’t fall upstairs.

B L O O M: The just man falls seven times. * (He stands aside at the threshold) After you is good manners.

Z O E: Ladies first, gentlemen after. * (She crosses the threshold. He hesitates. She turns and, holding out her hands, draws him over. He hops.*

(620)

Towards the end of Bloom and Stephen’s adventures in the brothel, the threshold/liminal space theme of the chapter is brought to a close with a last image of a doorway: “jammed in the doorway” (683), the sex workers witness the two men’s hasty exit. They are watching Bloom and Stephen run away from the brothel. In the brothel scene the uncertainty and in-between-ness of the location and of the individuals residing, working, and commuting there, are encoded in the idea of the place and the liminality of that space as standing on the interstices of Dublin society. That neighborhood and its liminal situation reflects the alienating effect that social norms have on individuals’ lives.

The constructed spaces of doors, doorways and windows appear in many other episodes of *Ulysses*, but the analyses presented above are sufficient to indicate the frequency and complexity of the textual encoding of liminality and alienation in this novel that is, famously, named after the archetypal home-seeking wanderer of all literature.

3.2.3 Riverside and Shores in Dublin

Dublin is located on the seashore, surrounded with many quays and bridges. Riversides, banks and shores are also liminal for they face two directions, one towards land, and one away from land. The lack of exact and solid borders between water and land that is represented by sea and river shores makes these places even more liminal than constructed thresholds. Because of its situation with respect to the sea and its river, Dublin itself is a liminal city. Furthermore, its economy, like that of many other seaports, seems heavily dependent on marine commerce and shipping, with goods and people coming and going between the city and places on
the other side of the sea. This liminal geographic and economic situation of the city may indicate difficult economic conditions of its inhabitants in the 1904 Dublin.

Dublin is, physically, partly surrounded by cliffs and rocks, with an opening to the sea. In *Ulysses*, references to this physical structure and location point to Dublin’s difficult condition of “underdevelopment, economic peripherality, and cultural trauma” (Nolan 102), as well as to its liminal situation in Europe. Dublin’s colonial situation enhanced its economic troubles. Ireland has businessmen and boatmen as its eyes, while the country is “full of rotten teeth and rotten guts. Living in a bog swamp, eating cheap food and the streets paved with dust, horse dung and consumptives’ spits” (*U*16). This piece could reflect the miserable economic situation in Ireland in the early twentieth century and when the events of the novel happen. In the same first chapter of *Ulysses*, we read “two men stood at the verge of the cliff, watching: businessman, boatman” (25). Many implications of economic difficulties in Dublin are reflected in the lives of the Dedalus family and the Dignams. For example, about Paddy Dignam’s funeral costs, Bloom wonders “where do they get the money?” (69), and later on there is a discussion between Bloom, Simon Dedalus, and Martin Cunningham (Dignam’s friends) about whether he had any insurance to support his family of five young children or not, which seemed Dignam did not have insurance (129). The Dedalus Family’s economic hardship is also mentioned when Dilly is looking for her father to ask for money and when she puts the house’s curtains or Stephen’s books on pawn (*U* 305,312,313).

The liminality of their city, geographically speaking at first, could be the cause of the alienation of some Dubliners who wish to leave the place to face a better situation, including Stephen, Bloom, and the Sailor. The Sailor could be the representative of a Dublin wanderer when he speaks about all his sea journeys and is described as one “who scarcely seemed to be a Dublin resident” (720). Besides, the dirty seashores could imply messy and unorganized management that exists in Dublin. We read in Stephen’s observations while walking by the seaside in the first chapter that

a porter-bottle stood up, stogged to its waist, in the caky sand dough. A sentinel: isle of dreadful thirst. Broken hoops on the shore: at the land a
Although it may appear far-fetched, this description of the scene on the seaside may well imply the disorder that hovers over the city in Dublin. In *Ulysses*, Dublin’s liminal economic situation seems to be dependent on Europe. The “Citizen” in Chapter 12 “Cyclops”, attacks and insults Bloom, verbally; “a wolf in sheep's clothing, says the citizen. That’s what he is. Virag from Hungary! Ahasuerus I call him. Cursed by God” (439). These words reveal the rejection of foreigners like Bloom, whom he rebukes for the bad economic conditions: “we want no more strangers in our house” he says (419), and he also expresses a desire for the well-being of Ireland:

our eyes are on Europe, says the citizen. We had our trade with Spain and the French and with the Flemings before those mongrels were pupped, Spanish ale in Galway, the wine bark on the wine dark waterway… our harbors that are empty will be full again, Queenstown, Kinsale, Galway, Blacksod Bay, Ventry in the kingdom of Kerry, Killybegs, the third largest harbor in the wide world with a fleet of masts of the Galway Lynches ad the Cavan O’Reillys and the O’Kennedy of Dublin when the earl of Desmond could make a treaty with the emperor Charles the Fifth himself. (425)

These nationalistic aspirations for the progressing of Ireland’s economy is mostly based on the hope that the Island would be open to other European countries. Notwithstanding all the potential of Dublin and the hope of help from Europe, Dublin’s colonial and liminal place in Europe causes some difficulties and economic hardship for its citizens in addition to the social alienation recurrent among them, and leads to their isolation and wandering.

For Stephen Dedalus the rented tower, Martello, located on Dublin Bay did not seem to offer any escape or survival. He left the tower early in the morning not to return that night. On the other side of the city, Leopold Bloom, wandering around Dublin streets, comes across an advertisement, which talks about “the model farm at Kinnereth on the lakeshore of Tiberias” (70). Tiberias is a town on the shore of a lake in what is now northeastern Israel. Bloom looks, further up, out of Dublin, towards faraway lands, daydreaming and musing about a land where he may find happiness and survival. Dublin and Bloom’s surrounding space have more than one
connotation for him, there are other layers to his sense of space and place. He is longing and daydreaming for other lands, where the Jews would be more welcomed.

Apart from Stephen and Bloom, another interesting example of a Dublin wanderer, and another alienated character, is the Sailor whom both Stephen and Bloom meet during their night of rambling. “The sailor, who scarcely seemed to be a Dublin resident” (U 720), seems, instead, to have a freedom of movement. This freedom of movement is inevitably a characteristic of liminal characters living in liminal spaces. This sailor, thus, can be an example of an alienated figure who after many sea journeys returns to Dublin society. Although the sailor has “circumnavigated” the world and seen many places, such as The Red Sea, China, North and South America, Stockholm, the Black Sea, the Dardanelles and Russia (U 720), he believes that “Dublin and its picturesque environs, even Poulaphouca, to which there was a steam tram, but also farther away from the madding crowd, in Wicklow, rightly termed the garden of Ireland, are an ideal neighborhood for elderly wheelmen” (U 724). The sailor believes that the picturesque Ireland could be a “radical change of venue after the grind of city life” (U 724). This is what might be the indication of his incorporation into Dublin society after many years of wandering around and seeing much of the world. He might also be an advocate of Parnell’s advice to every Irishman; that is (according to the sailor's report) to “stay in the land of your birth, work for Ireland, and live for Ireland. Ireland, Parnell said could not spare a single one of her sons” (U 742). Thus, the sailor who moves freely in and between Dublin and other places of the world seems to re-associate with Dublin after the years of alienation and isolation of the sea-life as well as witnessing city life around the world.

In an example in Chapter 17 in Ulysses “Ithaca”, in a question regarding Dublin’s city planning and development, one scheme is for developing the “Irish tourist traffic system in and around Dublin by means of petrolpropel led riverboats” and it seems a “scheme for the repristination of passenger and goods traffics over Irish waterways, when freed from weedbeds” (U 846). This scheme is the same as the one, which connects the Cattle Market …with the quays. In this part of Ulysses, there are some more implications about the necessity of some fixing and clearing up, for instance, of Dublin water ways, filled with weedbeds, in order to move on
towards a better harvest and as a result a more profitable economy. Continually, the seashore is a key liminal space in alienating or incorporating the city and its inhabitants into or out of the society and into or out of Europe. The riverside is significant in providing opportunities for Dubliners to trade with other European countries and to improve the economy of the colonial city of Dublin. These spaces are embedded and encoded in the text to convey the sheer idea of Dublin and Dubliners’ isolation and economic hardships; this alienating status is embodied, if not visualized in the spaces and locations on the shore and riversides.

3.2.4 Dublin’s Streets, Railway, and Tramline

Important Ulysses events or introspections take place in Dublin streets and inside trams. Although the actual physical spaces of “dear dirty Dublin” are largely presented as old, their liminality and in-between-ness do reflect a certain typically modernist sense of alienation, such as dislocation, displacement, and non-belonging. As Worpole notes, Bachelard held the view that there certainly is a “dynamic interplay between an active mind and its surrounding”, and the fact that Dublin streets are depicted as dirty and “paved with dust” (U 16), and that there is a “rocky road to Dublin” (38) are therefore among the novel’s indirect communications concerning some negative aspects or difficulty connected with the city. These dirty streets and that rocky road convey more than their literal meanings; they are features of the modern but old city at the heart of underdeveloped Ireland, which Joyce tries to depict. However, these old spaces, being places designed for physical access, communicate the isolation and, at least, the physical alienation, of the characters.

All the main characters in Dublin’s streets are walking in outwardly familiar places and spaces; however, there is a sensibility of isolation and alienation in their wanderings. For Bloom, some streets are still pleasing and amiable. One very important street for him is Eccles Street, where he lives at No. 7. For Bloom, Eccles Street, and in a way all of Dublin’s streets can be considered liminal and transitional. This liminality is related to Bloom’s longing for a “hurrying

---

homeward” (*U* 73), and at the same time his pleasure in leaving and avoiding his house and wandering around Dublin. Bloom’s sense of existential alienation is observable in his doubts and longings for another place to live. His desire to live in an imaginary promised land is an example of an “obstacle[s] to individuals’ ability to understand the world as their own” (Jaeggi 9-10). Bloom is wandering in the streets of Dublin, in between his home and the rest of Dublin, and he is, both mentally and physically, alienated and isolated. Thus, Eccles Street is a house but not a home, and Dublin is part of his country, but it is not the ideal home of his fantasies. It appears to be a powerfully liminal space for Bloom, representing his alienation and his possible incorporation into a household and family life.

Bloom’s job of doing “some canvassing for ads” (*U* 134), which refers to advertising that has been seen as a symbol of the modernization of the 1904 Dublin (Hayward 663), is also closely related to his wandering and moving freely in Dublin city. “The heart of Hibernian metropolis” (147) is Bloom’s transitional space; even so, while he is living in Dublin, he very frequently daydreams about his other homeland, Israel and about his dreamland, that he (in somewhat Joycean fashion) calls “Bloomusalem” (*U* 606). This daydreaming about another homeland, this mental inhabiting of another space, creates a sense of alienation and separation from his physical space of living. According to Foucault such parallel places are called heterotopias. He claims that

> there are . . ., probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places—places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias. (3-4)

In Foucault’s notion, heterotopias have two functions, they either “create a space of illusion” or they exist as “compensation” (Foucault 8). Bloom creates his heterotopias as both an illusionary space and a compensatory one, as one can claim, to escape the state of alienation he experiences in the social and external spaces in Dublin. For Bloom, Dublin and its streets are thus a liminal space lying between his fantasized sense of (be)longing to/for another homeland and another city, and his
real sense of alienation in his present location. Nonetheless, Bloom is shown to be more willingly associated with the places and spaces in Dublin than Stephen is; for Bloom, there are still some warm and pleasant streets, such as Eccles street where his house is located. This has its correlate in the Dublin of his emotions, for even though he is constantly daydreaming about other places and spaces, Bloom retains some ties and attachment to his frail and problematic family life and to the onetime love (Molly) he has in Dublin.

Bloom’s experience of heterotopia, his desire for another imaginary place, in addition to his freedom and ease of movement in Dublin and out of Dublin in his daydreams, may well reflect his social alienation (Schacht’s notion of lack of interpersonal relationships (157) fits Bloom’s sense of alienation) in Dublin, where some Dubliners like the “Citizen” state that they “want no more strangers” in their house and country (U 719-20). Bloom is still considered a converted Jew and a stranger in his hometown and far from “experiencing a crystallized totality” based on theories of social alienation (Fishman 6). “Is he a Jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a Swaddler or what the hell is he? Says Ned. Or who is he? … we don’t want him” (U 438). For Dubliners like the “Citizen” Bloom is a “perverted Jew” as Martin says when he describes Bloom (U 438) from somewhere in Hungary. In spite of all the seeming nets and borders- like him being considered a converted Jew and a foreigner from Hungary claiming to be an Irishman (U 430)- existing around Bloom’s identity, he can and will daydream about where he desires to live. The Bloomusalem in Bloom’s mind is constructed as a result of the liminality of his status and the alienation he feels in Dublin. He even visualizes the shape and details of Bloomusalem, as a space of illusion as well as a compensation for his present site of living, which will be discussed, in more details, in the following part about enclosed edifices.

The tramline and the train system in Dublin are depicted as very slow, old, noisy and heavy (U 90) and, due to Dublin’s many electric shortages, they are shown as “becalmed in short circuit” (U188). The novel is reflecting a regular experience of the Dublin of the day, for the city seemed not to own the necessary infrastructure for running such technology and therefore, as Gifford states, “power
failures in the tram system were not unusual before a central generating plant was built in Ringsend in 1906” (153). Lanigan (“Becalmed in Short”) states that:

The tram typified a massive shift in the sensory and spatial engagement of people with their cities consequent upon these changes. In Joyce’s works, the tram becomes more than a symbol of modernity, and more than an either joyous or alienating encounter with a new set of urban spatial relations. (34)

As Lanigan shows, the Dublin trams keep the Dubliners on a threshold, both in and out of community, and it thus acts as another liminal space. The tram separates people from the streets when they get on it, and at the same time, the tram moves through Dublin’s streets. As in Father Conmee’s journey in Chapter 10 “The Wandering Rocks”, as he is referred to as “the superior, the very reverend” John Conmee (U 280) the unknown narrator, he passes some streets and he thinks “it was a wonder that there was no tramline in such an important thoroughfare” (U 283). The scene when Father Conmee gets into the train and the mention of the ticket fare (four shillings, a sixpence and five pennies) denote the fact that trains were not convenient transportation means for poorer Dubliners and the tramlines would not pass through poor neighborhoods too.

On Newcomen bridge the very reverend John Conmee S. J. of saint Francis Xavier's church, upper Gardiner street, stepped on to an outward bound tram. Off an inward bound tram stepped the reverend Nicholas Dudley C. C. of saint Agatha's church, north William street, on to Newcomen bridge. At Newcomen bridge Father Conmee stepped into an outward bound tram for he disliked to traverse on foot the dingy way past Mud Island. (U 284)

The tram, in this example, not only separates people from the streets but it takes them away from the environments they live in, while also returning them to their homes, thus it creates a liminal space of vacillation between alienation and incorporation. There are no other examples of people in the trains, but just trains passing by slowly, noisily, and heavily. However, there are images and textual representations of liminality, marginality, and alienation in the scenes where tramlines pass or do no pass. For instance, in Chapter 15 “Circe”, which can be considered as the chapter occupying the most marginal and liminal space of the city, the Nighttown of Dublin, the narrator mentions that the tramline passes by the area and not through it. This is a direct reference to the political and ideological schemes
that lay behind the building of the tramline in a colonial city like Dublin. Lanigan records that it was mapped in order to prevent the tramline from passing through problematic or poor neighborhoods. Exclusion from the tramway system also, of course, rendered these places even more liminal and marginal in terms of access, as well as of status.

The trams were often too expensive for Dublin’s working classes to use, and their routes frequently skirted or avoided the areas of greatest poverty. . . . on the north side of the city, . . . trams ran on Talbot Street, Summerhill, and Sackville Street; that is, three sides of the red light district, but at no point through it. The tram system, then, was removed from areas of the city that were problematic, and also served to reduce the propensity for random encounters with the urban environment through which ideological views of the city as the locus of progress could be called into question. (Lanigan, “Becalmed in Short” 41)

This is a liminal space where Bloom and Stephen’s repressed desires are unleashed in a shape of hallucinatory dreams. A brothel, in Foucault’s terms, is a perfect example of heterotopia, which “exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory (perhaps that is the role that was played by those famous brothels of which we are now deprived)” (Foucault 9). The brothel frequenters, whether visitors or workers, are also liminal and alienated in that space. They are not part of the formally mapped space of the city life, however, they have their own life on the margins of the city. In Foucault’s heterotopias, as alternative spaces in relation to real places, “power is implied since heterotopia inverts and contests real sites” (Thacker 29); thus, it is possible to say that heterotopias are spaces of at least partial freedom and, as in the cases of Stephen, Bloom, and the brothel, they are examples of the spaces of resistance to the “dominant socio-spatiality, found in marginal places and locations” (Thacker 29).

3.3 Dublin’s Enclosed Edifices

In addition to the liminal spaces in *Ulysses*, which powerfully indicate a modern sense of alienation and a sense of not, or not fully, belonging to the spaces and locations of Dublin, there are many enclosed spaces in the novel that perform the same functions. The examination of places encoding alienation (and related states) in the novel now turns to the enclosed spaces of *Ulysses*, like its houses, hospitals, post offices, newspaper bureau and advertisement offices, and shops. It
will be shown that not only the protagonists but most of the characters in *Ulysses* are separated from enclosed spaces in Dublin, even though they commute to these places. Stephen Dedalus is alienated from and physically leaves his father’s house and his rented tower. He also feels isolated and detached from the school he teaches in during working hours. On the other side of Dublin, Leopold Bloom is similarly disconnected from his house and family life, although he has not left them permanently. Although he and his wife, Molly share the same house and bed, we understand that they have difficulty in communicating their emotions toward each other and at every level of their relationship they are alienated from each other.

In *The Poetics of Space*, Bachelard studies how enclosed sites like homes may provide the space, ignite the imagination, and prepare the mind for daydreaming, introspection, and self-analysis. In his analysis of space, Bachelard, as noted by Thacker, focuses upon spaces that “have been turned into places of pleasurable belonging, the transformation of house into home, where the rooms and corridors of the house articulate the topography of our intimate being” (Thacker 5). Furthermore, when a person feels isolated in a place, that person may start daydreaming and use that daydreaming, nevertheless, as an alternative space of refuge and living. Bachelard believes that “all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home” (Bachelard 5). John R. Stilgo in the introduction to this book also states that Bachelard’s purpose is to show that “the house is a nest for dreaming, a shelter for imagining” (viii). For Bachelard, a house is perceived as “place-world, a world of places” (Casey 291), and it is a place “where the exploration is not so much geometrical or architectural as imaginative or poetic” (Thacker 15). Thus, for Bachelard situated daydreaming has connotations for imagining, memories and inspirational moments because the imaginative part of the mind is close to the unconscious. Besides this, he argues that the mechanism for daydreaming comes into existence naturally when the subject is in a suitable space. According to Bachelard this happens as a process in which the imagination functions in this direction whenever the human being has found the slightest shelter: we shall see the imagination build “walls” of impalpable shadows, comfort itself with the illusion of protection-or, just the contrary, tremble behind thick walls, mistrust the staunchest ramparts. In short, in the most interminable of dialectics, the sheltered being gives perceptible
limits to his shelter. He experiences the house in its reality and in its virtuality, by means of thought and dreams. (5)

Thus, the necessary ingredients or components for a daydream are a shelter or any space functioning somehow like a nest, and a solitary person. In other words, an alienated person may use an enclosed space, whether it is a home or only slightly resembles one, for daydreaming and introspection either when he or she is comfortable in that space or on the contrary when she or he feels alienated and separated from that place. Similarly, daydreaming may well be used in comfortable places or as a retreat for an alienated person from his surroundings. For Bachelard, “the house is one of the greatest powers of integration for the thoughts, memories and dreams of mankind” (6). Many characters in Joyce’s Ulysses, such as Stephen, Dilly, and Simon Dedalus, and Leopold Bloom, are wandering and daydreaming outside of houses, though, and therefore Bachelard’s notion of the functional role of a house as a place for daydreaming underscores the alienation represented by characters who are daydreaming “out of place”, as it were, and whose daydreams are thus, in some ways, detached from the necessary surrounding and nurturing environments. The ‘unhomed’ characters of Ulysses, like Stephen and Bloom, who are nevertheless daydreaming, present a poignant contrast to these preconditions of Bachelard’s daydreamer, and in this way their alienation is all the more evident. They still daydream, but outside of the spaces, that (as Bachelard would claim) are normal, and nurturing and, in a way, protective of daydreamers.

In his book, Bachelard introduces his concept of “topoanalysis”, which he defines as the systematic psychological studying of the sites of our intimate lives. The house, the most intimate of all spaces, "protects the daydreamer" and therefore understanding the house is for Bachelard a way to understand the soul. In this way, the characters in Ulysses, reveal their souls and their senses of alienation or integration in the most intimate aspects of their lives when they daydream or talk about their homes.

Even outside of the domestic space, there are some strong images, like Bloom’s imaginary Bloomusalem, functioning and operating like heterotopias as a
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space of compensation, in each one of our imaginations. These “successfully separate the daydreamer[s] from the restless world, and give [them] an impression of domination at little cost” (Bachelard 173). This is what is applicable to the main characters in Ulysses; Bloom and Stephen frequently get distracted and fall into the daydreaming world, that is “the world of high solitude” (173). Thus, the enclosed spaces in Ulysses may well initiate the daydreaming and reveal part of the psychological and social alienation of the characters.

As mentioned in Bachelard’s theory of space, not only personal homes but any enclosed place that inspires the sense of home allows space for dreaming and introspection. Both Stephen and Bloom have their own series of daydreaming in Ulysses. It is partially because of their solitude and social alienation that these spaces, whether it is their homes, school, or a brothel, provide them with and shape daydreams, through which they distinctly reflect the alienation of their minds. Stephen Dedalus chooses an isolated and liminally positioned tower as an escape and residence. The tower could have embodied the notion of a home; but Stephen is deprived of having or he deprives himself of having this nest-like space. He deliberately, alienates himself not only from his father’s house, but also from the rented tower, as from the school he is working in. He chooses to alienate himself from every enclosed space that may give him the sense of a house. He chooses the physical and spatial isolation that appears to be what he feels in his mind and sensibility, while professing his “non-servium” ideology. Even though Stephen states he does not have any place to sleep in, he rejects Bloom’s offer of a place to stay overnight, for instance. Stephen needs spaces for introspection and self-analysis, but he alienates himself from suitable places and, specifically, from his living spaces. When he starts daydreaming about his artistic ambitions, the uncertainty and ambivalence in his ambitious ideals are what could be called his modern sensibility. Stephen does not feel the sense of belonging to the liminal and enclosed places he is living in. Or in other words, the liminal spaces he inhabits are depicted so as to convey his senses of non-belonging and alienation.

The enclosed places and edifices within this novel are, in fact, another way in which the places of Ulysses textually embody and encode the concept of alienation.
3.3.1 Bloom’s Enclosed Spaces in Dublin

Leopold Bloom observes the “blotchy brown brick houses” (73-4), while he walks in Dublin streets. He is the converted Jew, rejected at many levels in Dublin society, who is daydreaming about Bloomusalem all along the streets of Dublin. He imagines that he will establish Bloomusalem if Dublin is destroyed one day. This dreamland is, thus, what Bachelard calls an “oneiric house” (15). Bachelard declares that, “there exists for each one of us an oneiric house, a house of dream-memory, that is lost in the shadow of a beyond of the real past” (15). This oneiric space gives Bloom the “impression of domination at little cost” (Bachelard 173). This compensatory immense land, Bloomusalem, that Bloom daydreams about represents and depicts the depth and vastness of his sense of alienation and separation from the urban space he dwells in. Bloom’s alienation in Dublin has at least two levels or layers: at one level he feels social alienation due to a perceived rejection by the Dubliners that is based on his religious and racial background. In the other level he experiences emotional alienation from his old and rooted love for his wife, Molly Bloom. Thus, it is apparently an escape for Bloom to mix his desires for acceptance and intimacy with daydreams that construct an illusory or compensatory homeland for himself.

The creation and construction of “the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future” (U 606) in Bloom’s daydreams, with all the details of immensity of the place, could thus stand for the hugeness of his sense of isolation in Dublin. Besides, in Foucault’s theorization, Bloomusalem is a compensation heterotopia where its “role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled” (8). Bloom depicts this fantasy place as

a colossal edifice, with crystal roof, built in the shape of a huge pork kidney, containing forty thousand rooms. In the course of its extension several buildings and monuments are demolished. Government offices are temporarily transferred to railway sheds. Numerous houses are razed to the ground. The inhabitants are lodged in barrels and boxes, all marked in red with the letters: L.B. several paupers fall from a ladder. (606)

This daydreaming, as Bachelard also states, allows and creates another space. It is one in which Bloom feels that he is the dominant and most powerful figure, and all
the places and people that make him feel alienated in his experienced Dublin are now marginalized or re-enclosed in different spaces where they are no longer threatening to him. What Bloom has in mind is not so much a Promised Land, but a Promised Palace. It is significant that his memory-dream, in which he will no longer feel alienated and isolated, and which is formed by his needs for compensation, takes the form not of a country or city, but of an enclosed (sheltered), if enormous, place. This idea of daydreaming of other places is another typical sign of alienation and isolation in Bloom’s case. The depth of solitude in Bloom’s life is reflected in his isolation and alienation from the urban space he is wandering around. Thus, he has to dream about another place, a sheltered heterotopia in which he feels more at home and where he has marginalized or imprisoned (in boxes and barrels) all the elements that most cause his sense of alienation. In his daydream-created space he feels recognized and accepted. It is in this heterotopia of compensation that he is accepted and he is strong; he is attributed such power that he is given the keys to Dublin and becomes the ruler of the city (U 606); he is introduced to the people of the city as: “that's the famous Bloom now, the world's greatest reformer. Hats off!” (U 604), “he’s a man like Ireland wants” (U 606). Besides, it is in this heterotopia that Bloom feels strong enough to have “repudiated” his “former spouse” and tragically enough he has “bestowed” his “royal hand upon the princess Selene, the splendour of night” (U 605). It is only in this space of heterotopic compensation and strength that the Citizen who earlier in the day had degraded Bloom and insulted him, is now praising him as the reformer of Ireland: “Citizen: (Choked with emotion, brushes aside a tear in his emerald muffler) May the good God bless him!” (U 608-9). This heterotopia of compensation with all its details thus, through having created a complete opposite to what distresses him, embodies Bloom’s sense of social and psychological alienation and his isolation throughout the text.

3.3.2 Bloom’s House, Kitchen, and Bedroom

Another lonely space for Bloom is the enclosed space of his house, his kitchen, and more significantly his bedroom. He seems to create other places, i.e. heterotopias alongside his house, too. He has a secret correspondence, under a pen
name (Henry Flower), with some other woman. He creates a parallel space for love and his sexuality. He even starts masturbating at the Sandymount shore, while he is gazing at Gerty MacDowell. Furthermore, remembering Bachelard’s notion that enclosed and “inhabited” places ignite the daydreaming sense (5), the enclosed space of their bedroom reveals Molly Bloom’s depth of alienation and the desires she does talk about in the course of events in the novel. Her sexual desire and her frustration concerning her relationship, her son’s death and her daughter’s life in another city are all revealed in her interior monologue. She has that comfort to open up her mind and heart in her bedroom. The bedroom is the place in which she returns to her marriage and marital life. One may well claim that her soliloquy is a kind of daydreaming in which she reflects what is happening in her mind while she has been excluded from the dialogues and absent during Bloom’s wandering in Dublin. Then she brings to center the bedroom that was kept at the periphery all along the story and all along that day in *Ulysses*.

Both Bloom’s and Molly’s disorientation is reflected in their interior thinking and the soliloquies in which their sense of loneliness is emphasized. The physical space of their house and bedroom embodies their isolation and the emotional divorce they are experiencing. Molly’s soliloquy is a kind of self-analysis and introspection in many ways. She reviews her marital and social life of the past 16 years with Bloom. This is in addition to her mental analysis of her own feelings and complaints. She is oscillating between leaving and staying in her present status. This sense of oscillation makes her a more alienated figure. She is staying on the margins of the events of *Ulysses*, while she is one of the most referred to characters, as other characters, Boylan particularly, talk about her or ask Bloom about her upcoming concert, when she is absent.

The significant point about the Blooms’ bedroom and house is that almost all day long we hear about Molly, from an outside viewpoint; then finally Bloom and Molly come together in one edifice at the end of the day in *Ulysses*. Both of them are incorporated into family life when they are home and lie in their shared bed. Their alienation and isolation comes to the fore under their enclosed space. In addition to this, the final “yes” of Molly strongly indicates a resolution for the couple’s separation.
This section examined how psychological and social alienation are encoded through the literary and textual construction of places and spaces in *Ulysses*. As the many examples given above have illustrated, liminal and marginal places and spaces in *Ulysses* are found not all over the text. More than that, the novel itself is imbued in or creates its own complex of liminality wherein experiences, ideas and associations of alienation and isolation, experienced in and through both characters and locations, are shaped in and through the very form of the novel. In other words, it is not just a matter of the novel presenting alienated individuals or places, but that Joyce has embedded this sense of alienation in every detail of the places and spaces depicted in *Ulysses*, and (as will be shown in Chapter Four) within the very form and content of his language.

In other words, the previous section shows, how alienation is imbued in the artistic use of the urban and non-urban spaces by Joyce. In the following part, Sadeq Hedayat’s *The Blind Owl* will be studied in terms of its physically liminal and enclosed spaces that reflect the alienation of the mind and life of the protagonist of the story.

### 3.4 Urban Space and Landscape in *The Blind Owl*

The main focus of this part is to study and analyze how physical spaces and landscape are employed to reflect and represent alienation and isolation in *The Blind Owl* (1937); to specify how alienation is textually encoded in the form of the novel through the places and spaces, as has been done for the earlier novel. The protagonist of *The Blind Owl*, who remains nameless throughout the novel, is reflecting a deep sense of spatial alienation in his own descriptions of physical spaces, and through the spaces such as the garden, the cemetery, and the roads of the City of Rey he sees in his illusory dreams.

In this novel the City of Rey (that is in the non-fictional world a neighborhood to the South West of Tehran), the graveyard, the houses, and the protagonist’s house, room, walls, windows, and doors are all means through which the protagonist reflects his isolation and alienation; it is noticeable that in this novel the idea of alienation is encoded in all of these places and spaces and, as seen in
In *The Blind Owl*, the alienation and isolation of the protagonist, and his sense of detachment from the people around him, are encoded through his surrounding space, including walls, windows, doors, rooms, houses, streets, and roads, as well as graveyards and tombs. His surroundings act as a refuge for his isolation and they also provide him with an area in which to create and define an identity for himself. Accordingly, *The Blind Owl*’s protagonist seems to notice his deteriorating existence by recognizing his crumbling space, he perceives that he is surrounded by “ruins of ancient buildings constructed by massive bricks” (*BO* 30), “no trace of greenery” (*BO* 28), the river bed is dry, houses are depicted as empty and walls and windows give forth a “dim, sickly radiance” (*BO* 33). The descriptions he provides about his surroundings are fragmented, they reflect the social and psychological alienation and fragmentation of the character. He employs his surrounding space, specifically his room, as a place for daydreaming and introspection, as Bachelard states, and the world of his mind that is thus revealed is
the one that is falling apart, while he is describing the crumbling physical space around himself.

Abbas Milani states that “The Blind Owl [is] an example of a pendulum-like movement between independence and rejection, between liking and hatred of a world full of mean people” (215), the world of the rabble (rajjaleha) as Hedayat calls it in his letters to his friends. He believes that Hedayat’s point of view is a tragic worldview, which, we may note, is a fairly typical response of modernist artists to the experiences of modern life. Milani declares that

Hedayat’s essential epistemological pessimism is in an obvious contrast with the essential optimism of modernity and progress. His continual mourning and grievance over the accidental nature of life that is manifested in The Blind Owl as well as his personal life, his alienation from the daily routine life, his agony over the shortages of language’s capabilities to express and connect human relationships, his cynicism towards urban life and rationalism, his romantic depiction of reality, all and all prove his attachment to this tragic worldview. (216)

All that the artist protagonist of the story attempts to do is to give meaning to his “life of agony and pain” (Milani 219), and in order to achieve a sense of closure and meaning, he has to accept the “exilic and alienated life of an artist” (219). Milani also believes that for Hedayat “modernity, in spite of progressive effects, has not changed man’s life in a better way all the time, …, urban life, on the other hand, had caused misery and loneliness; …, people are in pain and agony in spite of modern progresses” (219). Therefore, whether Hedayat conveys an explicit kind of pessimistic view on modernity in The Blind Owl is not as clear as his purpose to show that the modernist artists are made out of the alienation they experience in modernity.

On the other hand, Dabashi claims that what was happening in Hedayat’s time, underneath Reza Shah’s era of modernization, created a time full of oppression and maltreatment, which is reflected in The Blind Owl. Dabashi believes that what Reza Shah was trying to do was to create a “delusional reality” in order to be able to perform his forced modernization in Iran. Dabashi claims, while producing “the finest modernist Persian work” in The Blind Owl, Hedayat
tapped into the farthest reaches of a collective terror at the heart of a people perpetually condemned to remember its past but never allowed to learn
what its future would be. Dwelling on the miasmatic delusions of a narrator lost in the phantasmagoric memories of a life that he may or may not have ever lived, Hedayat navigated through the collective subconscious of Iranians. The Blind Owl reads like the collective history of a culture unable to recognize what its senses and perceptions were telling it about the reality of its situation and trapped in a quagmire of narcotic delirium—all made of self-indulgent, self-pitying, vile, violent, and false memories of things that could or should have happened. ...There is a lyrical violence about Hedayat’s prose in The Blind Owl that would remain characteristic of Persian literary modernity throughout the twentieth century. (Iran: An Interrupted People 116-117)

What can be inferred from Dabashi’s interpretation of Hedayat’s attitude in his fiction is that The Blind Owl is a production of a time of oppression. Therefore, the individual’s reaction to the monarchic time could be to take refuge in the world of art, whether it is Hedayat or the protagonist in The Blind Owl, and to live a life of exile and alienation. The political powerlessness in such a political situation, the oppression and suppression as a result, will cause alienation and separation of the individuals from the society they live in.

Jahanbegloo states that “the exilic and alienated may be especially observed through the pages of The Blind Owl, where the narrator makes some very angry and scathing observations on most of the people who occupy the public space” (“Hedayat and the Experience of Modernity” 140). In the novel, the alienation and isolation of the place, the City of Rey (or, by implication, Iran) and the narrating character are reflected through the liminal and enclosed urban spaces of the City of Rey. The enclosed spaces, like the room in Hedayat’s story, and the houses and the tower in Joyce’s story, provide the sense of a shelter and a home, in which, the protagonists could daydream, introspect, and self-analyze their alienation and exile. On the other hand, the liminal spaces and places in this novel are also very significant in revealing the type and the depth of the alienation of the character.

In the following paragraphs, the enclosed and liminal spaces in The Blind Owl will be studied to see how they are presented in such a way as to represent the alienation of the protagonist. At the same time, where appropriate, some comparisons and contrasts will be drawn between these spaces and those of Ulysses that were mentioned earlier. The liminal spaces in The Blind Owl will be shown to represent the uncertainty and the fragmentation of the protagonist’s mind and his
sensitivity. Besides, the novel presents the enclosed spaces of the story as providing the protagonist with a chance and a space to daydream, and to carry out self-analysis and introspection. Alienation and isolation of the protagonist are here textually embedded and embodied in the places and spaces of the City of Rey and especially its liminal spaces and enclosed places.

3.5 Enclosed Spaces of the City of Rey

3.5.1 Walls, Room, House in *The Blind Owl*

“My life passed, and still passes, within the four walls of my room. All my life has passed within four walls” (*BO* 10).

In *The Blind Owl*, the walls are depicted among the most outstanding of alienating spatial features and they display part of the mind-set of the protagonist. The walls surrounding the narrator-protagonist’s room and his house, even the walls all around the City of Rey, are explained in such a way that it is difficult, at times, to make distinctions between actual physical walls and metaphoric walls. He appears to employ these walls to protect himself, to cover or hide himself within their enclosed space. Sometimes physical and metaphoric walls are merged in his fragmented narration. In the meantime, the walls, whether physical or mental, act to define a space reflecting psychological alienation as well as standing as defensive and protective barriers against the outside world. Actually, the narrator in *The Blind Owl* mentions the significance of walls in his life and repeats that he has passed and is passing his life within the four walls of his room. It is through these walls that the protagonist’s existential sense of alienation from his surrounding environment are reflected too. It is a sense of “psychological, perhaps even spiritual, kind of malaise” (Sayers 1), and the protagonist’s existential alienation originates from his inability to “understand the world as [his] own and to understand themselves as subjects that shape that world” (Jaeggi 9-10). The walls create a space of refuge (and alienation) for him from the outside world. The protagonist also employs these walls and the rooms they create, and his house in which these rooms exist, as a place for daydreaming and introspection. Thus, the ways in which the immediate place the protagonist lives in, i.e. his room, are depicted and mentioned in the novel are
among the most evident and memorable of ways in which this novel encodes his alienation and isolation, both physically and mentally, from the society he lives in and even from a sense of reality.

According to Bachelard, while enclosed spaces can create a space for the initiation of daydreaming and introspection, sometimes descriptions of the place can be representative of the mental constitution of the place’s inhabitants or of the dreamer him/herself. This complex interchangeability of exterior place with interior/mental space explains how the image that the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* provides of his room and the walls surrounding him can stand for, or indicate, his own mind—and this room closely resembles a cell and a tomb. He seems to be trapped within this room and walls, as well as being imprisoned within his body. The walls and his room seem to be a trap as well as a refuge for the protagonist of *The Blind Owl*, whereas, in *Ulysses*, there are almost always indications of lives going on behind the walls (the most significant possible exception lies in the last part of *Ulysses*, Molly’s monologue). Although people might be isolated from the outside society of Dublin, they do not seem to take refuge within the walls or to be incarcerated there.

*The Blind Owl*’s narrator appears to be very isolated and alienated, both socially and physically, especially when he recounts that he feels an urge to narrate his life story for his own shadow “which at this moment is stretched across the wall” (*BO* 7). It is owing to the reflection of his own shadow on the walls of his room that he creates a self and another being for whom the story is going to be narrated. He admits that he “broke the last ties which held [him] to the rest of mankind” (*BO* 7). Thus, in his detached and marginalized situation he only has a shadow and the four walls of his room to make himself known to and to communicate with. The walls and the shadow exist as an “other” which can create a uniform self for the fragmented self of the alienated narrator. In other words, only in the presence of another being the fragmented and alienated self can attain an identity for itself, however with the other being remaining only a shadow of the self, that alienation cannot be lessened. In descriptions of the cell-like room and the shadow on the wall as the audience, the idea of the extreme alienation and the overwhelming, indeed claustrophobic, presence of the alienation elements in the individual’s life are
encoded in the text to the extent that the whole situation and the whole space conveys the sense of estrangement and alienation.

In the setting of Hedayat’s story there are further pieces of spatial evidence, imbuing the places and spaces of the novel with the isolation and marginalization of the character. The Blind Owl’s protagonist tells his story in two different parts: the novel begins with the narration of the protagonist viewing a scene out of the ventilation-hole of his room: a young beautiful girl, standing under a cypress tree, offers a blue morning glory to an old man. Later on, apparently in a dream, the girl comes to the protagonist’s room, dies there and he has to mutilate the body and take it to the graveyard in a horrifying journey. At the end of the first part, the narrator falls asleep and when he wakes up, the second part of his story begins where he has turned into an old man. Then he starts telling the story of his wife/cousin and his mental and physical pain and finally the murder of the wife. Both parts of his narration happen in the same setting, the same house, on the margins of the City of Rey and on the ruins of the ancient City of Rey. In The Blind Owl the whole idea of the liminal and alienated situations of the City of Rey and the protagonist of the novel is encoded in the geographic location that Hedayat has chosen (as well as in the smaller parts of the City of Rey that are shown), for it is not just that the character or his life is filled with isolation and existential angst, the whole setting is formed to convey and reflect these emotions and this sense of alienation, being at the same time social, psychological, and existential.

The city and the houses depicted in The Blind Owl are actually perceived as old fashioned living spaces; “they are the sort of houses which one finds depicted only on the covers of ancient pen-cases” (BO 10). There is, further, not much indication of any social life happening outside his walls and his cell-like room. This being the case, the living space and artistic occupation of the protagonist (he is, in fact, an illustrator of pen-cases) are both marginal and obsolete, features that could be found only in ancient times. Thus, Hedayat does not seem to present the modern elements of urban life as the main force of alienation in his protagonist’s life in The Blind Owl. On the contrary, Hedayat seems to portray a philosophical alienation, thinks of the glorious, ruined and crumbled past, the ruins of a city they called “The Bride of the World” and the “greatest city” in the world (BO 44). The walls and
surroundings of the protagonist of *The Blind Owl*, as they are presented in the protagonist’s narrative show that they are used by him to contribute to his tendency and desire to enforce and keep the modern space away-at the margins- and to stay in his conventional, static, self-reflexive and useless world of art and imagination, as expressed in his comment that “everyone had gone out to the country. I had shut the window of my room in order to be able to concentrate on my painting” (12). This would sound like high aesthetic or artistic ideals if it was not for the fact that, as he informs readers, his ‘painting’ is the endless repetition of the same scene, in the same style, of the picture traditionally painted on old pen cases. The picture itself depicts the narrator’s most significant heterotopia that will be discussed later in this chapter.

The protagonist/narrator of *The Blind Owl* thus struggles to protect his identity and self through taking refuge within the four walls of his house, his room, and the walls within his mind. Walls function as a means of physical distancing at one level, along with revealing the character’s sense of mental and internal alienation at another and they contribute to his sense of existential alienation (Sayer 1) and self-estrangement (Johnson 790). This is especially noticeable when we compare this protagonist in his cell-like self-imposed room with Joyce’s protagonists who move away from the walls that had created living spaces for them. While Joyce’s isolated and alienated characters choose a state of wandering and physical exile in the streets of Dublin, Hedayat’s protagonist undertakes mental drifting to estrange himself from his non-ideal situation while remaining fixed within the confines of his physical and mental cell, rarely venturing physically outside. The walls separate him from not only his environment but from the people, around him and the idea of his inability to cope with his surrounding world (based on Jaeggi’s notion of existential alienation) is thus encoded in the place he inhabits. Hedayat’s protagonist calls the people in the outside world “the rabble,” disapprovingly. Thus, the walls function on both physical and metaphoric levels by separating the character from his space and from the people around him who he evidently does not wish to encounter.

The noticeable point about the role of walls in revealing the deep, multi-leveled alienation of the protagonist as in the fragmented description of the world
of *The Blind Owl* is that the metaphoric and physical walls are so merged that at times making a distinction between a true image and an imagined one becomes difficult and confusing as well. These confusing and fragmented images contribute to and reveal more of the character’s sense of alienation and claustrophobic fear (*BO* 15). Bachelard’s notion of intimate spaces of introspection are relevant to the walls around this protagonist for they provide him with an opportunity to daydream and to analyze himself and his surroundings. This analysis reflects his mind-set and his way of thinking. His introspections and alienation have caused his bitter and sharp point of view too. He seems to be in constant pain and conflict, suffering physical and mental pain at the same time, and this is partly the pain of the alienation he experiences in his conscious mind (alienation in its modern sense according to Jaeggi 10). He feels detached from his surrounding space, while actively seeking out that detachment, oscillating between his dream world and reality. He seems to be dislocated in the liminal zone between reality and imagination.

In some of the scenes that he describes reality and imagination are merged, creating a fragmented image. This fragmentation and confusion associated with it is more obvious in the first part of the novel, where the narrator protagonist is telling the story of when he wants to take a bottle of wine from the shelf on the wall and he happens to watch out of the ventilation-hole of his room and “on the open ground outside my room I saw a bent old man sitting at the foot of a cypress tree with a young girl—no, an angel from heaven—standing before him. She was leaning forward and with her right hand was offering him a blue flower of morning glory” (*BO* 12). He tells that he is haunted by the beauty of the girl and the peace of this scene. This is also the image he always has painted on the pen cases. Later on, while he also searches outside the house a lot, he cannot find either that aperture on the wall or the girl again, “but when I drew the curtain aside and looked into the closet I saw in front of me a wall as blank and dark as the darkness which has enshrouded my life. There was no trace of aperture or window. The rectangular opening had been filled in, had merged with the wall, as though it had never existed” (*BO* 15). This fusion of reality and imagination puts forth the alienation, at all levels, of the character’s world and mind.
One possible escape he can decide on is to “create from the resources of my mind a drug which would soothe my tortured spirit. I was taking refuge in the end in the motionless life of lines and forms” (24). The protagonist takes a traditional refuge in the realm of art and writing to escape from his physical and metaphoric alienation. In other words, the protagonist uses his art to create heterotopias of compensation, in the lines and forms of his painting and in the representation of his situation that he turns into writing (this is a little circular, because his writing is presented as a reflection of what he is doing outside of his writing, at least in many scenes, and the reader has no way of knowing how much is meant to be purely imaginary). With this heterotopia he expresses the angst of alienation he is feeling in his surrounding world. This narrating character, as we will observe, creates or visions another heterotopia, a space of illusionary stability and beauty (the peaceful garden). This, also, is somewhat self-reflexive for it is described as being visually the same as the garden in the pictures he paints, which are the same as the paintings on an old vase painted by other people before him. Therefore, as is obvious from Hedayat’s descriptions, his protagonist is mentally alienated, as well as isolated in his house and room. In Joyce’s Ulysses, as mentioned earlier, the characters’ alienation is depicted as more of a social than a thoroughly mental and internal one.

### 3.5.2 A Room Used as an Enclosed Alienation Fortress

The room where The Blind Owl’s protagonist spends most of his life and time is described as an isolated depressing place and the room he describes as a “threadbare, wretched, cheerless room which itself was like a tomb, in the darkness of the everlasting night which had enveloped me and which had penetrated the very fabric of the wall” (BO 22). It is even a tomb-like space in which life, within the four walls, is seen as a slow death and within “this fortress which I have erected around my life and thoughts, my life has been slowly wasting away like a candle… its walls are whitewashed and it has a frieze around it. It is exactly like a tomb” (43). This room also offers him an escape, keeping him away from the bustle of the city life and “the world of the rabble” (44) and it is a means for his chosen “self-estrangement” (Johnson 790). It is in this last function that it is at times difficult to distinguish between a physical or just a metaphoric space. This alienated and alienating room is depicted as “steadily shrinking and growing dark like the grave”
and at the same time, as the protagonist admits, this room “has been the tomb of my existence, the tomb of my mind” (57). This hopeless and separating room does not even lead out to a better world or city. His room opens into a “dark closet” (44). The novel encodes the extreme senses of loneliness, alienation, and nightmares through these ways of presenting the house and the room. Notwithstanding these grim aspects of the room, the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* voluntarily takes refuge in this enclosed place and starts analyzing and introspecting about his life and his dreams, constructing in the room and in his mind a space for a heterotopia of illusions to separate himself more from his surrounding world. This heterotopia reflects itself in the mirror hanged on the wall of his room. The mirror is referred to many times in the novel and it is through this recurrence that the protagonist’s sense of anomie and psychological alienation are encoded and reflected.

When the protagonist describes his room, he says “on the wall inside my room hangs a mirror in which I look at my face, and in my circumscribed existence that mirror is a more important thing than the world of the rabble-men which has nothing to do with me” (*BO* 44). The mirror in Foucault’s theorization of other spaces is both a utopia, because “it is a placeless place” (4) and also mirror is a heterotopia since it does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy. From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there. Starting from this gaze that is, as it were, directed toward me, from the ground of this virtual space that is on the other side of the glass, I come back toward myself; I begin again to direct my eyes toward myself and to reconstitute myself there where I am. The mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect: it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there (Foucault 4).

The protagonist is using the mirror in his room as a way to connect to his own surroundings after each of his dreams or hallucinatory visions. When the protagonist’s uncle comes to visit him, he recognizes a resemblance between his uncle and himself and states “he resembled me in a remote, comical way like a reflection in a distorting mirror” (*BO* 12). The image in the distorted mirror recurs again when the protagonist imagines himself to become old during the night he
takes the mutilated body of the ethereal girl to the graveyard in the first part of the novel or in the second part when he murders his wife. At his most disturbed mental moments when he is thinking of killing his wife, he looks at himself in the mirror and believes that he resembles the old man he considers his wife’s beloved, or the grave digger, or his father/uncle. “The old Koran-reader, the butcher, my wife—I saw all of them within me. They were reflected in me as in a mirror; the forms of all of them existed inside me but none of them belonged to me” (BO 89).

The image of the peaceful garden, cypress tree and a river, the girl offering a blue morning glory to the old bent man, and the image of the girl’s “Turkeman eyes” are recurring throughout the novel and in the dreams and nightmares of the protagonist as in a web of mirrors. He is astonished when he sees that what he had drawn of the ethereal girl’s eyes is exactly what he can see on the ancient vase he finds in the graveyard. He declares that those eyes are like a “magnetic mirror [that] drew [his] entire being towards it with inconceivable force” (BO 13) and about the pictures he states that there was no difference between his picture and that on the jar. “The one might have been the reflection of the other in a mirror. The two were identical and were, it seemed obvious, the work of one man, one ill-fated decorator of pen cases” (BO 34). This confusing multiplicity of events, scenes, pictures, and even people recur as the protagonist is seeing them or a reflection of them in the mirrors too. It is in this heterotopic status of the mirror that he “reconstitutes” himself and tries to connect with what is horridly unreal and to connect to his surrounding that is reflected in the mirror, otherwise, he states that: “I am afraid to look out of the window of my room or to look at myself in the mirror for everywhere I see my own shadow multiplied indefinitely” (BO 41). The mirror reflects and (de)actualizes the nightmarish images he sees in his dreams or delusional moments, which are very confusing and hard to distinct whether they actually happen or not, are revealing psychologically, especially because most of them are flashbacks to his childhood or the desire he seems to have repressed in relation to his wife and the hatred he feels because his wife avoids him and because he thinks she betrays him; however, her betrayal is not a certain thing in the novel because of the unreliability of the narrator.
The butcher’s shop located across from the protagonist’s window and the rituals of killing the sheep, brings the thought of murdering his wife to him. Then the protagonist looks at himself in the mirror on the wall:

I stood in front of the mirror and stared at my face. The reflection that I saw was unfamiliar to me. It was a weird, frightening image. My reflection had become stronger than my real self and I had become like an image in a mirror. I felt that I could not remain alone in the same room with my reflection (BO 73).

Through the images reflected in the mirror and his descriptions of them, the fragmentation of his mind and his existential alienation are presented. His lack of certainty that whether or not what is happening is real or even he himself is real or not, makes the mirrors stronger heterotopias because he struggles to reconstitute his real self and to connect with his surroundings via connecting with his real self he sees in the mirror. He even thinks of suicide and declares it in front of the mirror to himself in the mirror.

As I looked into the mirror I said to myself, ‘Your pain is so profound that it has settled in the depths of your eyes … and, if you weep, the tears will come from the very depths of your eyes or they will not come at all.’ Then I said, you are a fool. Why don’t you put an end to yourself here and now? What are you waiting for? What have you to hope for now? (BO 82-83).

The thought of suicide or the murder of his wife, when reflected in the heterotopia of the mirror becomes more of escape and absolutely real, these images are “real because they are connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there” (Foucault 4). In any case, the horrifying nightmarish experiences he expresses through the tomb-like space of his room and reflected in the mirror, spatially embody the extent to which he is alienated, both physically and existentially and how he feels “how frightful was the face that [he] saw” (BO 88).

Significantly enough, the death of the ethereal girl (BO 22), in the first part of the narration, and her being mutilated and being put in a suitcase (BO 26), to be taken to the graveyard, happen in the protagonist’s house and in his room. It is here that he tries to draw the eyes of the dead girl and create a drug, as he says, from the resources of his mind to sooth his “tortured spirit” (BO 24), it is the art of painting in his reclus shelter that makes him feel comfortable. However, he is still depressed
by his troubled mind and existence and believes that “the subject I had chosen, a
dead woman, had a curious affinity to my dead manner of painting. I had never been
anything else than a painter of dead bodies” (BO 24). As the protagonist states to
him “love and hatred were twins” (BO 97), and the love he feels toward the ethereal
girl, a love that aroused in him “a heat of passion like that which is kindled by the
mandrake root” (BO 13), shows its other extreme in the hatred for his wife. The
murder of the wife also happens in the house and in the bedroom (BO 98), where
the protagonist has been prevented to enter since their wedding night. The reader is
not sure whether these two events happened in reality in the enclosed space of the
room or just in the mind of the character; in any case, the isolation and the
separation of the setting, the house and the room, and the horror associated with the
mutilation of the dead body and the murder of the wife, encode in them the extreme
psychological alienation of the character and his distorted sense of existence. The
house, the room, and the protagonist’s mind remain closed and enclosed to a great
deal and even if we read about the horrible events they remain uncertain and in a
liminal state, between real and unreal, between, reality and imagination.

3.6 Liminal Spaces in the City of Rey

The City of Rey itself, as mentioned earlier, is a marginal place – i.e. marginal
to a larger metropolis, and located south of the bigger city, Tehran. There is a
remote mention of the capital city, Tehran, by referring to Mohammadiyye
Square, center of Tehran, in one dream of the protagonist (BO 64). The location
of the character’s house is “beyond the edge of the city in a quiet district far from
the noise and bustle of life. It is completely isolated and around it lie ruins” (10).
The ruins are, as mentioned in the novel, remains of the ancient City of Rey,
Rhages (BO 30), “an important city in Iran since the 8th century B.C. and
remained so till its destruction by Jengiz Khan in the 13th century A.D.” (Costello
27). Around and under the protagonist’s house there are ruins of the ancient City
of Rey. Within this already marginal place, the protagonist’s house is located in
an isolated location. He describes this location further as “only on the far side of
the gully one can see a number of squat mud-brick houses which mark the
extreme limit of the city. They must have been built by some fool or madman
heaven knows how long ago…They are the sort of houses which one finds depicted only on the covers of ancient pen-cases” (BO 10). And this quiet district provides for the house a courtyard, that is an important place for the narrator-protagonist’s imaginative and actual focus on the outside world. One of the room’s windows opens into the courtyard of the house and the reader is not told exactly whether there is a cypress tree there or not, however, the cypress tree appears in the paintings on the pen cases and in the protagonist’s imagination. The courtyard is, itself, enclosed, being walled and it is thus an extremely ambiguous place, being both an intrusion of nature into a city space and a piece of nature that has been intruded upon and enclosed by the city. It is furthermore one of the many places that is liminal in being on the threshold between the narrator’s material and imaginary worlds. Just as the walls of his house are sometimes real and sometimes metaphorical, so the garden (cypress tree and the river described in the image on the pen case and in his vision of the ethereal girl) is sometimes a confusion of real people and objects and sometimes a dream or memory or illusion.

The houses and its surrounding architecture described in The Blind Owl appear as uncanny and strange places. They are in some ways de-urbanized and are not presented in a modernist fashion. Dublin is also illustrated as an old-fashioned place in Ulysses. Furthermore, the City of Rey is portrayed as filled with strange, uncanny, and fragmented shapes of buildings. For instance, in many scenes the houses and windows are depicted as made of odd shapes and as if vacant, and buildings were shaped like pyramids, cubes, and prisms, with low, dark windows without panes. The windows were like the wild eyes of a man in a state of delirium. The walls of the houses appeared to possess the property of instilling intense cold into the heart of the passer-by. One felt that no living creature could ever have dwelt in those houses (28).

The houses are said to be located on ruins and to be empty of inhabitants, conveying the sense that no living being is around. This kind of depiction reveals not only the possible isolation of the physical space the narrator describes, but also the definite alienation the character feels in himself. He conveys his alienation and estrangement through the description of his detached space. He depicts a
fragmented image of a city full of uncanny and strange-shaped buildings, houses, windows, doors, and ruins. The protagonist sees the city as a small, depopulated, deteriorating, and crumbling space; while there is no sign of human life (and no reason given for this emptiness), the buildings themselves take on agency: “the sides of the road were lined with weird houses of individual geometrical shapes, with forlorn, black windows. The walls of the houses, like glow-worms, gave forth a dim, sickly radiance” (33). In this description, we see again how the narrator’s existential and psychological decay is reflected in the things he records, in fact it is embedded in the formal descriptions of the text itself. Alienation and isolation are embedded in the text at many levels, and the places described are one of the most important parts of the text to encode these states of being.

After awakening from a strange nightmare (the ethereal girl’s death and her being buried in the graveyard) the protagonist narrator remarks that

when I awoke in a new world everything that I found there was perfectly familiar and near me, so much so that I felt more at home in it than in my previous surroundings and manner of life, which, so it seemed to me, had been only the reflection of my real life. It was a different world but one in such perfect harmony with me that I felt as though I had returned to my natural surroundings. I had been born again in a world which was ancient but which at the same time was closer and more natural to me than the other (38).

In this scene, the protagonist is returning to or, perhaps, creating yet another heterotopic space, this time a compensation heterotopia lying somewhere between his illusions and his imagination. Here he feels in perfect harmony with his surroundings. The City of Rey seems to be a liminal space for the protagonist, in-between space for the protagonist; it is where he is living right now, but he does not feel that he belongs there and in fact he often escapes into other heterotopias, some of which are so similar to the one he describes as ‘real’ that it is hard to know which is which. That sense of uncertainty and ambivalence both arises from a state of alienation and non-belonging and is encoded through the novel’s ambiguous representations of its settings. In fact, the inability of any reader to pin down which places in the novel are ‘real’ parts of the narrator’s physical setting and which are imaginary or delusional is not only part of the liminality of the settings, but also effectively create a mise-en-abyme about place that reflects an existential mise-en
abye of extreme alienation from any certainty in the reality of a material world. Here we see Hedayat’s modernism seamlessly moving into postmodern questions.

3.6.1 Windows as Liminal Spaces

In *The Blind Owl*, the windows in the narrator’s room and in the city that he describes, do not appear to be the means of communication and/or an opening towards light and open space. The protagonist illustrates these windows opening into the rabble’s world and, somewhat contradictorily, as gloomy apertures overlooking a space in which no human being seems to be living. He describes the two windows—one facing the courtyard and the other facing the city and the butcher’s shop—in his room and what he perceives from that space, as follows:

Opening off my room is a dark closet. The room itself has two windows facing out onto the world of the rabble. One of them looks onto our own courtyard, the other onto the street, forming thereby a link between me and the City of Rey, the city which they call the ‘Bride of the World’, with its thousand-fold web of winding streets, its host of squat houses, its schools and its caravanserais. … These two windows are my links with the outside world, the world of the rabble (*BO* 44).

The notion of the psychological alienation of the character and his self-estrangement, his dissatisfaction with the society he lives in, is encoded all through his perceptions of the place he lives in. Isolation and separation is obvious from his description of the windows, as liminal spaces with one side facing the world of the rabble, and the other looking toward the isolated interior dark world of his room. What the self-alienated protagonist observes from his room’s windows is a despairing picture of the world. Besides, from his distant corner and the aperture available in his room, what he can see is a scene connoting death and violence: “the central feature of the city landscape as seen from my window is a wretched little butcher’s shop directly opposite our house” (44). If the butcher’s shop right outside his window stands for the over-sensitive protagonist’s experience of, or expectations of confronting the outside world, then his self-imposed incarceration becomes more understandable. If the windows show readers what he himself expects to see in life, then these windows embody his non-conforming beliefs and also his own “assigning [of] low value” (Seeman 788) to the values of the society.
associated with that outside world, the people he calls the rabble and thus imbue his social alienation and self-estrangement in this society.

These depictions of the liminality and two-sidedness of the windows in *The Blind Owl*, contribute to the ambiguity and uncertainty of the represented life of the protagonist. This uncertainty, confusion of reality and imagination, is a reflection of his own anguish and anxiety. Besides, this uncertainty and liminality convey much about the merging of illusion and reality in the life of *The Blind Owl*’s protagonist. The windows in *Ulysses* were encoded differently; here the protagonists were wandering around on the outside of buildings, and while the primary function of the windows was to display to the outside the lives on the other side of the windows, the overall meaning was to show the liminal position of the protagonists who passed by on the outside and who both belonged and did not belong to this society. Through windows Stephen and Milly Dedalus as well as Bloom could witness the family life they were in different ways deprived of. Some windows in *Ulysses* were “happy” and some emitted smell of cooking foods. In contrast, in *The Blind Owl* many of the windows mentioned by the text are seen from a distance and form part of a view of houses that the protagonist portrays as if vacant and threatening (*BO* 28). The social life of Dublin is portrayed in *Ulysses* as active and alive, while the Rey is depicted in *The Blind Owl* as if empty and uninhabited. Thus the sensibilities and awareness of the protagonists in each novel are encoded in their perspectives on their cities, and reflect the minds of these characters.

Although all of these main characters are, in one way or another, alienated and isolated, their senses of separation and alienation are different, and shown to be different by the different styles of their experiences of the places and spaces around them, as detailed in the novels. This is far more a matter of the focalizers’ (*Ulysses*) and narrator’s (*The Blind Owl*) different types of alienation colouring the perspectives revealed in the novel than of different cities existing in the material world, for both would be, in reality, populous places with active social lives taking place within them. What remains the same between the novels is that, both the different and the shared senses of alienation of these characters colour their focus,
and are encoded at the textual level through the marginality of locations and liminality of different places in the novels.

### 3.6.2 Streets as a Means of Alienation and a Liminal Space for Wandering

Streets and roads in *The Blind Owl* are depicted mostly as vacant and gloomy spaces, twisted and formed like a “thousand-fold web of winding streets” (*BO* 44). This is very different from the crowded and dirty Dublin streets filled with cars and old trains. The protagonist admits that he wants to run away from his misery and walks “aimlessly along the streets, wander[s] without set purpose” (*BO* 59). The streets in the story reveal more of his alienation and estrangement while he is walking through them, observing the “rabble-men” hurrying by. The streets are also liminal spaces, facing toward the society or the dark gloomy room/house of the protagonist. What he sees while walking in the streets, either of the architecture or of the people, is uncanny and despairing; again and still from an isolated and lonely point of view:

> I found myself walking along deserted streets lined with ash-grey houses of strange, geometrical shaped-cubes, prisms, cones-with low, dark windows. One felt that these windows were never opened, that the houses were untenanted, temporary structures and that no living creature could ever have dwelt in them (*BO* 60).

The streets which appear as vacant and unoccupied -which in fact it is not possible to know and it is difficult to decide whether they are actually empty or it is a reflection of the character’s mind- are the liminal spaces, where the character’s spatial alienation in the city is revealed. These streets in *The Blind Owl* are very much different from the crowded Dublin streets where people are having an active social life; the houses and streets of the City of Rey are de-urbanized and uninhabited; however, alienation is observable in both places and spaces, whether in Dublin or the City of Rey.

Important as liminal spaces that very evidently encode the protagonist’s alienation in this novel are the graveyard and the road to the graveyard. The protagonist passes the road from his house to the graveyard in the novel. The significance of the liminality of the road and the graveyard on the side of the road encodes the sense of dangling and uncertainty he lives in and the reality and non-
reality of people and events become even more emphasized in these road trips to the cemetery. In the first part of the story, the protagonist has to take the suitcase he has filled with the mutilated body of the girl to bury somewhere far from the city, “very far from the people’s eyes” (BO 26). The old odd man, standing outside the protagonist’s house, offers him his hearse to take him to the graveyard and says “I take dead bodies every day to Shah Abdo’l-Azim [A mosque and cemetery situated among the ruins of Rey, a few miles south of Teheran]” (BO 27). During his trip to the graveyard and back, the descriptions and perceptions of the protagonist of the road and the houses obviously come from a dark and fragmented part of his mental insecurity and isolation. While passing by the hills and streams, he sees a number of “weird, crouching, accursed trees” (BO 28) and strange-shaped houses are located among these trees. The houses and their walls, as the character says, appear to him “to possess the property of instilling cold into the heart of the passer-by” (BO 28). In all of these descriptions of the road the fear and the angst the protagonist feels is expressed through his perception of the space. After a while, they arrive in the cemetery, “the hearse stopped at the foot of a stony, arid hill on which there was no trace of greenery” (BO 28). Afterwards, as he passes the hill, on the other side, he finds “an isolated enclosure, peaceful and green. It was a place which I had never seen before and yet it looked familiar to me, as though it had always been present in some recess of my mind” (BO 28-29). The hearse driver also tells the protagonist that the place is so isolated that even birds do not fly over there. Then the old hearse driver offers to dig a grave beside the stream and the cypress tree, when they reach that point, the protagonist notices that the tree is dead and the bed river is dry. The significance of the graveyard in the narration of the protagonist is related to the symbolic presence of the mutilated body in the suitcase and the fact that he wants to bury it very far from the eyes of people.

The graveyard is acting like a heterotopia for the protagonist, where, based on Foucault’s theory of heterotopia, the cemetery is a space that is “connected with all the sites of the city, state or society or village, etc., since each individual, each family has relatives in the cemetery” (Foucault 5). He does not feel he belongs to the city or the house he lives in; in his imagination or perhaps in reality, he travels to the cemetery, through strange roads to bury a loved body which implies the extent
to which he is detached and alienated from his surroundings. According to Foucault, heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time. This situation shows us that the cemetery is indeed a highly heterotopic place since, for the individual, the cemetery begins with ..., the loss of life, and with this quasi-eternity in which her permanent lot is dissolution and disappearance. (6)

The psychological and existential angst and alienation of the character is embodied in the forsaken cemetery with dead trees, and dried river bed. When he has buried the body, he states that he “felt profoundly happy and reflected that those great eyes, when they awoke from the sleep of earth, would behold a place which was in harmony with their own nature and aspect (BO 30). The happiness he expresses and the harmony he talks about could also refer to his sense of belonging to the graveyard more than his attachment to his house or city. On the way back to the city, when he is lost he says that he does not care if he does not arrive anywhere at any place and while he is surrounded by sheer silence, he has the feeling that “all mankind had rejected me and I took refuge with inanimate things” (BO 31). When he comes across the hearse driver once again on his way back home, he narrates that: “I climbed onto the vehicle and stretched myself out in the sunken space where they put the coffins, resting my head against the high ledge so that I should be able to look out as we drove along” (BO 32). This place in the cart which is actually constructed for the coffins gives him the comfort of observing the road back to the city and once more he observes “the sides of the road were lined with weird houses of individual geometrical shapes, with forlorn, black windows” (BO 33). These houses and the road seem to belong to nowhere he knows. The liminality of the road and the graveyard encoded in the strange and non-traditional descriptions of the houses and roads, reveals the alienation and anomie of the narrator protagonist in making the graveyard a strange site of heterotopia, where reflections of existential and mental angst are embodied in odd places and spaces.

In the second part of the novel, when the narrator, seemingly, wakes up from his nightmarish experience of the trip to the graveyard to bury the mutilated body of the ethereal girl, he finds himself in a place more familiar, that is his present house, on the outskirts of the City of Rey (BO 40). He expresses the urge he feels
to write down what had happened to him for the shadow on the wall (BO 41). Then
he states that “at this very moment I doubt the existence of tangible, solid things, I
doubt clear, manifest truths” (BO 42) and in order to escape this confusion and
isolation he feels, he decides to leave the house, because “all the bonds which held
me to the world of living people have been broken the memories of the past take
shape before my eyes. Past, future, hour, day, month, year—these things are all the
same to me” (BO 43). This bewilderment and confusion he declares, puts him in a
liminal position, between reality and imagination, between past and present; at a
very difficult point of associating his existence with his surrounding, thus, he feels
he is a “crumbling, decomposing mass” (BO 58). It is among such mental and
existential angst that he makes up his mind to “go away, to go somewhere where
people would never find me again” (BO 59). All the images he expresses of his
loneliness and his decision to leave his house are reflecting the extreme lack of
interpersonal relationship and his anomie. He states that he walks “aimlessly” in the
streets to get away from his “own misery”, then he passes by the houses in deserted
streets, where windows seem dark even when the sun is high in the sky (BO 60). In
this walking along the streets the images and descriptions of the house and windows
perceived by the protagonist encode in themselves the detachment of the
protagonist from the real spaces around him. He walks such a long distance that he
finds himself at the gates of the city (BO 60). The whole city, and the roads leading
to the outside of the city are the thresholds which he has to pass in order to come
across or to cross his sense of isolation. When he reaches out of the city and close
to Suran river which is dry, he arrives “at the foot of a barren, stony hill” (BO 61).
It is in his escape out of the city to its margins and suburbs that he finds a “peaceful
and lonely spot” on the bank of Suran river (BO 61). After some peaceful moments
on the isolated spot he goes back to the city, yet again, the streets and the city make
him feel estranged and unattached and cause him to express the psychological
alienation he feels through descriptions of the scenes he perceives.

Mechanically, I took the direction that led to my own house. I saw nothing
and nobody in the street. It seemed to me that I was walking through a
strange, unknown city. Around me were weird isolated houses of
geometrical shapes, with forlorn, black windows. One felt that no creature
with the breath of life in it could ever have dwelt in them. (BO 64)
The protagonist feels at home in none of these urban and non-urban spaces in the City of Rey. From each possible perspective, he is still feeling that sense of estrangement, distance, and alienation. All the open areas and the streets are lined up and enclosed with “weird houses of geometrical shapes-prisms, cones, cubes-with low, dark windows and doors and walls overgrown with vines of morning glory” (74). His feeling and the status of not belonging and at the same time, him living in a despairing society reflect the alienation of the protagonist through the spaces and places presented in the novel. The notion of the psychological, existential, and social alienation of the protagonist is encoded in the text through the descriptions of the places and streets; words and phrases such as “deserted streets”, “ash-grey houses”, “dark windows” which textually convey this sense of alienation and isolation within the form of the novel.

3.7 Spatial Alienation in Ulysses and The Blind Owl

As demonstrated by the many definitions of alienation that were surveyed in the first chapter of this thesis, it is a very subjective and extensive feeling, state, situation and emotion: it is almost indefinable, and there are certain situations, notions, symbols and images, which may be used to reflect the often overlapping senses of alienation and isolation. One can say that the alienation of the protagonists of these novels is modern in the sense that it is represented by, caused by and also found in varying degrees of fragmentation of the mind, in the often fragmented consciousness of the characters and in their perplexity, in the ambiguity of their situation, and their liminal place in the space they are occupying. As we have seen, the urban and non-urban spaces and places in both Joyce’s Ulysses and Hedayat’s The Blind Owl are presented in such a way as to reflect the alienation of the characters with specific reference to a troubled experience of the modern situation in their physical spaces. Although, Dublin in Ulysses and the City of Rey in The Blind Owl are not depicted as modern and new places, but rather as old and ragged, the narrating protagonists have minds shaped by the experiences of the modern elements (in their rejection of older conventions and institutions, for instance). The idea of alienation and isolation of these characters is presented through images, symbols, and actual physical spaces. As was studied in the liminal and enclosed
spaces and buildings of both novels, there are certain similarities in the literary representations of alienation in both novels, as well as definite differences and distinctions. Their liminal spaces such as windows, doors, streets, roads, graveyards and riversides reflect the uncertainty, ambiguity, and sense of in-between-ness in both novels. This sense of non-fixity, flux, and not belonging is an all-important and causal factor in the alienation of the characters in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. This is in addition to the notion of non-belonging and fragmentation which resulted from liminality, which reflects the notion of their alienation existing alongside, or in painful proximity to, the security and familiarity that these characters have left or rejected, or which has rejected them. The main difference lies in the fact that alienation in *Ulysses* is mostly social, while the alienation of the unnamed protagonist of *The Blind Owl* is more of a mental and internal one, alongside his psychological alienation and physical isolation. One can claim that *The Blind Owl* focuses on mental alienation through which he also mentions social isolation, whereas *Ulysses* represents, in the first place, a social alienation through which he can devise a mental and psychological separation.

In *The Blind Owl* marginalization of traditional and old urban space is reflected through descriptions of the protagonist’s house, which is located in the City of Rey, on the edge of the capital city, Tehran. The protagonist employs his surrounding space to create a self, that is, to define a customized identity based on that space. In this way, what he depicts of his space is a description of crumbling traditional and old spaces, which reflect his isolated and deteriorating sense of selfhood. Crumbling and messy spaces are what we also observed in Joyce’s depiction of Ireland and Dublin as places which are, in design or age of the buildings, not new, even if they included such things as a telegraph office and a tram line. Dublin was depicted as a very old, untidy, and dirty place, and the main difference between it and Hedayat’s City of Rey is that Joyce’s Dublin is a living and active urban space, whereas, in *The Blind Owl*, the descriptions of urban spaces show mostly metaphorical rather than actual physical places. The protagonist of Hedayat’s story, much like Bloom and Stephen, seems to be living in his mind more than in the outside world; his is a constant world of imagination and daydreams, if
not just hallucination, and he also creates his spaces of illusion and compensation heterotopias.

The enclosed spaces depicted in these novels imply the notion of home and any space of the kind, according to Bachelard, may trigger daydreaming. People must feel separated from their surrounding environment in order to start daydreaming, and for the main characters of these novels that separation also involves a sense of alienation. Daydreaming seems to be an escape for the characters in *Ulysses*, for Bloom and Stephen, and for the protagonist in *The Blind Owl*. They appear to be uprooted and separated from their surrounding physical space, although they are present in the place. The two novels’ concepts of home are similar in one way, that is for the protagonists of the novels home is both familiar and foreign. While we are facing descriptions of home in these novels, the concept is separated from the reality of the characters’ lives to the extent of alienation. This sense of home, as both similar and familiar, is embodied in the text through the places and liminal spaces as well as the enclosed spaces from which the characters are deprived of or isolate themselves from.

What distinguishes the spatial alienation in both novels is the types of alienation that Joyce and Hedayat are trying to convey. Hedayat's alienation reflects itself, mostly, in the psychology and mind of the protagonist, while he is definitely physically isolated and alienated too. Joyce’s type of alienation, on the other hand, is multiplex and more predominantly a social alienation, where, although, there is an active social life in Dublin, the individuals lead alienated lives within an isolated city in a marginalized and colonized island. These people’s psychological alienation comes along with their historical, political, cultural and physical isolation and exilic states. Thus, it is possible to claim that Joyce projects his sense of alienation, and all the Dubliners' sense of estrangement in Stephen’s and Bloom's dislocation and loneliness in their hometown. Blades declares that Bloom's alienation is in fact the focus of the novel and “the central chapters of the novel emphasize this impression of his alienation amidst the teeming life of the city” (140). There is also, however, an argument to be made that it is Dublin’s alienation that dominates and pervades the novel; after all, Joyce had always intended to write about Dublin, “because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities of the world. In
the particular is contained the universal”. This chapter has shown that the representation of the physical spaces in and around the cities of *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* makes the novels as much about the city alienated within modern context of the setting of the novels as they are about the alienated characters that inhabit them.

In general, this chapter has shown that, when it comes to the notion of separation, mental alienation and liminality, the real-life places and biographical authors that lie (as it were) behind these novels, share many of the features and experiences of their fictional places and characters. The senses of separation, isolation, and alienation are embedded in the texts and are reflected in the explanations of the space, provided by the characters. Alienation of the characters and marginality of locations, are encoded and embodied through the places and spaces of Dublin and the City of Rey, rather than just through the themes or the isolated mental and social state of the protagonists.

---

4.1 Narrative Forms and Language Use

Having dealt with representations of alienation in the urban spaces in which *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*’s characters lived, this chapter is a study of how alienation is reflected and shown in the novels’ language use, via certain words and other linguistic and communicational tools such as conversations, dialects, foreign languages, and also silence. The unconventional and subversive narrative techniques that have become associated with modernism, other fragmented and ungrammatical formats and structures, and unusual representations of language are among the ways in which language and words can portray a sense of distance and alienation from their surroundings and from each other in the minds of these characters, in their communications and likewise in the acts of communication between narrators and implied readers. Both Joyce and Hedayat’s extensive experimental and liberal use of such innovative and flexible narrative styles as stream of consciousness and free indirect speech ended up in the creation of two hard-to-approach novels. *Ulysses* abounds in differing narrative styles and register, such as stream of consciousness, free indirect speech, and interior monologue, religious register, informal dialogue and newspaper reportage, among others; *The Blind Owl* exploits the complexities of a first person, mono-narrative style of free indirect speech with very few reported conversations and also makes extensive use of interior monologue.
In this chapter the aim is to show how alienation is encoded by and embedded in the language use, word choice, and narrative techniques in these two novels. That is how alienation is both reenacted and reflected through their language and narrative styles. This chapter starts with overviews of Joyce’s most significant literary characteristics, such as (among many others) his innovative narrative style and experimental use of language, and Hedayat’s avant-garde features are given in this chapter through a short account of Joyce’s and Hedayat’s dealings with language. Since much has been written and published about Joyce’s language, and, in contrast, very little has been written about Hedayat’s linguistic style, and since the reader of this thesis may not be familiar with the latter, these introductory and contextualizing comments are designed to serve as a reminder of Joyce’s language use and an introduction to Hedayat’s use of language. This basic information about the writers’ non-conforming use of language is essential for displaying how alienation is portrayed through words and language use in these two novels. Since the primary purpose of this chapter is to analyse how alienation is represented in words and styles within Joyce’s and Hedayat’s literary modernism, and not the contextual contributions of elements like colonialism, the colonized and colonizing elements of Joyce’s and Hedayat’s language will be referred to only occasionally and when related to the chapter’s main focus.

4.1.1 Ulysses’ Language of Alienation

James Joyce is notably famous for the myriad of styles his novels display and for an experimental employment of language, especially in *Ulysses* and later on in *Finnegans Wake*. *Ulysses*’ narrative style is not easily categorized; in other words, it consists of, among other things, a fluid movement from reported speech to interior monologues and stream of consciousness which all mix and merge, in and out of characters’ minds. Joyce applies a range of unconventional narrative styles in *Ulysses* to “pronounce,” as Kiberd states, his dissatisfaction with “previous writerly styles, offering pastiches of many, especially in the “Oxen of the Sun” chapter [Chapter 14]” (xxxvii). Moreover, it seems that the abundant use of interior monologues in *Ulysses* “permitted Joyce to contrast the richness of a man’s imaginative life with the poverty of his social intercourse” (xxxviii). This poverty
of social interaction and lack of genuine communication, and the ironies and misunderstandings reflected through language and words in the novel also refer to the alienating effects of language as well as to the alienation and estrangement of the characters in *Ulysses*. The alienating effects of language in a piece of modernist writing like *Ulysses* arise from the breakdown of the old notion of the “equitation between the structure of a language and the structure of a known world” (Kiberd xlv), or rather Joyce uses it to show how the fragmented structure of the known world can best be represented by a language that is fragmented in some way. In *Ulysses*, this breakdown culminates with Joyce’s abundant use of foreign words, perhaps to convey the “foreignness of all languages” in one way or another (xliii). In addition, the reader is provided with a great range of linguistic and stylistic diversity and this variety “presents us with an extraordinary proliferation of different languages, discourses, idioms and forms of defamiliarisation: … Processes of multilingualism and multiple defamiliarisation at times trouble the referential function of language to an extreme degree” (Taylor-Batty 116). Kiberd expresses the apparently alienating effects of language both from the character Stephen’s and from Joyce’s viewpoints, noting that in these novels “the estranged artist may wish to blame society for his loneliness, but most of all he blames language, failing to recognize …, that the alienation of language merely reflects a prior alienation of man” (xlvi-xlvii). Thus, Stephen Dedalus had mastered language, as presented in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, “only to find that he was talking to himself in the loneliness of a diary” (Kiberd xlix).

Representing fragmentations in time and sometimes in grammar and the structure of language in the process of communication, in addition to the defamiliarising effects it has on the reader, leads in *Ulysses* to the creation of an extremely complex text. The novel is hard for readers to follow, causing alienation and estrangement between the reader and the text, and showing alienation of the characters in the novel at the same time. In order to analyse how language creates these alienating effects and also represents alienation in *Ulysses*, this part of the chapter will focus on some unconventional formats and typography, such as the use of newspaper reporting, imitating various prose styles of different literary and historical eras in Chapter 14 “Oxen of the Sun” and in Chapter 7 “Aeolus”
journalistic style, question and answer format of Chapter 17 “Ithaca”, non-linear, isolating and inward looking narrative techniques such as stream of consciousness, interior monologues, and free indirect speech, use of foreign languages and dialects, as well as what characters have to say about languages. Moreover, the significance of silence and the linguistic silence of female characters and of Molly Bloom in particular, will be examined.

4.1.2 The Blind Owl’s Language of Alienation

Sadeq Hedayat’s free indirect speech and the non-linear temporal narrative style in The Blind Owl (1937) has made this novel complicated; thus difficult for many readers to follow. The narrator’s language is predominantly that of a literate person; however, he very frequently and noticeably uses forms (words) which in Persian language are considered vulgar, words like rajaleha (the rabble) and lakkateh (bitch, harlot). In fact, in his later writing Hedayat employed a greater range of linguistic styles and narrative techniques. He uses a realistic language that is very close to informal speech in short stories like “Morde Khorha” (1930) “Alaviyeh Khanoom” (1943) and “Haji Agha” (1945), and displays a mastery of the Persian folklore and colloquial language, which was very rarely used in Iranian literature before him. In other words, Hedayat took a fresh look at folklore and the vernacular, picked up the specific characteristics of conversational and slangy language, and renovated the language of Iranian literature by bringing this idiomatic and vernacular language to the world of printed literature. In his stories, this popular language mostly consists of irony, vulgar and obscene words, proverbs and curses, as well as the expression of many superstitious opinions, and it rendered the stories more realistic and substantial. For instance, Haji Agha, in the eponymous story, is introduced to the readers via a series of conversations he has with his family members and friends. In this religious satire, Hedayat portrays his hypocritical, stingy, opportunistic, and mean protagonist through this series of conversations (P. 4, 7, 11). In another story, when Hedayat is picturing the complaining and moaning of the widow of an unfaithful man, he uses very life-like language, a very avant-garde technique in the hitherto floral Farsi literature whose language was estranged from the popular language of ordinary people. A good example of this every-day,
non-ornate language is the widow’s complaint that her husband passed away and left her “with no support or backup in these dark freezing winter days, with a cattle of children, no money or food, no coal, no life” (“Mordeh Khorha” 60).

On the other hand, in his symbolic and surrealistic writings, such as *Buried Alive* (1930), *Three Drops of Blood* (1932), and *The Blind Owl* (1937) Hedayat mostly employs monotone narrative styles, with free indirect speech and interior monologues used to convey a vivid image of the isolation, estrangement, and alienation of the protagonists. As Khademi states, in this type of story Hedayat’s readers “encounter a single distinct style full of images, ironies and metaphors as vivid as what we see in *The Blind Owl*”. *The Blind Owl* is so densely populated with images and metaphors of Persian informal language that its language is very close to a new form of poetry—for instance, when the narrator describes the ethereal girl’s eyes (13) or when he describes his mental and physical condition after using opium.

It was then that I first beheld those frightening, magic eyes, those eyes which seemed to express a bitter reproach to mankind, with their look of anxiety and wonder, of menace and promise—and the current of my existence was drawn towards those shining eyes charged with manifold significance and sank into their depths. That magnetic mirror drew my entire being towards it with inconceivable force. They were slanting, Turkoman eyes of supernatural, intoxicating radiance which at once frightened and attracted, as though they had looked upon terrible, transcendental things which it was given to no one but her to see. (*The Blind Owl* 13)

The original Persian text from which the above quotation is translated is full of similes and metaphors, which have been simplified in English translation. Although it is very difficult to transmit the poetic qualities of such passages in translation, we may still note that the language and his way of using the daily language of people in a literary manner is far from the conventions of the written Farsi of Hedayat’s...
time. Although Hedayat’s use of words is simple, it is full of profound meanings and ironies achieved through vivid images and descriptive situations.

Hedayat’s descriptions of the characters’ mental states, the internal conditions of their minds, their daydreams, fears, anxieties, desperation, and isolation in *The Blind Owl* as well as in *Three Drops of Blood*, and *Buried Alive* are innovative and artistic. For instance, one of the significant strategies used in these stories is that the language and narrative style abound to an unusual degree with interior monologues and free indirect discourse, rather than the dialogues or the preaching and moralizing authorial commentary common in the literature of older times; this directly exposes to the readers the internal world of the minds of the characters. Besides, the narrators’ language is full of ironies and images which make the text connote various meanings while retaining an apparently simple language on the surface. These characteristics provide Hedayat’s texts with depth and eloquence at the same time. All the descriptions are realistic and replete with real people’s language and the culture of their daily life, making his stories rich and strong. In a sense, Hedayat is the first novelist writing in Persian/Farsi language, in Iran’s literary history, to depict individuals rather than types; looking at the outer public world through the eyes of individual characters, using specific features and characteristics of language use (among other things) to depict the individual’s point of view.

In *The Blind Owl* interior monologue and free indirect speech provide the main techniques of a narration that convey the alienation and isolation of the protagonist and his tendency toward anomie is embedded in the language he employs and in the way he recounts his life story. Through this non-linear, expressionist, and complicated technique the reader comes to know the idealist protagonist of the story, who is very pensive and secretive about the events of his life and very unhappy as a result. He takes refuge in his world of narration and his art, telling his painful story to his shadow, which resembles an owl, on the wall. In other words, he seeks to escape external worldly miseries and dwells almost entirely in his own mental tumult and darkness. In such a mind, he can find neither tranquility nor peace and he remains caught between the two suffering worlds of anxieties and perplexities, one outside, and one inside his mind. The protagonist’s
sense of alienation and the alienating world around him are explained by and through the story’s particular use of certain words and its narrative technique. The silence of the ethereal girl, wife-cousin of the narrator and its special significance in conveying alienation will also be examined in detail in this analysis.

### 4.1.3 Alienation in *Ulysses*’ Narrative Style

Virginia Woolf recorded in her diaries that T. S. Eliot thought *Ulysses* would become a “landmark” because it actually “destroyed the whole of the nineteenth century. It left Joyce himself with nothing to write another book on. It showed up the futility of all the English styles… But there was no ‘great conception’; that was not Joyce's intention.” (Diary entry, 26 Sep.1922). Joyce’s most unconventional and revolutionary use of language and various styles may well be found in the narration of Chapter 14 “The Oxen of the Sun” in *Ulysses*, where he is “deliberately breaching boundaries and highlighting cultural differences in a way that is subversive” (Sheehan 69). This subversive treatment of styles and high degree of experimentation with language led to the creation of a novel whose language was at first alienating for its readers, and then could be seen as representing the sense of alienation experienced by the Dublin characters in the novel, including Stephen Dedalus, Leopold and Molly Bloom. This is not to forget that all the existing intertextualities in the text also convey a sense of fragmentation, a breakdown of the conventional conception of one to one equation between words and their meanings. In other words, Joyce’s writing style and special use of words, as we will see in examples from the text, have alienating effects on the process of reading as well as themselves communicating alienation as a meaning within the text. What actually happens in this subversive process in *Ulysses*, Sheehan argues, is that:

The normal referencing of words to things is destabilized by citing other words, other verbal references, not in order to defer to an authority but to open up new possibilities for articulation. Any established, hierarchal boundary between language and the world dissolves into an intertextual, porous landscape peopled by references, quotations, echoes, parallels, and other contagious linkages. (14)

This undermining fragmentation in the process of the normative standards of novel writing indicates something more than Joyce’s exhibition of skillful composition,
however. It is also an indirect technique of characterization and of transmitting an essential theme of the novel, for it inherently conveys a sense of the alienation of the characters through (at one level) alienating, i.e. subversive methods of narration and (at another level) in the word choices and conversations of the narrators and characters.

4.2 Foreign Languages and Their Alienating Effects

One of the most significant and obvious ways in which language can be alienating is when foreign languages and words are used in a text or a conversation; thus, the listener or even the user might feel uncertain in deciding what to do about the language. In modernist literature according Taylor-Batty,

the very act of representing a polylingual world might be seen to induce a perspective on language that can be related to modernism’s “linguistic turn” because attempts to represent languages other than the primary language of the text inevitably draw attention to the problems of linguistic representation per se. (39)

This focus on the modernist linguistic turn, then, can be called a “multilingual turn” too. In modernists texts like *Ulysses* the use of different foreign words (and dialect terms, too), and the presence of various languages according to Yao, as noted by Taylor-Batty, “seems in large measure to have meant “Make it Foreign” (4) as a way of “Mak[ing] It New,” which was Pound’s mantra. This element of foreignness increases the defamiliarisation effects of texts, and this is exactly how alienation is encoded in the writing styles and the language/dialects used in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. In these two novels, we find the presence of many dialects or registers, and of foreign languages.

The issue of foreign languages, which in both novels are particularly related to religions, will be examined first in *Ulysses* because it is prioritized in the novel, its significance being indicated by the fact that the story almost opens with Mulligan’s Latin utterance. This is merely the first of many other foreign words and phrases in the novel —in Greek, Hebrew, French (*Zut! Nom de Dieu* (U 25) ‘Damn it! In the Name of God’ (Gifford 26), Italian (*maestro di color che sanno* (U 45), ‘Master of those that know,’ Gifford 45), German (*Uebermensch* (U 27), meaning
“superman” (Gifford 27), Welsh, Gaelic, Swedish (froken (U 53), ‘an unmarried woman’ (Gifford 55), Hindu (Upanishads 14), Middle English (Agenbite of inwit (U 18) meaning "remorse of conscience" (Gifford 22) —to name just very few of the numerous examples.

Buck Mulligan’s first sentence is spoken in Latin because he is parodying the priest’s arrival at the start of the Catholic mass: “STATELY, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead, bearing a bowl of lather in which a mirror and a razor lay crossed. A yellow dressing-gown, ungirdled, was sustained gently behind him by the mild morning air. He held the bowl aloft and intoned: -Introibo ad altare Dei” (U 1). The whole scene is a de-familiarization process of the Catholic mass ritual and Mulligan’s Latin phrase means “I will go up to God’s altar” (Gifford 13). Soon after this, Mulligan again draws attention to his knowledge of ancient languages by referring to Stephen’s Greek-sounding surname (Dedalus): “your absurd name, an ancient Greek!” (U 2). Mulligan also comments about his own surname’s Hebrew origins: Malachi, meaning “my messenger” (Gifford 14). Mulligan continues with more foreign words and phrases: “sea. Epi oinopa ponton. Ah, Dedalus, the Greeks. I must teach you. You must read them in the original. Thalatta! Thalatta!” (U 3). Then, when there is mention of the death of Stephen’s mother, in his stream of consciousness he recalls his recent dream about her, during which he saw “Her eyes on me to strike me down. Liliata rutilantium te confessorum turma circumdet: iubilantium te virginum chorus excipiat” (U 11). In English these Latin words are: "May the glittering throng of confessors, bright as lilies, gather about you. May the glorious choir of virgins receive you"(Gifford 19). Then again a few pages later Mulligan while preparing the eggs for breakfast, returns to his priestly parody and remarks “In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti” (U 13), which means “‘In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’; a formula of blessing and consecration” (Gifford 20). These are only a few of the numerous examples of the abundance of foreign languages and phrases in the opening pages of Ulysses, which keep many readers puzzling or hesitating

14 Homeric Greek: "upon the wine-dark sea."

15 The sea
over their meanings, or shock them by their unconventional appearance in this context, rendering the text itself unfamiliar and to that extent alienating the reader, and at the same time as revealing how, even within the utterances of individual nations, even within a single person, more than one language “speaks”, and how communication itself is fragmented in, by and through language.

Further on in the first chapter of *Ulysses*, “Telemachus”, the conversation about Gaelic openly represents the (social) alienation of the Irish from their homeland through their estrangement from the original language of their race. However, the relation of language and alienation in this case is complicated. In this scene, it will be remembered, an old woman comes to the Martello Tower to deliver milk. Haines, a British medical student, speaks to her in Irish Gaelic, but she does not understand it. Stephen who witnesses this conversation asks the old woman if she understood what Haines said:

– Is it French you are talking sir? The old woman said to Haines. Haines spoke to her again a longer speech, confidently.
- Irish, Buck Mulligan said. Is there Gaelic on you?
- I thought it was Irish, she said, by the sound of it. Are you from west sir?
- I am an Englishman, Haines answered.
- He’s English, Buck Mulligan said, and he thinks we ought to speak Irish in Ireland.
- Sure we ought to, the old woman said, and I’m ashamed I don’t speak the language myself. I’m told it’s a grand language by them that knows.
- Grand is no name for it, said Buck Mulligan. Wonderful entirely. (*U* 16)

In this conversation, which is significantly placed in the opening chapter of the novel, soon after the Latin phrases mentioned above, Haines assumes that Irish people should speak their indigenous tongue. In spite of having studied the Irish language he is estranged from his host community in being ignorant of what is happening with language issues in Britain and Ireland. On the other hand, the old woman, Stephen, and Mulligan are also, in different ways, alienated by language. Even though they seem comfortable with their (English) means of communication, they do not seem to know Irish at all (Mulligan’s comment about the language is
sheer bluff and bluster), and the variety of English they use is affected by the otherwise silenced Irish language, for their dialect of English is molded by an underlying Irish idiom. This is heard when Mulligan asks the old woman “Is there Gaelic on you?” Thus, the Irish English they use signifies both an alienation of these Irish people from their own language, and an alienation of the English language from itself, because there is no such structure in the Standard English language of grammar books. Moreover, the old woman’s remark that she feels ashamed that she does not know Gaelic and that she has been told it is a “grand language” unfolds another layer of alienation and isolation, which happens at the social, personal and linguistic levels. Here the relationship between language issues and alienation is not as straightforward as one might expect; in fact, a simple model of the colonialists’ language dominating that of the colonized is shown to have an obverse effect, where it is complicated in various ways.

Haines assumes that the Irish peasant should be speaking Gaelic, thus categorizing them as speakers of that language, which is to say that they are other than, different from, and thence alienated from, both the Irish English speakers of Ireland and the English speakers of England. At the same time, he is shown to be unaware of the fact that even the laboring Irish have been deprived of and alienated from Irish Gaelic for generations. His own social and intellectual alienation from his Irish environment is in this way illustrated, ironically, by the very fact that he, unlike his Irish interlocutors, can speak Irish. Furthermore, the English that is now the mother tongue of the colonized Irish people has itself diverged from Standard English, by the subtle interweaving of Irish idiom and accent into a local variety, and the English language has, in this way, been partly colonized by the disappearing Irish language, resulting in a variety of English that may be considered alienated from itself. A primary alienation may have occurred when the colonizer’s language took over from that earlier spoken by the colonized; thus causing alienation of people from each other’s communities, but the effects and implications of that primary event has resulted in a very complicated picture of how language may cause both alienation and integration of people from or in each other’s communities. The fact that these characters are socially alienated (absence of genuine interpersonal relationships) and are dissociated from the “norms, values, and cultures” of their
society (Schacht 157), is encoded in this scene and this sense of alienation is part of the form of the writing throughout the novel.

In Chapter 10 “The Wandering Rocks”, Stephen encounters his young sister Dilly in front of a pawnshop, and notices that she is holding a French book. “He took the coverless book from her hand, Chardenal’s French primer. What did you buy that for? He asked. To learn French? She nodded, reddening and closing tight her lips. Show no surprise. Quite natural” (312). Here it seems that learning a foreign language could offer an escape for Dilly. Besides, the French language could signify culture, freedom, education, and independence. Thus, it could help Dilly to distance herself from a miserable family and very bad economic conditions. Stephen analyses his sister’s face, thinking to himself: “My eyes they say she has. Do others see me so? Quick, far and daring. Shadow of my mind” (312). In this example, Dilly seeks independence and freedom in learning French and increasing her educational qualifications in order to widen her limited chances of finding a job suitable for a woman (Gifford 6). Unlike the men (Stephen teaches at a boys’ school where Latin in taught), Latin cannot help her in this quest. Dilly’s situation as a powerless individual results in a sense of “alienation and powerlessness” (Seeman’s phrase) that arises from the “discrepancy between” her “expectations for control” and her desire for control (Seeman 786), and this is shown by the text in this brief revelation of her desire to learn a foreign language; the episode also implies how knowing one language (Irish English), and perhaps being familiar to some extent with another (church Latin), but not knowing another foreign language (French) excludes her from a better job.

In yet another example, in a conversation with Molly at the beginning of the fourth chapter, an interesting foreign language estrangement process comes to the fore. Bloom asks about Molly’s program in her upcoming opera performance: “What are you singing? --La ci darem with J. C. Doyle, she said, and Love's old Sweet Song” (76). Then Bloom, who is aware of Molly’s rather elementary level of education, “wonder[s] if she pronounces that right: voglio” (77). A few minutes later, Molly asks Bloom to help her with the meaning of a word, which is used in academic English although not of English origin, and which she does not understand:
What does that mean?
He leaned downwards and read near her polished thumbnail.
-Metempsychosis?
-Yes. Who’s he when he’s at home?
-Metempsychosis, he said, frowning. It’s Greek: from the Greek. That means the transmigration of souls.
- O, rocks! She said. Tell us in plain words. (77)

This short conversation further denotes women’s awareness of the deficiencies of their education, and what Gifford called, the “limited horizons” of women’s education at that time in Ireland (he notes, for instance, that only 2.66% of students enrolled in colleges and universities in Ireland were women (6)). More specifically, these episodes in Ulysses show how this discriminatory educational system meant that very few of Dublin’s women had access to the terminology of philosophy, or to the ancient languages of scholarship: Greek and Latin. Besides, on a simpler level, language is, in this episode, again creating an alienating effect on the speakers themselves, because foreign words and phrases create an obstacle in communication between people who know them (and write them) and people who do not. Molly’s linguistic alienation from a language of men is further illustrated in her famous interior monologue in the closing chapter of Ulysses, during which she remembers one of her confessional visits to church, where the priest was praying and asking for things in Latin (U 875). Taken together, these scenes remind readers that women, even more than men, were alienated from their religion by virtue of the Latin that was used in Mass and in other church rituals. The whole idea of women as being more powerless in such an educationally and religiously moulded system, is encoded textually in thus representing the potential foreignness of language itself.

In Bloom and Molly’s conversations, other well-known language-related issues are also noticeable. For example, when Molly tells Bloom that “I.N.R.I.” and “I.H.S.” (U 100), initials on the back of the priest’s ceremonial garments, stand for “Iron nails ran in” and “I have sinned” or “I have suffered” show her complete
ignorance of both Latin and the religion that she professes. And the fact that Bloom also does not seem to know much Latin, except for some very common words repeated in church is also revealed in this example. Then, later in the same chapter, when there is a hymn sung in church, Bloom notices that it is English and comments “English. Throw them a bone” (U 102), — meaning that the clergy or liturgy is here somehow pacifying the laity (“them”) with a cheap offering of English, like keeping a dog quiet by throwing it a bone. These are some examples which indicate the scale of the issue: the sheer amount of Latin throughout the society and the book of *Ulysses*, and the sophistication with which the novel shows its both being an integral part of the life in Dublin, and at the same time, in Bloom’s and Molly’s and the novel’s perspective, an alien language.

4.2.1 Latin as the Alienating Language of Religion

The Latin distancing experience is repeated in some parts of Bloom’s stream of consciousness when he is passing by a church, witnessing a mass being performed in Latin, the priest murmuring in Latin all the time (99) “good idea the Latin. Stupefies them first. Hospice for the dying. They don’t seem to chew it; only swallow it down” (99) or a few hours later in the same day, at Dignam’s funeral, when Bloom, the narrator and free indirect speaker of this part, indicates that it “makes them feel more important to be prayed over in Latin. Requiem mass” (130). Bloom’s sense of social alienation from the church he has joined (he was raised a Protestant, and Latin is not required in the practices of that religion), and he being presented here as alienated from the religious norms and signs prevalent in the society are encoded in his distant comments on Latin. The idea of Latin as the ancient religious and authoritative language is embodied and mentioned in simple events and comments. Latin as a foreign language presented in prayers, funerals, and also related to the higher education reflects the alienating effect an imposed language may have on people’s lives. Joyce seems to be aware of the national and religious colonizers’ influential roles in this process. For instance, in headlines that

16 “I.N.R.I.” stand for the Latin phrase pinned onto the cross that Jesus was crucified on “King of the Jews (Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum)” (Gifford 94). “I.H.S.” is the Latin form of the Greek letters that are the first three letters of the name “Jesus’ and are variously interpreted as *Jesus Hominum Salvacor* (Jesus the Savior of Man) and *In Hoc Signo-Vinces* (In This Sign Thou Shalt Conquer)” (Gifford 94).
mock the journalistic style in Chapter 7 “Aeolus”, “LOST CAUSES NOBLE MARQUESS MENTIONED” we read that

we were always loyal to lost causes, the professor said. Success for us is the death of the intellect and of the imagination. We were never loyal to the successful. We serve them. I teach the blatant Latin language. I speak the tongue of a race the acme of whose mentality is the maxim: time is money. Material domination. Domimus! Lord! Where is the spirituality? Lord Jesus! Lord Salisbury. A sofa in a Westend club. But the Greek! (169)

This quotation reveals a prevalent contempt for what it could be called the colonizing, disintegrating, and alienating effects of a dominant religious and educational academic language. Yet in some other examples such as the confession scene below, from Chapter 11 “Sirens”, Latin and its domineering role in Catholicism is alluded to, presenting another instance of the alienating effect it has on the characters’ lives in Ulysses’ Dublin.

The voice of penance and of grief came slow, embellished, tremulous. Ben's contrite beard confessed: in nomine Domini, in God's name. He knelt. He beat his hand upon his breast, confessing: mea culpa. Latin again. That holds them like birdlime. Priest with the communion corpus for those women. Chap in the mortuary, coffin or coffey, corporsum nomine. Wonder where that rat is by now. Scrape. (366)

In this scene, the expression “I am guilty” is said in Latin, as the congregation would have said it in the Latin mass, here it perhaps also acts to de-familiarize the otherwise expected language, and even to create a distance between the speaker and the listener; to exclude and alienate the non-educated and non-Catholic or non-Christian reader from the immediate accessibility of meaning in English.

These samples from Ulysses have illustrated how the use of a foreign language can both encode within and impose upon a text an alienating effect, and thereby both show and create the distances existing between characters and their society in the story, and between the text and the reader at that interface, making the text hard and challenging to approach. Ulysses displays abundant uses of foreign words and phrases from various origins such as Latin, Greek, Gaelic, German, French, and Swedish. This alienating effect is embedded in the narrative style of
the novel, making them multilayered and complex, and at the same time very rich and unique.

4.3 Unconventional and Non-Grammatical Uses of Language

4.3.1 Alienating Narrative Style in *Ulysses*

There are various examples of unconventional and nonstandard language use displayed in *Ulysses*. This nonconformist language use contributes to an outstanding difference, on the textual level, between *Ulysses* and other contemporary works of literature. Besides, it creates an alienating impact in the text’s confrontation with the readers as they encounter it, in a fashion similar to the difficulties mentioned with respect to the use of foreign language expressions. Some very well-known and explicit examples of unconventional and nonstandard language can be found in the following places: in Chapter 7 “Aeolus”, where a journalistic style is used in the narrative; in Chapter 12 “Cyclops”, where a parody of various writing styles is found; in Chapter 14 “Oxen of the Sun”, where there is an imitation of different prose texts in English literary history; in Chapter 15 “Circe”, where the narrative is similar to a film script; and throughout Chapter 17 “Ithaca”, the whole chapter being composed of 309 questions and answers. In the following paragraphs some examples from these chapters will be referred to, selected from among the many more examples to be found in the novel.

Chapter 7 “Aeolus”, as its Homeric tag indicates, is about the importance of wind, as well as being about keeping secrets, and it is a mockery of victory. As Gifford mentions, this chapter is very famously concerned with the art of rhetoric and various language games. The setting of this chapter is The Freeman’s Journal Office, and the chapter starts in a journalistic style, presenting a newspaper-like headline printed in capital letter format: “IN THE HEART OF THE HIBERNIAN METROPOLIS” (147). Then there is a description of a scene at Nelson’s Pillar, a central location from where most of the trams departed to different destinations in Dublin. A descriptive passage starts with the exterior of a newspaper’s office, the central tram station, and then moves to “THE WEARER OF THE CROWN” (147), a report on a statue located in front of the office. The narrative then moves inside
the office, with a headline saying, “THE GENTLEMEN OF THE PRESS” (148). The Aeolus episode of Ulysses is an outstanding example of the novel’s unique composition style, where a daily routine act of Bloom’s visiting the newspaper office is highlighted in a written report of using journalistic headlines as if on a newspaper page. This opening and the use of newspaper language and style produces some degree of an estrangement effect on the readers of the text, whose expectations of a more conventionally novelistic writing style are once more flouted, to be replaced with a no less conventional, but non-novelistic style of writing. This time the words are in the “same” language as the matrix text (English), but the register is so unexpected that it once more draws the attention of the readers away from the content of the narrative and onto the more abstract, formal level of language. The narrative style used in introducing the characters and events in this chapter is an innovative modernist method which is actually experimental and a kind of “anti-representationalism” (Child 22). The estrangement effect that arises from this anti-representation and de-familiarizing form of communication disturbs the conventional perception of the reader and as a result the alienating effects of newspaper language do not need to be explained or described, because they reveal themselves in the very form of the text as it is experienced by readers.

A very intriguing way of character presentation appears in this chapter when, for instance, Bloom is displayed in his professional role, in the headline “WE SEE THE CANVESSAR AT WORK” (152). He is in the offices of the Freemans Journal to order an advertisement; while he is in a conversation with Mr. Nannetti, an agent in the newspaper’s office, the reader is shown Bloom’s thoughts as they are streaming in his consciousness. Within a newspaper short report structure, and in a mixture of dialogue and interior thoughts, the reader faces a piece of Bloom’s daily activity. This replaces any more conventional reporting or description. It seems that each specific headline has been given a language related to its own subject, and thus, as the narrator also mentions, “everything speaks in its own” (154)—even a creaking door is personified in asking to be shut (154). Bloom is shown as a discreet advertisement man who is making his point indirectly but carefully. “Better not teach him his own business. -You know yourself, councillor, just what he wants. Then round the top in leaded: the house of keys. You see? Do
you think that's a good idea?” (153). In this scene, Bloom is shown as persistent and discreet in his job as an ad canvasser, and instead of descriptive language he is presented as an ad man in the newspaper office and in newspaper headlines.

Towards the middle of this chapter words that appear to be not so much newspaper language but rather theatrical stage directions, or film script instructions, are also observable, such as “HIS NATIVE DORIC” (160), “SAD” (158), “A COLLISON ENSUES” (163), and “EXIT BLOOM” (164). Moreover, some headlines such as the three sole question marks “???” (167), and the comments “CLEVER, VERY” (173), “SUFFICIENT FOR THE DAY • • •” (175), and the mysterious “K. M. A.”, “K. M. R. I. A.” (186), are very unconventional and alienating parts of this chapter, because while some seem to take the reader to the proof reading phase of a manuscript’s gestation, a phase that readers are not meant to witness in the final printed product, others are fairly inexplicable. These estranging stylistic strategies may indicate the author’s intention to produce a text which speaks and conveys its messages in such a unique way that communication is made anew.

After this Aeolus chapter, another unconventionally narrated chapter is Chapter12 “Cyclops”, which consists of 33 different passages in the text, parodying 33 different “pompous, sensational, or sentimental literary styles. In most cases the parodies are ‘general’-parodies not of specific works but of generalized stylistic conventions” (Gifford 314). This episode’s unconventionality lies not in the visual strangeness of using capital letters or starting different pieces of the text with a different headline, rather, the nonconformity of “Cyclops” is in its evident discontent with so many previously conventional styles of writing, parodying them, and thus questioning the previously well-structured ways of narration and language use. While this episode, taken superficially, simply tells the story of Bloom’s wanderings alongside the Liffey river, heading towards a pub and pondering on various things, its narrative style has made it one of the most alienating and complicated chapters of Ulysses for readers. Gifford has explained all these parodic passages (314-38), space and time limitations do not allow such detailed examination here; however, regarding the purpose of this chapter to study how
alienation is encoded in language use and in narrative style in *Ulysses* some examples are mentioned below.

In an avant-garde manner, the text’s parodic strategy in this chapter undermines and subverts all the well-established narrative styles and the languages of late nineteenth-century sentimental fiction, journalistic language, legal, biblical, children’s literature, Irish medieval legends, and even medical texts, to name but a few. For instance, one of the interesting examples, is the treatment of a fake Sanskrit in a parody of the speech of the Theosophists: “he had heard from more favoured beings now in the spirit that their abodes were equipped with every modern home comfort such as talafana, alavatar, hiitakalda, wataklasat and that the highest adepts were steeped in waves of volupcy of the very purest nature” (*U* 389). As a reading out loud of these words reveals, these apparently Sanskrit words are actually the words telephone, elevator, hot and cold water (respectively) and water closet, however; “the spelling parodies the Theosophists' predilection for Sanskrit terms (Sanskrit being regarded as the penultimate language [after Pali] of mysticism” (Gifford 330), terms guaranteed to be unknown to the majority of readers and thus, apparently, evoking an air of the unknown to the discourse, purposefully obfuscating the actually mundane and trivial matter that is being referred to. Among other examples of word and style games in this chapter, elucidated by Gifford, are the following: a legal document parody (377), parody of Irish texts’ translations (378), a parody of Irish-revival legendry (318), a parody of descriptions of the Irish hero in late 19 century texts (384), and parodies of Irish legends retold in Greek mythology and mediaeval romance (386).

Another evidently unconventional chapter in terms of style and language is Chapter 14 “Oxen of the Sun”, which is structured as a series of imitations of several prose styles “presented in chronological sequence from Latin prose to fragments of modern slang” (Gifford 408). The setting of this chapter is the National Maternity Hospital, where Bloom is inquiring after the health of Mrs. Purefoy, who has been in a long and difficult labor for three days. The whole chapter is full of conversations about fertility, pregnancy and contraception, narrated in different prose styles, ranging from middle and old Latinate prose style to styles similar to those of Bunyan, Defoe, and Dickens. Thus, “the sequence of imitations is a
sustained metaphor for the process of gestation; Joyce would have assumed that in that process ontogeny (the development of the individual organism) recapitulates phylogeny (the evolutionary history of the species)” (408). The narrative’s imitations of several prose styles generates and forms a kind of strange diversity, making the text belong to no one and no time. Thus, the reader of this episode witnesses a journey to everywhere and feels as though they are nowhere; hence, this chapter develops in the readers a sense of not belonging and distances them from a text which is alienated and alienating, full of wandering alienated characters like Stephen and Bloom who prove to be separated from the rest of the group in their conversations and in their opinions and intellectual sophistication. The narrator(s) of the chapter add to this overall evocation of rootlessness with language that renders a sense of exclusion and non-belonging to any kind of prose style available.

The subversive use of narrative styles continues into Chapter 15 of *Ulysses* “Circe”, in which the text resembles the format and language of film scripts. The opening of the chapter is a description of events printed in italics and depicting the setting: “The Mabbot street entrance of nighttown, before which stretches an uncobbled transiding set with skeleton tracks, red and green will-o'-the-wisps and danger signals. Rows of flimsy houses with gaping doors. Rare lamps with faint rainbow fans” (561). Conversations follow, with different descriptions of the scenes and situations inserted among the dialogues. The film scripts format also contains various hallucinatory scenes. This chapter is one of the longest in the novel; however, what happens in it is not very much. On the other hand, the hallucinatory scenes that are introduced in between different dialogues demonstrate the unconscious mind and desires of Stephen and Bloom, including Stephen’s concern with his deceased mother and Bloom’s anxious thoughts about Molly and Boylan’s sexual tryst that afternoon. Through these unusual and hallucinatory visionary scenes, the reader is encountering the uneasy parts of the protagonists’ minds. The characters’ psychological alienation self-estrangement, shown by their being unable spontaneously to assert their “individual initiatives, feelings, wishes, opinions” (Horney 252) is embodied and substantiated in the narrative style of this scene. This narrative style is very distinctive and differs greatly from a more conventional linear descriptive narration of a story.
Chapter 17 “Ithaca”, is a series of 309 questions and answers exchanged between Stephen and Bloom on their way back to Bloom’s house. This chapter is reported by a third person narrator putting forward questions about various issues ranging from the water system in Dublin and its population, to astronomy and many other scientific subjects. The entire chapter is structured like a catechism (Gifford 566). In one of the questions the unknown reporter asks about the number of different languages that Stephen and Bloom know; the answer is that Bloom knows a little Hebrew, and Stephen knows a bit of Irish. The two protagonists then exchange some utterances in Hebrew and Irish (U 805-807). Bloom chants the favorite Zionist anthem “Kolod halejwaw pnimah Nefesh, jehudi, homyjah” (807), which means “As long as deep within the heart/ The soul of Judea is turbulent and strong” (Gifford 579). Then Stephen chants an Irish song named “Little Harry Hughes” that tells the story of a boy who was killed by a Jewish girl (U 809-810). Here, popular or familiar songs about language, race, and religious distinctions appear in an uncomfortably didactic format. The narrative strategy as well as the continued presence of different foreign languages draw attention to the otherness and/or differences in the content as well as language of these verses.

Ulysses’ narrative is closed with Chapter 18 “Penelope”, which uses the subversive and nonstandard storytelling style of Molly Bloom’s interior monologue. Although her words are a linear and uninterrupted stream of words, there is no linear or chronological time in the ordering of Molly’s represented memories and events, no punctuation, and no specific structure indicating where the story starts and where it ends. The interior monologue of this Chapter is unusually uninterrupted and long (other uses of this narrative style, before and after, tend to include shorter and frequently interrupted passages of interior monologue).

Taken together, the many narrative styles of Ulysses serve to make the novel a unique expression of the fragmentation and alienation of existence, and stylistic experimentation and encoding of themes like alienation were to become the major characteristic of avant-garde writers. No writer followed Joyce in presenting such a degree and extent of linguistic experimentation, although many of his techniques could be found individually in famous modernist writings of the early decades of the twentieth century. In a form-content symbiosis that is also characteristic of the
writings of High Modernism (and of many poems), the fragmentation of style and expression of language as an alienated entity also links themes of the novel’s content with many of its images and events (at that thematic level), and brings in the readers expected closeness or distance from the text as part of that communication (the more ‘difficult’ the text seems to readers, the more they are reenacting the fictional characters’ difficulties in feeling estranged from the linguistic, economic, political and social discourse fields to which they ostensibly belong. Social and psychological alienation of these characters as well as their self-estrangement and isolation are thus textually encoded through the modernist- that is experimental and innovative- narrative styles and language use in the novel, and Ulysses is seen to encode alienation into the very fabric of the text.

4.3.2 The Blind Owl’s Alienating Narrative Style

It would be an understatement to say that The Blind Owl is not as polyphonic a novel as Ulysses. One voice dominates this short and complex work, and it is the fact that this voice and the perspective it provides are so steeped in expressions of, and modes and means of expressing, acute and chronic states of alienation that characterizes the text as supremely modernist. The Blind Owl’s, avant-garde, narrative style marks a radical change and a distancing from the floral, didactic, and formal language of Persian classics and Iran’s standard literary language of previous centuries, to a simpler choice of words and non-didactic subjects. Nonetheless, the novel is exceptionally complex, and its complexity emerges from its unconventional and distorted narration, (narration is composed of two different parts and hard to say which one is the story of a dream and which one is the real part of the story) as well as from its abundant use of repetition of similar images, idioms, and paradoxical descriptive phrases.

Hedayat’s experimentations with language use and word choice are not as varied as Joyce’s, but the results create a novel almost as difficult to follow in parts as Ulysses. One cause of this complexity may be that Hedayat “constructs his stories from a remarkably cosmopolitan range of technique and imagery” (Fischer 20), and that The Blind Owl “is an imaginative response” to modern life with its “complexities, ambiguities, and uncertainties” (Jamili and Zarrinjoee 233). Fischer
notes that Hedayat, “by reconstructing and revolutionizing the style of fiction in the Persian literary mainstream, uninges the traditional system of discourses” (21). Moreover, Hedayat “attempts a radical recasting of Persian tradition itself, channeling recurrent conventional images and themes of the classical legacy into the paradigms of psychological affliction shared by modernist writers from the first half of the twentieth century” (Jamili and Zarrinjoee 233). Jamili and Zarrinjoee make a comparison between the narrative forms of *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. They note that *The Blind Owl*, “unlike *Ulysses*, …, is a first-person narrative expressed in a dialogic voice often seemingly in conflict with itself; however, the novel has a complex nonlinear chaotic structure and an undercurrent of oedipal conflict deeply reminiscent of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*” (235). On the other hand, Shamisa identifies *The Blind Owl*’s structure as being “based on ‘repetition,’ ‘paradox,’ and ‘unification’” (Shamisa 82) and Beard considers the entire narration to be a series of “circling repetitions” (Beard 77). It is mostly due to these repetitions and paradoxes in *The Blind Owl* that Hedayat’s novel may be considered as formally displaying the alienation of language from itself, of story-telling from its narrator, of reality from imagination.

After reviewing some general points and comments on *The Blind Owl*’s narrative style in the following paragraphs, particular examples of the language and narrative style of the novel will be analysed to assess how alienation is encoded and represented in and by them. Since there is very little dialogue in Hedayat’s novel, the focus will be on how certain words and the choice of interior monologue as the dominating narrative style reflect and represent the alienating effects of language. The first person free indirect speech and interior monologues of the protagonist, along with the remarkably small number of conversations, are found to convey a deliberate and remarkably inextricable confusion of space and time in *The Blind Owl*, thus contributing to the overall effect of alienating the narrative from any sense of grounded and reliable constructed reality, estranging readers from the text because of the immense difficulties of finding a perspective from which to interpret this novel, and also, perhaps, showing a distressing alienation of the narrator and his inner world, as well as demonstrating his senses of anomie, alienation and exclusion from any normative social existence. In other words, the narrative style
in this novel, while it seems to take the fictional outer world of the narrator, as well as of the reader of the novel, into the most personal parts of a person’s self (his or her mind and even into their barely conscious thoughts), can at the same time show a deep alienation of that mind from both its outer and its layered inner experiences, and because it is not addressed to any identifiable narratee it may also seem particularly uncommunicative and, even, alien to the reader.

Interior monologue is positioned as an enclosed, non-sharing type of language use. Not only are the recipients of this monologue (the readers of the novel) potentially cut off from this (apparently) unintentionally communicative type of communication, but *The Blind Owl*’s protagonist expresses his own distress at being (he believes) destined to remain unheard; he mentions that he is afraid that he will die soon and no one will have heard his life story: “my one fear is that tomorrow I may die without having come to know myself” (*BO* 7). This emphasizes another feature of the narrating protagonist’s life, together with his social alienation and his lack of interpersonal relationships: the heavy and dominant presence of silence. The language of silence presides in the novel. As mentioned earlier, there are very few dialogues in the novel, even though the protagonist struggles to find an audience in his room—and settles upon his own shadow on the wall.

The contradictory desire of the protagonist to reveal his self to an audience and at the same time his urge to remain silent in his encounters with the people around him can be read in this narrative. “In the course of my life I have discovered that a fearful abyss lies between me and other people and have realised that my best course is to remain silent and keep my thoughts to myself for as long as I can” (*BO* 7). The distance he feels between himself and his surrounding community presents itself in the way he narrates his story, intimately recounting a very individual experience from his inner mind; while being unwilling to address an audience, even if the audience is merely the construct of the narration. He excludes himself from any potential audience’s community and writes down his story. He recounts that

*[if] I have now made up my mind to write it is only in order to reveal myself to my shadow, that shadow which at this moment is stretched*
across the wall in the attitude of one devouring with insatiable appetite for each word I write. \textit{(BO 7)}

Regarding this self-revealing introduction, we come to know why the protagonist is recounting his story, or what he thinks is the reason for recounting it, and a further point about \textit{The Blind Owl} is made clear, which is the dominance, or the zeal for, a language of silence. Although this tendency to silence may have further implications such as indicating the protagonist’s depression, his ability to maintain it definitely indicates an isolated and deeply alienated physical and social situation, as well as psychology and philosophy. This last level of alienation is expressed in his comment that “the silence had for me the force of eternal life; for on the plane of eternity without beginning and without end there is no such thing as speech” \textit{(BO 19)}. This bold claim that, ultimately, there is no such a thing as speech, is further emphasized when he affirms that “each movement has its own precise meaning and speaks a language that is not of words” \textit{(47)}, and we do not understand this silence very easily \textit{(31)}. His tendency towards silence and solitariness is made evident in these and other similar expressions.

Based on the protagonist’s utterances in the course of his narration we learn that the narrator of \textit{The Blind Owl} has a tendency towards isolating himself from his surroundings, alienating himself by taking refuge in the world of silence, or in the world of his own mind and speaking the language of silence, as he also declares. The only trustworthy, or available, audience he can identify is his own shadow on the wall, which could also be a reflection of his unconscious mind. In other words, one can say that the protagonist of this story is articulating through silence and absence, which must be among the most alienating narrative approaches and language uses, to share his deepest sense of separation and alienation from his world (which we learn is most immediately made up of his household, his beloved and/or wife) and his living space and to convey the anomie he experiences. The issue or story of how and to what extent this alienation and self-isolation is voluntary and to what extent it could be the result of being excluded and marginalized by his surroundings remains unclear. In the text, however, it is effectively encoded in the language of the novel.
The protagonist’s deep sense of loneliness and painful feelings of alienation in *The Blind Owl* can be observed right in the opening lines of the novel when he, famously, starts his story with the statements that “there are sores which slowly erode the mind in solitude like a kind of canker. It is impossible to convey a just idea of the agony which this disease can inflict. In general, people are apt to relegate such inconceivable sufferings to the category of the incredible” (1). The pain he refers to here is the agony and anguish of feeling alienated by his surroundings and feeling that he is a castaway in life. Perhaps as a result of this deep sense of misunderstanding, or even total lack of communication and understanding, he maintains a silent approach to his life; as he states, he has decided to “remain silent and keep my thoughts to myself as long as I can” (7).

It seems that the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* struggled to conquer the extreme silence and isolation around him by merging his existence with his surroundings, whether through writing his story or using drugs or drinking. His previous struggles show that he cannot become part of the external world around him except in a delusional state after opium and wine consumption which implies his psychological alienation and lack of ability to immediately assert his desires and wishes (Horney 252). This displays a distorted mind state, a distortion due to his extreme sense of loneliness and isolation and an existential angst where he cannot or does not want to understand his surrounding world as his own. These kinds of alienations and his delusions are encoded textually and within his language of silence and actually through his interior monologue.

The protagonist of *The Blind Owl* makes some conflicting and contrasting comments about his surrounding space. For instance, when he is profoundly under the influence of wine and opium, he describes a deep sense of reunion with his surroundings, which is in stark contrast to his senses of isolation and alienation expressed elsewhere in the narration.

At that moment, my thoughts were numbed. Within me, I felt a new and singular form of life. My being was connected with that of all creatures that existed about me, with all the shadows that quivered around me. I was in intimate, inviolable communion with the outside world and with all created things, and a complex system of invisible conductors transmitted a restless flow of impulses between me and all the elements of nature. There was no conception, no notion, which I felt to be foreign to me. I was
capable of penetrating with ease the secrets of the painters of the past, the mysteries of abstruse philosophies, the ancient folly of ideas and species… past and future, far and near had joined together and fused in the life of my mind. (22)

Apart from the distorted state of mind reflected in the language of narration, and represented in his conflictual desire to be part of the outer world and reject the rabble’s ideals of life at the same time, there is another pattern in the language of the story teller-protagonist, which could expose his isolation, distortion of personality, and alienation; this is the submerged narrative that is reflected in the protagonist-narrator’s production of parallel artwork.

His painting (of pen cases) repeats itself (he produces multiple versions of the same design) just as his verbal repetition parallels repetitions in his reported experiences and in his narration. The noticeable fact about this repeating pattern of a picture is that time seems to be stopped in the image on the pen-case; a very peaceful and romantic image, in a silent situation. Timelessness and beauty are no comfort here, though: “listless and helpless as I was, I, the decorator of pen-case covers, what could I do? What means had I of creating a masterpiece when all that I could make were my lifeless, shiny little pictures, each of them identical with all the rest?” (23). The repeated patterns thus display some of the protagonist’s barren, spiritless, and alienated perceptions about life. The “stereotyped pattern” on the pen-case could also stand for the absurd attempts of the protagonist (and by extension, perhaps, of anyone) to take refuge in the realm of art or to use it to provide life with some meaning and purpose. When that fails he claims that, hoping to “create from the resources of my mind a drug which would soothe my tortured spirit, I was taking refuge in the end in the motionless life of lines and forms” (24). This motionless quality of painted lines and forms is parallel to his silence, and both are used as forms of refuge. The conflictual desire to be a part of and at the same time not to be part of that life reflects itself in contrasting and self-negating phrases such as, “a pleasant vertigo” (BO 69), “a moving dead” (BO 72), “a deep empty sleep” (BO19), “a dark window” (BO 37), and in various repetitions in patterns like the image on the pen-case, the ethereal girl’s eyes appearing in many points in the
story, the past and present of his story, and the reappearance of a “poisonous” wine\textsuperscript{17} bottle (BO 49, 90) inherited from his parents.

There are various experiences that the protagonist talks about and which are very vividly depicted in his mind. These painful scenes are so clearly alive in his mind that within his narration it is sometimes difficult for the reader to make a distinction between his lived reality and his imagination, as Chapter Three also showed for images of place. The only alleviation that the protagonist finds for his suffering is to increase his intake of wine and opium in order to paralyze this sense of painful alienation, but these “remedies of despair failed to numb and paralyze” (17) his mind in the end. His choice of words, as well as images, representing his despair, loneliness, and isolation indicate, directly and indirectly, the inner feelings of his mind and soul. Besides, he reacts oversensitively to the things which are happening around him. He is over-conscious, for instance, of the actions and life of those people whom he names “the rabble” and, more often than not, he associates them with religion. The protagonist’s senses of social and psychological alienation along with his tendency toward anomie is embedded and encoded in the text of the novel, in the narrative style with its repetitions as well as the images created through those repetitions as in the one of the pen case. In such textual and formal strategy, the readers come to know about the existential and psychological anxiety of the protagonist while they decode the alienation through the narrative style and language use.

4.3.3 Arabic as the Foreign and Alienating Language

In some passages in The Blind Owl, the character reveals his awareness of and his ideologically loaded insights into religion and Arabic; Arabic is the language of prayer for “the rabble”. When his nanny gives him a prayer book, seemingly to make him read it and to sooth his physical pain (shown in symptoms like constant bloody coughs and fever) and torment, he notices that the book was covered “with half-an inch of dust on it. It had no use, not only for prayer books, but for any sort of literature that expressed the notion of the rabble. What need had

\textsuperscript{17} The wine has the venom of the cobra, Indian serpent, that killed either the father or uncle of the protagonist in their fight to win the Indian temple dancer who is the mother of the narrator/protagonist too.
I of their nonsense and lies” (70-71). At first glance, the protagonist’s sense of alienation from religion and his scorn is expressed through his commenting on the prayer book’s uselessness. However, a few lines later he conveys his detachment at a deeper level from the language of prayers, Arabic, mosques, and even God himself. He states:

As for the mosques, the muezzin’s call to prayer, the ceremonial washing of the body and rinsing of the mouth, not to mention the pious practice of bobbing up and down in honour of a high and mighty Being, the omnipotent Lord of all things, with whom it was impossible to have a chat except in the Arabic language—these things left me completely cold. (71)

This sense of total disjunction from religious culture also expresses his isolation and alienation from his society at different individual, social, and spiritual levels. For he displays a mindset that rejects all authority, along with the culture of religion, and that is completely detached from all authoritative institutions and figures. In other words, religion provides him with a specific focus for his more general alienation from all his society and surroundings. He is an individual who, according to Seeman’s descriptions of isolation and alienation, “assigns low value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society” (788). Thus, the character’s sense of social alienation and isolation is from another angle encoded in the presence of Arabic, as the alienating language of religion and as an alienating authoritative element in the protagonist’s world.

As The Blind Owl’s narrator expresses his angst and revulsion from religious expositions such as the language of its communication, the call for prayer (Azzan), people performing religious actions such as a muezzin and an old man reading the Koran, he complains about a God to whom praying is made impossible unless it be in the Arabic language. The face of a Koran-reading old man appears in the protagonist’s nightmares several times (46) and this increases his horror and unease. In another example, the butcher, who has his shop across from the protagonist’s window, starts the ritual of killing sheep using the “sacred formula of ‘besmellah’ [In The Name of God]” (91); this “expression and attitude” of the butcher lodges as an ever-present part in the oversensitive mind of the protagonist. Here, again, a religious expression in Arabic causes him disturbance (perhaps because of the act of killing the sheep) and disgust and indicates reasons as to why
he is alienated spiritually too. This revulsion of, particularly, the authoritarian power of religion is implicated in the alienation of the protagonist from the concepts of God, religion, and the divine as well as resulting from the alienating effect of religion itself in the individual’s life. Moreover, the whole idea social, psychological, and existential alienation, is embodied in the text’s presentation of Arabic as the foreign language of religion and ‘the rabble’ as its practitioners, from whom the protagonist isolated himself.

In another example that is related to this rejection of religious authority and sense of alienation from it, the protagonist mentions that his marriage to his cousin and the hateful emotions existing between them could have resulted from the fact that “a preacher, by the process of reciting a few words in Arabic over us, had placed her under my authority; perhaps she simply wanted to be free” (BO 52). Here, the recitation of Koranic Arabic, ostensibly joining people in marriage, is seen as having, on the contrary, created a sense of separation and alienation between them. This religious ritual, instead of enriching his life, had created another alienating factor in his existence. Once again, the lack of interpersonal relationships between the protagonist and people around him, even those closest to him, is encoded in the presence of the alien language Arabic which has an estranging effect rather than integrating the individual into a community or, here, partnership.

The protagonist’s tendency to isolate himself and his sense of separation from the individuals around him and the religion they practice, signify the fact that he suffers from a profound sense of exclusion and alienation, represented in his interior monologues and the language he employs. In examples like this he even expresses a sense of exclusion from the whole universe, this world and even the world after death—in which he expresses his disbelief, anyway. When he describes an old odds-and-ends man selling his petty things in front of the narrator’s house, he is seen as the same person who, from among his bad, decayed teeth, recites the Koran (84); he states that this old man, for him, represents a sample of what exists in the whole universe:

The old man with his ailments, with the rind of misfortune that encrusted him and the misery that emanated from him, was, probably without
realising it himself, a kind of small-scale exhibition organised by God for the edification of mankind. (85)

He expresses his sense of isolation and exclusion from individuals around him, as well as the God and Creator of the world he is living in via his interior monologues and the silent strategy he has chosen, i.e. not to speak. In other words, language performs a nonstandard role in the life of this narrator, who is aiming at expressing his sense of exclusion and extreme loneliness. Besides, the Arabic language the old man uses encodes in it the idea of the alienation of the character from the traditional values prevalent around him. His social alienation and self-estrangement are encoded in the rejection of and expressing distance from the language of Koran, Arabic. Hedayat employs language and modernist narrative styles, such as interior monologue and stream of consciousness, to convey the notion of alienation of the protagonist and to point to the alienating elements, such as religion, in his world.

4.3.4 The Unconventional Use of Language in *The Blind Owl*

The protagonist of *The Blind Owl*, in spite of his preference for silence, explains that the only way out of his miserable situation is recourse to the realm of words and the unspoken – but written -- verbal composition of what was hurting his mind and body. Thus, perhaps, this process of tale telling and writing his life story exists as the narrator’s attempt to eliminate his feelings of suspension, separation, and alienation. “The source of my excitement was the need to write which I felt as a kind of obligation imposed on me. I hoped by this means to expel the demon which had long been lacerating my vitals, to vent onto paper the horrors of my mind” (39). He wishes to let out and release the dismay, panic, and miseries of his alienation and loneliness onto paper. It seems likely that these horrors of the mind are closely linked to his sense of isolation, and thus we may say that he hoped that writing - the words and language and his narration process-would help him to dismiss his sense of alienation from the individuals around him, from his surroundings, and as we saw in some examples, his sense of alienation from God as well as the alienating effects religious issues have on him. The language and the narrative style, and the images used in *The Blind Owl* are coded representations of the sense of alienation of the protagonist at different levels. These levels include his disconnection from individuals and people around him (as has been shown in terms
of the religious elements in his society), and a dis-integration with his surroundings and environment. In order to distance himself from the feelings of angst and misery that result from this alienation and isolation, he takes refuge in the realm of words and writing and of painting as he states too (BO 7, 11, 23, 39, 41).

Strategies that make writing style and language use in The Blind Owl complicated and alienating, comprise contradictory phrases and descriptions; strategies like repetitions and reappearances of many identical or hard to differentiate characters such as the frequent appearance of the old man, father and uncle, the cousin, wife, or the ethereal girl; and various uncertainties and doubts expressed through negating phrases and near-identical passages relating to characters or situations make the narrative style more complicated and unconventional. Shamisa notes, further, that in this novel there are some ungrammatical usages of language in the novel as well as many slang words which are embedded within literary sentences. While these factors, as Shamisa believes, increase the semantic diversity of the text (90), they do it in a way which breaks up the stylistic unity of the work in a discordant and unexpected way that is typical of modernist, avant garde writings, internationally. Some examples of each of these alienating and distinguishing features of the text will be analyzed in the following paragraphs. Since the English translation of the novel at some points is not accurate enough to illustrate the contradictory phrases and the ungrammatical usage of language in this novel, the Persian text of The Blind Owl (Buf-E-Kur, henceforth abbreviated as BK) is also used where necessary.

There are in the text various examples of negating and contradictory phrases. At the level of the novel’s plot or character development these phrases display a skillful use of language to directly illustrate the uncertainty and doubtful attitude of the narrator as well as in the creation of intriguing illustrative idioms. For instance, when he describes the ethereal girl’s eyes, he says her eyes were “threatening and also inviting” (BO11), or the windows admitted an “opaque lightning”\(^{18}\) (BK 26) into his room, translated as grey light (BO 24), and he

\[^{18}\text{روشنایی کدر}\]
encounters a pleasant vertigo\(^{19}\) (BK 69) translated as agreeable giddiness (BO 60), dark windows\(^{20}\) (BO 37), and “a living corps” \(^{21}\) (BO72), among various other instances of oxymoron. Such phrases in Hedayat’s text were not as frequent in earlier prose fictions in Iran, and they are among the features which make this novel uniquely modern. These illustrative but negating phrases are unconventionally used to convey the encrypted distortion of the bitter experiences the narrator presents in his life story.

There are many examples of ungrammatical uses of language in the novel which have not been rendered in the English translation, which makes the translated novel appear less radically unconventional than, in fact, it was. They are of significant importance in creating a different nontraditional Persian prose; for instance, as Shamisa points out, the use of an extra, emphatic pronoun which is not common in Persian. “It was as if I knew her name already, I”\(^{22}\) (BK 18). “I bent down, I, to watch her see her better”\(^{23}\) (25). These kinds of additional pronouns are in a way redundant and bring the language closer to the nonstandard informal language of daily use, and are especially noticeable when they are used in a literary format. Moreover, there are numerous examples of slang words very subtly positioned next to literary words. For instance:

I felt that this world had not been made for me but for a tribe of brazen, money-grubbing, blustering louts, sellers of conscience, hungry of eye and heart\(^{24}\)—for people, in fact, who had been created in its own likeness and who fawned and grovelled before the mighty of earth and heaven as the hungry dog outside the butcher’s shop wagged his tail in the hope of receiving a fragment of offal. (BO 78)

In this example, in the text the Persian equivalents for words like brazen, money-grubbing, and blustering lout are slang words and very insulting. Other examples
of the many colloquial words found in the narrative, include the frequently used words for “rabble”\(^\text{25}\) and “bitch”\(^\text{26}\). The protagonist believes that his life is different from ordinary people’s lives and when he wants to address or talk about them he employs an informal and insulting language, perhaps to illustrate his distance from them.

The various phases of childhood and maturity are to me nothing but futile words. They mean something only to ordinary people, to the rabble—yes, that is the word I was looking for—the rabble, whose lives, like the year, have their definite periods and seasons and are cast in the temperate zone of existence. (43)

Or in another example, when he introduces his wife/cousin into his narration, he admits that he cannot name her and thus he will call her “the bitch”.

“I call her ‘the bitch’ because no other name would suit her so well. I do not like to say simply ‘my wife’, because the man-wife relationship did not exist between us and I should be lying to myself if I called her so” (58). This mixing of very informal slang words into the narrative of the novel makes it an outstanding prose style, unique in Persian prose literature, with no precedent and also without peer in its contemporary time. This writing style is modernist in its combination of subverting the established writing methods of its time, while using the resultant discordant, fragmented register of language to encode the multi-layered alienation of the protagonist-narrator.

In addition to the frequent use of slang and ungrammatical phrases and structures, the narrative presents a confusion in time, and in narrative the time dimension is inextricably intertwined with language structures. The story is not narrated in a linear and organized manner, and there are many confusions in the narrative including the numerous repetitions and reappearance of events, images, and characters that were mentioned earlier. All of these elements involve repetitions of words and expressions. These repetitions and non-chronological narrative sequences make a recognizable time scheme—and thence a recognizable present time of narration--even harder to distinguish in the bewildered narration of the
protagonist, adding more to the text’s anti-representationalism and complexity. For instance, the image on the pen case, which is the same as the scene the character witnesses from his window, appears in many occasions in the narration:

I chanced to look out through the ventilation-hole above the shelf. On the open ground outside my room I saw a bent old man sitting at the foot of a cypress tree with a young girl—no, an angel from heaven—standing before him. She was leaning forward and with her right hand was offering him a blue flower of morning glory. The old man was biting the nail of the index finger of his left hand. (13-14)

This scene becomes the only image on the pen cases that the narrator paints, and we have been told that it is the same scene as is painted on old pen cases. The old man in the image seems to reappear as the old Odds-and-Ends man who sits outside the protagonist’s house and is also the wife’s secret visitor and lover. Besides, the old man and the uncle, the narrator’s father-in-law as well, seem to be the same person too. This image and its scene once again appear on an ancient pot that the old man finds while digging a grave for the body of the girl who died in the protagonist’s room. As a result, the simple phrase “the old man,” which is repeated many times in the novel, and which would in other texts be a simple linguistic pointer to a recognizable character, becomes increasingly un-definite in its reference, for the more often it occurs the more unclear becomes the reference: is this the same old man each time or not? Do any of the instances of this phrase refer to an old man materially existing in the outer world of the narrator, or are some or all of them purely figments of his imagination?

In the same way, the ethereal girl and the image of her eyes reappear in various scenes and events. There are over thirty times that eyes are mentioned and as all of them are similar to each other, even when he is talking about his wife’s eyes, or her brother’s eyes. The eyes appear on the narrator/artist’s pen case, on the pot from the graveyard, and in the looks of the wife/cousin and they are all similar: “magic eyes” (9, 13), “shining, wondering eyes” (10), “Turkoman eyes of supernatural, intoxicating radiance” (13), “her strange, slanting eyes” (14, 91), “feverish, reproachful eyes” (24), “strange Turkoman eyes” (97). In the final part of the story, when the narrator protagonist recounts his wife’s murder, he says “in the palm of my hand lay her eye, and I was drenched in blood” (98). These eyes
resemble the eyes of the ethereal girl’s eyes. His wife also appears in his memories as wearing the same black dress as the ethereal girl’s, and having the same graceful movements like the “Indian dancer” (BO 13), who seems to be his mother, too (BO 87). Thus, it becomes difficult to make a distinction between the wife, whom he calls the bitch, the ethereal girl, the Indian dancer/mother. The other repetitions of images that are also repetitions of phrases are the “poisonous wine bottle” which has been left to the protagonist by his parents, which at another level may represent the presence of death or the desire to die, a form of willed alienation that is more openly admitted in the statement that “perhaps for the very reason that all the bonds which held me to the world of living people have been broken the memories of the past take shape before my eyes. Past, future, hour, day, month, year—these things are all the same to me” (43). This “poisonous wine” appears in both parts of the story, when the narrator tells his past life story and when he has changed into an old man and tells his present story and still it is difficult to decide which part of the story is a dream/nightmare, and which part is what really happened to the protagonist. The distortion of the mind and the psychological alienation of the protagonist is reflected textually and in the narrative style and repetitious language use in the novel.

4.4 Linguistic Silence of Female Characters in Ulysses and The Blind Owl

Apart from the terminating interior monologue of Molly Bloom in Ulysses, women characters in both Ulysses and The Blind Owl are rendered silent or are involved in very few conversations. In other words, female characters are most of the time linguistically alienated from the narratives of the story. With that one exception, they are given very few occasions to speak and almost no voices in which to represent or express themselves; they appear in a few or no conversations and they have no independent narration of their own. Meanwhile, female characters in both Ulysses and The Blind Owl are very much spoken of, and reported about by the male protagonists and other characters. Cixous’s notion of *ecriture feminine* and Kristeva’s distinction between the symbolic and the semiotic in language are applicable to analyses of female characters’ silence in these two novels, with references to Spivak’s notion of subaltern, however, not with its postcolonial
connotations. The connection with the thesis’ concern with alienation in modernist texts is that it is in the representation of female language that these two novels show how characters – female characters and by extension women in general – are alienated from and marginalized by the masculine voices of these novels’ narrators and focalizers. In this section a very brief sketch of the feminist study of linguistic silence is presented. These ideas have mostly developed decades after the writing of these novels but they provide tools with which the critic can understand what texts of any age do with their female voices and silences. Thus, the focus will be to examine the linguistic alienation of the two main female characters in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, Molly Bloom and the ethereal/harlot-like girl, as well as to investigate the language of some more minor female characters, such as the old woman selling milk to Stephen and Mulligan in the opening chapter of *Ulysses*, Gerty McDowell and Stephen’s sister, Dilly, in the same novel and the old nanny in *The Blind Owl*.

Cameron starts her argument in *Feminism and Linguistic Theory* with the claim that “the idea that language is abused by the powerful to conceal or distort the truth appears throughout the Western intellectual tradition” (6). According to feminist theories of language and linguistic silence, there are at least two relevant theories that could refer to and explain the linguistic alienation of the female characters in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. According to Cameron, one group has “suggested that ‘femininity’ means in a sense being outside language or marginal to it. This might explain the alienation of many women from prevailing forms of (rational, unified) discourse” (14). In opposition to this group, other theorists believe that our language, just like many other things in our life, “has become so fragmented that we cannot talk in these abstract terms (‘language’, ‘women’, ‘femininity’); we need a less global, less Utopian feminist account of language” (14). Within the first group’s ideas, the controlling or dominant power over language seems to be the male, leaving women alienated from it. Silence is thus an outcome of this gendered linguistic alienation. This notion is often applicable to the female characters in these novels’ setting of the very male-dominated colonial Ireland and Iran; in both of these geo-political and cultural settings we may
uncontroversially claim that communicational means, including language itself, were appropriated by the dominant male voice.

Three major feminist theories about language allow us to provide theoretical explanations for what caused the women characters in the Joyce and Hedayat novels to be muted. Cameron summarizes these theories as follows:

Radical feminist linguistic theories hold that language determines (or in a weaker formulation, places significant constraints on) our thought and perception, and thus on our reality. A second theme is that men control language as they control other resources within a patriarchal society. Men determine how language is used and what it means; and consequently language enshrines a male and misogynist view of the world. Thirdly, radical theorists assume that women are placed at a disadvantage as language-users. They may use the “male” language, thus falsifying their experience and perceptions. This is “alienation.” Or they may try to express themselves more authentically, in which case, they will soon encounter a lack of suitable linguistic resources, and fall silent. (130)

Probably all of these, and certainly the last of these three envisaged situations, would seem to be most relevant to the cases of Joyce and Hedayat’s female characters’ silence and linguistic alienation in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*. Anyhow, however it is theorized, the fact is that these novels show their female characters being deprived of full means of communication and expression.

Another theoretician who could be mentioned as a milestone in female linguistic silence is Gayatry Spivak and her notion of the subaltern is also appropriate to these novels and their silenced women. In her lengthy article on the question of if the subaltern (as women) can speak or not, she finally claims that “the subaltern cannot speak” and women are or become silent in a society where the power structures are decided by male power (308). In addition to Spivak’s ideas, Kristeva and Cixious’ theories of female language are concerned with the subversive effects of feminine writing or language. According to this, Kristeva makes a distinction between two different phases of language acquisition and meaning production, “semiotic” and “symbolic”. The semiotic as Kristeva herself explains is not as structured as the symbolic, that is related to the fatherly language; rather, it is “unnamable, improbable, hybrid, anterior to naming, to the One, to the father, and consequently, maternally connoted to such an extent that it merits "not even the rank of syllable"” (Kristeva 133). “The semiotic is a realm associated with
the musical, the poetic, the rhythmic, and that which lacks structure and meaning” (Schippers 26-7) and it is associated with the subversive force. Kristeva’s theory of distinction between the symbolic and the semiotic is based on Freud’s view of women as “castrated” and experiencing “absence” and “lack” in Lacan’s phraseology. In the same way, Cixious believes that writing and language are totally phallocentric and thus:

until now, far more extensively and repressively than is ever suspected or admitted, writing has been run by a libidinal and cultural-hence political, typically masculine-economy; that this is a locus where the repression of women has been perpetuated, over and over, more or less consciously…. that this locus has grossly exaggerated all the signs of sexual opposition (and not sexual difference), where woman has never her turn to speak-this being all the more serious and unpardonable in that writing is precisely the very possibility of change, the space that can serve as a springboard for subversive thought, the precursory movement of a transformation of social and cultural structures. (879)

It is noticeable, as has been mentioned before, that in Ulysses and The Blind Owl the narrative style, although very innovative and experimental, still allocates almost no space for female voices and language; with the major exception of Molly Bloom’s interior monologue. Molly’s narrative can be read, with the benefit of these more recent perspectives, as coming in some ways (the lack of punctuation is one major indication of this) from the semiotic and subverting the established disciplines of language use (the symbolic), thus, as an example of ecriture feminine.

In other words, in texts like Ulysses we can claim “it is in modernist forms themselves that the repressed maternal feminine unconscious of Western culture actually emerges into representation” (Dekoven 179). In the following analysis of the two novels’ female characters’ silence and linguistic alienation, these post-structuralist theories will be used to help explain the relations between silence and alienation, and why it should appear so especially as a feature of female, rather than male, characters. For these characters the silencing points to the inferiority or marginality of the female in masculine dominated discourses, and that gendered alienation is encoded in the language and silences of females in these texts.

In Ulysses, there is a variety of female characters who appear in conversations, however few, and they have social and economic roles outside of the domestic setting, such as singing (Molly Bloom), a photography student (Milly
Bloom), and a babysitter like Gerty MacDowell. Molly's interior monologue in bed, which comprises the final chapter of the novel, is a special case which requires a separate treatment. However, Molly is up until this point almost completely silent throughout the novel, except for the mention of her major means of public, professional, and oral communication, which is her singing. We learn that she is not in control of her vocalizations even here. The fact that she does not know the meaning of some words or the songs she performs, also signifies the point that she, and perhaps any female, is linguistically excluded from the male-dominated culture and entertainment industry in Dublin, even though she is the most essential contributor to that industry. Similarly, although she is the object of conversations of Bloom and Boylan, she is not present in any of the dialogues and conversations reported during the day.

Kiberd believes that Joyce’s discontent with previous writing styles shows itself in—as we had already seen—Chapter14 “Oxen of the Sun”, that contains “pastiches” of many styles, which are there, at least in part, Kiberd states “in order to clear the way for a return to oral tradition with Molly Bloom. (This is one possible meaning of the massive full-stop at the close of the penultimate chapter.)” (xxxvi). Molly's murmuring-like, interior thoughts, which are not structured in a conventional novelistic tradition, consist of only eight full stops, with no other punctuation, jumping from one topic to another without any verbally indicated transitory words or phrases. Molly’s language use is not similar to what was known as well-structured standard composition, but a less standardized, more flowing structure that displays the subversive form of ecriture feminine. Molly’s narrative and language use, in addition to her identification as a singer, is a kind of “articulation, a rhythm, but one that precedes language” (McAfee 19). She allows her mind to ramble through various subjects and mixes and merges topics and sentences nonstop, in a flowing, true “stream” of consciousness. In one part of this interior monologue Molly remembers going to confession and is again, as in the “metempsychosis” (77) instance, annoyed that people do not use simple and direct language, thinking that

I hate that confession when I used to go to Father Corrigan he touched me father and what harm if he did where and I said on the canal bank like a
fool but whereabouts on your person my child on the leg behind high up was it yes rather high up was it where you sit down yes O Lord couldnt he say bottom right out and have done with it what has that got to do with it and did you whatever way he put it I forget no father and I always think of the real father what did he want to know for when I already confessed it to God he had a nice fat hand the palm moist. 27 (875)

The whole chapter consists of these apparently structure-less flashbacks mixed with other thoughts in Molly’s mind and her language indicates the fluidity of her thoughts. This intriguing narrative style makes this chapter very attractive and complex as well. The text finally allows her a voice, of sorts, and in showing it as a silent voice in her mind only, implicitly acknowledges the irony that Molly’s truest utterances, her deepest confessions, can only be heard when she has no audience, no male confessor to overhear and re-formulate her expressions into a male discourse. The male dominance over language is not only emphasized in Molly’s memories of the confession scene, but also foreshadowed in Chapter 14, where Gerty thinks “there ought to be women priests that would understand without your telling out” (U 476).

The aloof position of Molly’s narrative- while she is thinking about the most private things in her mind and desires- creates a sense, in the novel, that she has been excluded from the reported events of the day, while at the same time she has been a significant part of the story for the whole day, being a constant presence in Bloom’s mind and in thus accompanying his wandering around Dublin. She is thus narratorially subsumed (in all the novel except her last chapter) to and within her husband’s voice, just as she and the other women are subsumed in what the novel depicts as an overwhelmingly male-driven culture, even when she is in her singing role. However, she has no say on and no control over the stories of her flirting and infidelities that pepper the entire novel. It is in her interior monologue only that Molly exposes her concerns about various things including, for example, her concern about Leopold Bloom’s secret correspondences with other women (873), and again it is just in this interior monologue that she reveals a motherly lament that Milly sent her a postcard only, while she wrote a letter for Bloom (898), and it is in

27 There is no full stop in the original text.
this most private moment and thought process that she mourns for their dead son, Rudy (while she is thinking of Stephen) (921).

Molly Bloom’s narrative style is the last and perhaps the most radical of the novel’s exploration and exposition of different styles and registers, and presents a very personalised and unique insight into the character expressing herself; it not only reveals her as a character who had up until now remained unexplored, but also emphasizes that she is an example of what Spivak refers to as the “subaltern” in a masculine world of conversations and communications. Both the content and the form of this extraordinary passage encodes the depth and complexity of a female experience of being alienated from the male-dominated world (or discursive fields) of Dublin as she experiences it; it reveals the extent to which she has been misread, misunderstood and misrepresented in a narrative that has hitherto been provided by Bloom and other male characters in the novel. The semiotic language and apparently unstructured narrative of Molly is subversive of all the symbolic language that represents her to her outer world, as to the readers. It places readers in the privileged position of hearing a voice that is otherwise always silenced.

In Ulysses there are other female characters who are shown to be underprivileged either linguistically or socially or educationally; for instance- as we have already seen- Stephen Dedalus’ younger sister, Dilly Dedalus who, while her family is in great poverty, seeks French books to learn the language. There is also the case of an even more textually disempowered (silenced) female, Martha, Bloom’s secret pen friend, with whom he corresponds only in writing and carries on a fantasy affair. The novel allows her no voice except in these letters, which are kept inaccessible to the readers, except for the last one received by Bloom. In this letter Martha asks for the meaning of a word, like Molly who had asked Bloom about the meaning of some words in her song. She writes to ‘Henry Flower’ (Bloom’s penname) “please tell me what is the real meaning of that word” (U 95), implying again a linguistic incompetence among women, or at least that men and women have different vocabularies. Gerty McDowell, the lame girl who is babysitting on the shore, while Bloom is watching her from afar and masturbating, also does not have a decipherable verbal language for, as she is at some distance from him and reported only through Bloom’s stream of consciousness, she is
represented as speaking indistinct words, which cannot be heard clearly, and therefore cannot be reported.

In Chapter 13 “Nausicaa”, readers encounter Gerty MacDowell on the sea shore at Sandymount. Although it is possible that the entire episode or chapter is a complex of embedded free indirect reports (the narrator indirectly reporting what Bloom is indirectly thinking that Gerty is thinking), the first parts mostly appear to be a simple, though complex enough, presentation of third-person free indirect reporting of Gerty’s thoughts, which take the verbal form and style of the artless terms of badly-written romance magazine stories, articles and advertisements. These descriptive paragraphs are evidently an intermingling of the third-person narrator’s observations (noticeable with the exclamation “Leopold Bloom, for it is he” (U 478), about half-way through the chapter) with an indirect report of the interior fantasy-monologue of Gerty (no one else would know or be interested in many of the minute and intimate details of her life that are inserted). These observations, up until Gerty is described as leaving the shore with her friends, are all presented in the characteristic language of magazine romances, which is clichéd, childish and commonplace in content, style and tone. Gerty is daydreaming and barely speaks a word, and, as Kiberd states, her interior monologue is mocked throughout the episode, because she seems to be talking to herself in a language which is not hers, but the language of the women’s magazines from which she reads about relationships and fashion. “Her mind has become so infected by the conventions of her favorite magazines that it is hard to tell when she is sincere in the expression of feeling and when she is simply impersonating the kind of woman she thinks she ought to be” (Kiberd xli). This mockery of magazine style language further denotes the fact that Gerty, as the third person narrator in this chapter also implies, has been deprived of a decent education, “had kind fate but willed her to be born a gentlewoman of high degree in her own right and had she only received the benefit of a good education” (U 453). Thus, the language she is employing to express her emotions to herself does not belong to her at all, indicating that even the language of her thoughts is alien to her, and perhaps she is also, thus, alienated from her own inner life.
She is textually and verbally, though not physically or socially, depicted as a lonely character among the chattering group of the young by the sea. As she daydreams she catches sight of Bloom in the distance, and weaves him into her fantasy of the aristocratic suitor in love with her.

Wonderful eyes they were, superbly expressive, but could you trust them? People were so queer. She could see at once by his dark eyes and his pale intellectual face that he was a foreigner, …. Here was that of which she had so often dreamed. It was he who mattered and there was joy on her face because she wanted him because she felt instinctively that he was like no-one else. The very heart of the girl-woman went out to him, her dreamhusband, because she knew on the instant it was him. She was a womanly woman not like other flighty girls, unfeminine, he had known, those cyclists showing off what they hadn't got and she just yearned to know all, to forgive all if she could make him fall in love with her, make him forget the memory of the past. (U 465)

Still in the style of a romance novella, she thus fantasizes that this older man (Gerty’s friend Cissy disrespectfully calls him an “Uncle Peter”) is “her dreamhusband.” The use of such a style, which is commonly associated with ‘low’, ‘cheap,’ and trivial reading material for the young and uneducated, associates Gerty’s thoughts with these qualities – commonplace, unoriginal and, above all, uneducated.

This chapter also presents its main female character as an inarticulate, supremely physical being who is the object of the male gaze (of Bloom). Furthermore, she sees herself in these terms too, her own thoughts and actions concentrating upon her looks, her form, and her clothes, and Bloom’s observations of her being limited to her body and sexual potential, as we learn in the second part of the chapter, that returns to an intermingling of third person narration and Bloom’s interior monologue:

Tight boots? No. She's lame! O!

Mr Bloom watched her as she limped away. Poor girl! That's why she's left on the shelf and the others did a sprint. Thought something was wrong by the cut of her jib. Jilted beauty. A defect is ten times worse in a woman. But makes them polite. Glad I didn't know it when she was on show. Hot little devil all The same. Wouldn't mind. (U 479)

For this female character, then, the novel gives her only the language of body, or other people’s words. The novel, and both her and Bloom’s fantasies,
present her as a silent icon of woman-as-body, and woman as the object of male
gaze.

In other parts of the novel and in particular in this same chapter, there are
further examples of phrases and words which conform to the notion of Kristeva’s
semitic and that could also be attributed to a feminine language, which is both
alienated and alienating in the sense that it is pre-linguistic and does not present an
equivalent or a one-to-one meaning for each word. In other words, the semiotic is,
metaphorically speaking, a developmental liminal space; it is the semiotic that
occurs before the symbolic. The words in the semiotic, as briefly mentioned earlier,
are (or are like) the “glossolalais, rhythms, and intonations of an infant who does
not yet know how to use langue or refer to objects” (McAfee 19). We see how this
is reflected in the language of Gerty and two other girls, Cissy Caffrey and Edy
Boardman, who are babysitting. Cissy is encouraging the baby to say papa “-Say
papa, baby. Say pa pa pa pa pa pa pa” (464). The baby manages to say “-Haja ja ja
haja” and “-Habaa baaaaahabaaa baaaa” (464). These female
characters are shown
as naturally communicating with infants, using a kind of semiotic, non-symbolic
language. Thus, through their verbal language, and above all through the textual
manipulation of their language in this novel, women are quite literally infantilized,
as well as being almost wordless in the narration of Ulysses, for they are represented
as almost entirely alienated from the language of men, and have no effective means
of verbally communicating their own thoughts. They are alienated even from their
own thinking processes by the necessary moulding of their thoughts that occurs
when having only the vocabulary of male-formed discourses to use for expression.
The same limitations can also be phrased as freedom, however, for these female
characters are presenting a language beyond the symbolic language through their
silences or through not following the same language rules. That is, they might be
subverting the patriarchal communicative language as they are alienated from its
communication zone.

The fact that the female character in The Blind Owl is not heard almost
anytime during the story, or when she talks it is as if she speaks unconsciously in a
dream (BO 96) is thus theoretically similar to the murmuring style of Molly’s
interior monologue or to the verbal silencing of Gerty (and the other two girls on
the beach, who are observed by Bloom but are not heard clearly). In fact, just like Gerty’s disturbingly clichéd reported thoughts, women in The Blind Owl (as in other writings of Hedayat such as “The Doll Behind the Curtain” and “Three Drops of Water”, “Laleh”, “Alaviyeh Khanoom”) are depicted in crudely-drawn stereotypical ways, as either an ethereal angel-like person, or a harlot type. In fact, it is very difficult to find any attempt at characterization in Hedayat’s female characters; they are more often than not types rather than credible individuals. When it comes to the depiction of female characters, Hedayat’s writings seem to be fixated with these two types. In this novel, the inability of the narrator to see or imagine women beyond these caricatures is part of the characterization of the narrator/protagonist: the story takes us into the mind of a very unwell person, someone who (among his other difficulties) can only perceive other humans as objects in his imagination, and for him the types of objects that women are can be either angels or whores. His ethereal girl, whom he calls an angel not a human being, and his depiction of his cousin/wife as, apparently, the whore type, (the text does not make clear whether she has been promiscuous or not) are the outstanding examples of this characterization. In these kinds of depictions, Hedayat/protagonist narrator seems to fall into the category of the male modernist misogynists, and despite the forceful presence of female characters in the novel he shows an obsession with femininity and a “reactive misogyny” (Dekoven 176). This kind of (mis)-representation, as revealing as it might be, encodes in itself the alienated spot from which these female characters come.

The female characters in The Blind Owl do not have names, for reflecting the narrator’s unwillingness or inability to see women as equally independent human subjects, they are not nameable; as the narrator himself says “I did not know what to call her” (21). Two of the three women characters, whether it is the ethereal girl or the cousin/wife (who are almost undistinguishable, with their similar eyes and wearing the same black dress), do not speak nor do we see them in any conversation in the novel, except once when we hear the wife, apparently to her lover/visitor, saying “have you come? Take your scarf off.” We are told that “her voice had a pleasant quality, as it had had in her childhood. It reminded me of the unconscious murmuring of someone who is dreaming. I myself had heard this voice
in the past when I was in a deep sleep” (96). It is as if she is speaking in her dreams, not to a real person. Other than this example, the wife/harlot is reported only when she is spoken of. For example, it is the nanny who tells the protagonist that his wife is unwell or that she is pregnant or that she is preparing clothes for the baby who is going to be born (70); we hear nothing from her mouth. The protagonist states that the nanny complains about his wife and reports to him that

‘Oh yes, my daughter’ (she meant the bitch) ‘was saying this morning that I stole her nightdress during the night. I don’t want to have to answer for anything connected with you two. Anyway, she began to bleed yesterday. ... I knew it was the baby. ... According to her, she got pregnant at the baths. (93)

On another occasion, his wife’s brother reports what his sister has told him about the protagonist’s illness and inheritance: “‘Mummy’ says the doctor said you are going to die and it’ll be a good riddance for us. How do people die? ‘I said, ‘tell her I have been dead for a long time’” (94). The muteness of the protagonist’s wife could signify her reluctance to speak, for which there is hardly a clue, or it could signify her alienation from the means of communication that is language. In other words, she is silent because she is not heard or cannot express herself with what is available as language; and mainly it also signifies that the narrator/protagonist is so entirely alienated from all those aspects of life that involve young women (desire, love, friendship, companionship, living and changing beauty) that he is unable to give them voices in his mind: in his mind desirable women are mere images, objects of his distorting perception but not humans with expressive and communicative capabilities. It is noticeable, in connection with this, that not only do these women (for they are two in his mind, if not in any reality that might exist outside of it) share silence, but that they also share a single appearance and beauty – and it is the same appearance and beauty as that which he sees and reproduces in an age-old series of replicated pencil-case paintings. They have no real time or beauty, just the timeless comfort of form and line, as he put it.

The character of the nanny in Hedayat’s novel represents a very superstitiously religious, illiterate, and shallow person, and whatever she says

---

28 Apparently, the wife’s brother calls his own older sister “Mummy”.
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seems like nonsense to the protagonist. She is given by the narrator more space and voice than the other female characters, perhaps to reflect the speech of only the least educated or intelligent of the female characters in his life. For instance, he states that the nanny, who is nursing him too, would

talk about the miracles performed by the prophets. Her purpose in so doing was to entertain me but the only effect was to make me envy her the pettiness and stupidity of her ideas. Sometimes she retailed pieces of gossip... Sometimes she would fetch me home-made remedies from the neighbours or she would consult magicians and fortunetellers about my case. (70)

Although she may be doing nothing more than her nursing duties and what she does is limited by her age and knowledge, the narrator/protagonist looks down on her and her actions with contempt, degradation, and humiliation. Thus, if the nanny has some space and voice in the narration, it is perhaps to feed the contemptuous emotions of the narrator. “How had that woman, who was so utterly different from me, managed to occupy so large a zone of my life?” (66). On the other hand, the wife (who is smarter) shies away from him, either in coming near him, having a marital relationship with him, or taking care of him now he is very ill.

If the bitch my wife had shown any interest in me I should never have let Nanny come near me in her presence, because I felt that my wife had a wider range of ideas and a keener aesthetic sense than my nurse had. Or perhaps this bashfulness of mine was merely the result of my obsession. (69)

The wife is both absent (she is only present in the memories of the narrator) and silent, and keeps silent all through the story, and that could perhaps also be the result of her sense of alienation from the narrator’s language with which he struggles to express his own, not someone else’s, thoughts and emotions. The female characters’ sense of social and linguistic alienation in Hedayat’s novel can be decoded through their silence in the text.

4.5 Alienating Narrative Style and Language: An Unlikely Comparison

The language and narrative styles in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* are, as we saw in the examples given in the previous paragraphs, unconventional, very experimental, fragmented, and non-conformist, and they include ungrammatical
treatments of language in some parts; thence, in a sense, they create effects that make the reader aware of the distinction between the textual, linguistic aspect of the text, and the content or story that the text is related to; this is not how novels conventionally present themselves and it creates a barrier between the reader and the story where more conventional realistic story-telling styles allow the reader free-access to the fictional world thus created. In this respect, these modernist and linguistically experimental novels alienate their texts from the readers. Readers are not allowed to enact that “suspension of disbelief” that they are accustomed to both use and enjoy in the experience of fiction and are, on the contrary, shown how the text can enable, or on other occasions may disallow, that pleasurable illusion-making experience. These novels create their own readerships of more practiced or adventurous readers, who are able to or wish to discern the intricate mechanics of the creation of fictional meaning, and who enjoy the poetic and polyphonic effects of these stylistic techniques. In addition to the fact that these textual features are typical of avant-garde and modernist fictions, they not only produce and present, but also signify the potentially alienating effects of language. Even though there are distinct differences between the two novels regarding their lengths, structures, and narrative modes, scrutiny of many examples from these works has revealed some very delicate similarities in how different aspects of modernist alienation are encoded in the novels’ settings as well as how they are encoded and embedded in the narrative styles and of language use, of the withholding of language, and silence.

Ulysses is bulkier than The Blind Owl and the length of the novel is a major cause or facilitator of the differences between the novels, including differences in presentation of language. Its enormity can accommodate not only more streams of consciousness as its main narrative strategy but also more characters and thus a greater potential for differentiated dialogues. Despite the fact that Ulysses displays a greater number of narrative styles, there are some noticeable similarities between the monotone narrative style of The Blind Owl and the more varied narrative styles in Ulysses. In both cases, most noticeably, the preponderance of interior monologues and stream of consciousness is encoded as to be textually symptomatic of a lack of genuine communication between the novels’ protagonists and other
characters, and this lack of true communication is an effective way of depicting and even replicating the alienation of the persons involved in the stories.

To start with some points of correspondence between *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, regarding similarities in the alienating effects of language on individuals in the novels, and creating a sense of distance and alienation between the text and the reader, a focus on the estranging presence of foreign languages, and especially of Latin and Arabic, is noteworthy. Latin as the dominant language of the church in Ireland at the time and Arabic as the main language of mosques and Muslim prayer, are referred to in these novels. It seems that religion, and certainly the language of religion, is encoded in the novels to exacerbate the social and individual alienation of the characters. We see this, most particularly, in the lives of Bloom and Stephen and in Hedayat’s unnamed protagonist. Leopold Bloom converted from Protestantism to Catholicism in order to be able to marry Molly, just as his father had converted from Judaism to Protestantism in order to marry Leopold’s own mother; nonetheless, he is still sensitive to the anti-Semitic words and behavior he witnesses among his fellow Dubliners. Mullin states that Leopold Bloom’s “Jewish heritage marks him as dangerously different in an Ireland constrained by narrow definitions of nationhood and blighted by casual, often vitriolic, anti-Semitism” (Mullin 2016). The clearest example of this occurs when Bloom and a citizen are having an argument in Barney Kiernan’s pub in Chapter 12 “Cyclops”. The citizen who has been observing a dog outside the bar sniffing Bloom, the unknown narrator of the chapter, who can be identified with the citizen too, is thinking that “old dog smelling him all the time I'm told those Jewies does have a sort of a queer odour coming off them for dogs about I don't know what all deterrent effect” (393). Although the citizen does not mention “Jewies” outright and although he does not voice his anti-Semitic feelings, his later expressions and insulting phrases towards Bloom could be interpreted as being very anti-Semitic. For instance, there is a direct mention of the “memory of the dead” by the citizen and his taunting suggestion that “the friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us” to Bloom’s face (396). In other examples the citizen expresses pity for all the women who marry “half and half” men (416), and when Bloom later defines a nation as people living
in the same place or in different places, “So of course everyone had a laugh at Bloom” (430).

What is your nation if I may ask, says the citizen.

-Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland.

The citizen said nothing only cleared the spit out of his gullet and, gob, he spat a Red bank oyster out of him right in the corner. (U 430)

Bloom is mocked and is despised (shown in the citizen’s spiteful gesture in the previous quotation), because it seems that his fellow Dubliners consider him a foreigner rather than a Dubliner, or Irish. “And I belong to a race too, says Bloom, that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant” (431-2). The citizen and other Dubliners in the Kiernan’s tavern also state that they do not want any strangers, when Bloom is not there to hear them they talk about him

-Where is he? says Lenehan. Defrauding widows and orphans.

-Isn't that a fact, says John Wyse, what I was telling the citizen about Bloom and the Sinn Fein?

-That's so, says Martin. Or so they allege.

-who made those allegations? says Alf.

-I, says Joe. I'm the alligator.

-And after all, says John Wyse, why can't a Jew love his country like the next fellow?

-Why not? says J. J., when he's quite sure which country it is.

-Is he a Jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? says Ned. Or who is he?

No offence, Crofton.

-We don't want him, says Crofter the Orangeman or presbyterian.

-Who is Junius? says J. J.

-He's a perverted Jew, says Martin, from a place in Hungary and it was he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system. We know that in the castle.

-Isn't he a cousin of Bloom the dentist? says Jack Power.

-Not at all, says Martin. Only namesakes. His name was Virag. The father's name that poisoned himself. He changed it by deed poll, the father did.

-That's the new Messiah for Ireland! says the citizen Island of saints and sages! (U 438)
Then, the argument becomes heated when Bloom says that Marx and Spinoza and even Christ were Jews like him (U 444-5). Regarding all the religious spite and enmity towards each other and – in this chapter --towards the Jew in particular, Latin as the official language of the church could signify the alienating effects of religion on all the individual Dubliners’ lives.

Stephen stands against what he considers as the authoritative demands of the Catholic Church and refuses - both symbolically and in physical reality- to kneel down before the God that this church preaches, even at his mother’s deathbed. In the same way, The Blind Owl’s protagonist displays signs of becoming even more distant from his community when it comes to his attitudes towards the Koran, the Muezzin’s call to prayer (Azan), and even God himself. The narrator of Hedayat’s novel expresses his foreign experience of going to mosque, which seems to make him feel even more excluded, like this:

Earlier, in the days before I fell ill, I had been to the mosque a number of times, always more or less unwillingly. On these occasions I had tried to enter into a community of feeling with the people around me. But my eye would rest on the shining, patterned tiles on the wall and I would be transported into a delightful dream-world. Thereby I unconsciously provided myself with a way of escape. During the prayers I would shut my eyes and cover my face with my hand and in this artificial night of my own making I would recite the prayers like the meaningless sounds uttered by someone who is dreaming. The words were not spoken from the heart. I found it pleasanter to talk to a friend or acquaintance than to God, the high and mighty One. God was too important a personage for me. (71)

It is possible to claim, then, that allusions made to Latin and Arabic in these two novels are encoded as to expose the alienating effects of these two languages and, at a deeper level, of their associated religions on individuals in their respective societies, and the protagonist narrators understand the political implications of this alienating force. For instance, as mentioned before, Bloom, while passing by a Church, hears the mass in Latin and ponders with himself that this language is a “good idea” because it “Stupefies them first. [. . .] They don’t seem to chew it; only swallow it down” (99). Alternatively, the protagonist of The Blind Owl, when given a Koran and a prayer book with inches of dust on the cover, affirms that he feels no association with the book because it is part of the religion and it is in the language of the “rabble” (intellectually speaking, equivalent to Bloom’s “them”) whom he
despises. This is, in addition to this, his horrific depiction of a cruel God to whom you cannot speak, except in the foreign and archaic language of old (Koranic) Arabic (70-71).

The alienating effects of religion are seen in both novels to be embodied in its language and also to be represented by the novels through its language rather than through direct reference to the religion itself. Parallel examples of this are found in the involvement of religion in the marriages of the two protagonists of the novels; in *Ulysses* the marriage of Bloom and Molly would not have happened at all if he had not been prepared to convert from Protestantism to Catholicism (just as the marriage of his parents could only take place after his father had converted from Judaism to Protestantism). In *The Blind Owl*, we find that the protagonist and his wife were married traditionally through the utterance of some Arabic words granting him authority over her, and he supposes that this may be a reason why his wife hates him (52). Thus the definitive function of religion in the marital lives of the two couples is mentioned, albeit very briefly and in different ways, and it is associated in both novels with their protagonists’ senses of alienation within their marriages. The alienating language of religion is used in both novels as a part of and a synecdoche for the alienating power and effects of religion.

Another ground for comparing and contrasting the idea of alienated characters and alienating languages in these two novels is the idea of female silence or women’s linguistic alienation or linguistic marginalization at the least. Molly Bloom’s interior monologue appears showing a different and by implication feminine, and subversive according to Cixous and Kristeva, viewpoint and it is an exception in *Ulysses*. Sheehan analyses this structurally uncategorized final chapter of the novel in the sense of its discourse and believes that

> there is no tradition for the last chapter, “Penelope”, suitably, devoted to an authentic female voice, a discourse that up to then had been necessarily relegated by the hierarchal order, one capable of questioning masculinity, going beyond petty nationalism to assert a healthy outlook on life unstained by either British or Catholic mores. (17)

Thus, it is possible to claim that Molly’s language is original and authentic, associated with Kristeva’s semiotic, and is both unique and marginalized and excluded from the whole narrative of the novel, as well as shown to be distant from
that of the male society, whereas female characters, such as Bloom’s correspondent Martha’s language shown in a letter (U 94), which is written in an arch and flirtatious manner that seems artificial, perhaps related to music hall style (a popular form of theatre at the time), is not very authentic. Gerty MacDowell seems to have internalized the vocabulary and cadences of music hall characters or of women’s magazines, which are not standard spoken female language. It should be recognized that these speech styles belong mostly if not entirely to the male-dominated world of theatre and publication. Gerty, and perhaps Martha too, is a marginalized character, devoid of standard education and decent family income, using an alien language that has been culturally imposed upon her very way of thinking by exposure to a popular mode of publication. Thus, in a way, Gerty and other characters like Dilly Dedalus, Molly Bloom, and Bloom’s correspondent, are mostly silent and when their language is represented it appears as one that is alienated from an authentic (female) language. It seems that all of these mentioned women characters are marginalized in the sense that their language and language use is mostly associated with the semiotic, thus, distant from the male standard language of their society, standing at a liminal space, between symbolic and semiotic.

Women in The Blind Owl are not represented in public communication, since, in fact, the setting does not include many public spaces at all. However, this statement is strictly accurate because women characters are not shown in any active communicating situations. As mentioned before, it seems that there is a repetition, or at least a confusion between the characters in the novel; the wife, cousin, the ethereal girl, and in some parts, the young Hindu dancer who is introduced as the protagonist’s mother, are all the same character. We hear very little from these characters in conversation except for what the nanny or the narrator reports from them. They are in many ways silent, while they have a great impact on the narrator’s life and psychological state. The only voice audible is the nanny’s, and she is introduced as an illiterate, superstitious, and shallow character. In this novel, too, language use and narrative style are used to encode the marginalization of women, in spite of the fact that they are definitely present in the course of the story. In other
words, the story to a great extent belongs to them, even while they are absent from the narrating and speaking zones.

The alienating effects of language and narrative style are modernist and reveal themselves in various ways, including subverting the traditional equation between word and meaning, between signified and signifier. In other words, the inward looking narrative style and nonstandard, unconventional language use, rather than showing how language connects people and thoughts, presents some of language’s distancing effects, in strong contrast to its earlier and unquestioned role as a conventionally reliable communication tool. Besides, this kind of fragmented and broken communication further signifies the socially alienated frames of mind of the characters who prefer to express themselves in streams of consciousness and interior thoughts rather than in person-to-person conversations. Thus, the constant displacements in language and narrative styles in modernist novels such as *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* in fact reflect and indicate the alienating, rather than integrating, effects of language on a character’s life and reveal the alienated position of the characters in a society where individuals are or feel excluded from unmediated or more authentic means of communication.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis was a study of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1922) and Sadeq Hedayat’s *The Blind Owl* (1937) from the point of view of their responses to and presentation of modernist alienation and how these two novels through the places, spaces, language use and narrative style encode, embed, and reflect alienation. This study demonstrated how alienation is textually represented in the literary creation of urban and non-urban spaces of Dublin and the City of Rey and in the extreme linguistic experimentations in the novels as well as through very innovative and modernist narrative styles which eventually reflect the alienation of the characters as well. In this concluding chapter, first, a survey of the results of this study will be presented. Then, there will be a look at the question of to what extent modernist alienation counts as universal in terms of these two very different cultures and literatures. Afterwards, there will be a discussion of future studies and how this analysis may fit into upcoming scholarship on alienation and modernism as well as suggestions as to how such a study could be expanded to include a greater range of concepts and writers.

One of the early concerns of this study was whether or not it was possible to compare *Ulysses*, a very huge novel, to *The Blind Owl* which is very short; and, specifically, whether it was possible to compare novels of such unequal bulk when taking into consideration also the fact that these novels come from two very dissimilar backgrounds and cultures. When comparing the details of the aspects of alienation in these two modernist novels, however, it became evident that they are in fact extremely compatible, in spite of such historically, culturally, and geopolitically disparate backgrounds. Almost extraordinarily, it was found that
these two novels employ the same modernist tactics: about liminality and liminal spaces; about language and alternative narrative styles; about linguistic innovations, technical and formal experimentations in writing; about loss of belief in conventional values and social norms as well as about disbelief in traditional ways of literary expressions while one struggles to create anew. Thus, the fundamental, big issues were the same in these two novels, in addition to the fact that the characters appearing in these novels were represented as being themselves alienated: socially unattached to their surroundings and consequently living on the margins of their communities. These characters, such as Leopold and Molly Bloom, Stephen Dedalus, and the unnamed protagonist of *The Blind Owl*, noticeably represent and depict alienation in various ways within their different fictional settings and within their novels.

Another important issue in this study was the exceptional nature of the experience of the modern social changes in Ireland and in Iran. In both Ireland and Iran, there was a negotiation toward modernism, because in both cases something was being imposed upon the cultures and the society. However, modernism in these diverse societies led to some similar results. For example, the types of alienation, whether it is being alienated from the tradition, language, or religion; or alienation from the newly imposed technologies in a society not capable of accepting them, were perceptible in these two novels. Nonetheless, the study of these two quite different cultures’ approaches to modernism provided us with some evidence to lead us to look at modernism as a universal movement. Thus, the ultimate purpose was not to find enormous similarities or differences but to study the theme of modernist alienation as encoded and represented in the novels.

The cases of Ireland’s and Iran’s modernism, in comparison to other European and Western cases, is obviously informed by Ireland’s colonial history and Iran’s enforced and speedy modernization, as well as Iran’s semi-colonial situation and foreign intrusions in its transition from traditional state to modern ways of life. The particular experience of modern elements in these two countries, considering all of the geopolitical, cultural, and historical dissimilarities, demanded a separate chapter and focus. Ireland’s colonial status caused its modernization and its reflection in the arts as modernism to be different from what was happening in
other European countries at that time. Ireland was a country in continuous turbulence because of the intrusions of the colonizer and because of the independent movements going on for a long time. Besides, as was discovered, Ireland’s modernism is mostly associated with literary modernism led by three universally famous authors, without whom Irish modernism might not have been noticed as it is now: William B. Yeats, James Joyce, and Samuel Beckett. Progresses in the fields of Irish painting, architecture, and music, do not seem to have been as huge or as noticeable as what occurred in the linguistic and formal revolutions in the literary zone in Irish modernism.

In Iran’s case modernization which happened during the late 19th century and early 20th century was forceful and hasty and did not occur on all social levels in a balanced manner either. It seems that in both Ireland’s and Iran’s cases, individuals may have felt as outsiders and stayed on the margins of the social changes which were alienating; the result of which is the creation of alienated characters like Bloom, Stephen, and many other Dubliners together with the lonely scared figure of The Blind Owl. However, as mentioned above, in the end it was found out that the fundamental modernist issues were proved to be the same in an unexpected and noteworthy way. Complexity of and experimentation with language and narrative styles in these novels and employing high-brow alienating language were the modernist methods which contributed to the intricacy in these novels and alienations of different types in the novels. Besides, these novels introduce marginal and self-exiled characters who like Stephen Dedalus either stay away from the social and religious conventions and ignore them; or characters like Bloom who are indifferent to social norms; or like the protagonist of Hedayat’s novel exile themselves from their society. These characters proved to be socially and psychologically alienated. Both novels in referring to taboos or unaccepted things, like religious and sexual issues were very similar.

In Chapter Three, representations of liminal urban and non-urban spaces of the two cities in the novels proved to represent the alienation of individuals. The liminality of windows, doors and doorways, streets and roads communicated dislocation, disorientation, ambiguity, and as a result alienation. In Ulysses, there were various examples of liminal spaces encoding and conveying the liminality and
dislocation of the characters, as well as their senses of alienation and loneliness. These liminal spaces, depicted right from the beginning of the novel (when Haines, Mulligan, and Stephen speak together) through to Chapter 15 “Circe” (in the brothels district of Dublin), all communicated senses of detachment and alienation of the individuals as studied in this analytical chapter about alienation and liminal spaces. Related to the discussion of liminality of doors and doorways, examples of keys functioning in these liminal spaces were embedded in the novel so as to reflect alienation of Bloom and Stephen. Stephen’s decision to give up the key to his house and Bloom’s forgotten key to his house made them to be referred to as “keyless couples” and Bloom was also referred to as “keyless citizen” in the “Ithaca” chapter. As it was found, encoded in the images of keys and doors in *Ulysses*, was representation of social alienation, isolation, and exile of the characters in the novel. In *The Blind Owl*, the two mentions of the key did not have the same function.

On the other hand, in *The Blind Owl*, the City of Rey was depicted as more isolated than Joyce’s Dublin, and far less populated. The focus was almost entirely on the protagonist’s room and its walls, although the two windows of his room opening into the city were also discussed. The room was depicted like a tomb by the protagonist and the windows of his room opened onto a literal scene of butchery (the butcher’s shop opposite); the windows of other houses in the city were depicted as threatening and non-communicating, as if no one was living on the other side of the windows. Moreover, the road to the cemetery and the character’s perception of a marginal place like graveyard also embedded in them extreme alienation representing the anomie, existential, and psychological angst of the protagonist. In this novel, the character’s senses of alienation and detachment are transmitted through the liminality and obscurity of these situations, where the city is described and portrayed as both threatening and isolated and there is no clear line between the reality of his descriptions or his hallucinatory fears and sense of alienation.

The chapter on alienation and space also considered heterotopias of compensation and enclosed places as suitable for unleashing the repressed desires of alienated characters such as Bloom. Bloom, as an outsider to Dubliners, creates a heterotopia in his mind—Bloomusalem—to compensate for his desires for a parallel friendlier space than where he lives. This heterotopia of compensation
provided Bloom with the ability, at least imaginary and temporarily, to confront his suppressed feelings about his wife’s tryst and his father’s suicide, and gain the recognition (when he is chosen the King of Ireland in his heterotopia) he does not receive in Dublin society as a converted Jew. In a different way the protagonist of *The Blind Owl* creates his own heterotopias through his constant dreaming and hallucinating while most of his interior monologues are apparently happening in the enclosed space of his room; he does not seem to be able to establish any genuine relationship with his surroundings or with the people of his household, and he displays symptoms of extreme loneliness and alienation. The protagonist of *The Blind Owl* uses the mirror on the wall of his room as a heterotopia where he can connect an image of himself with his surrounding; a space where real and unreal are merging again. In the recurring images of mirror, creating heterotopia according to Foucault, the idea of lack of personal relationship and anomie of the protagonist are encoded and reflected. As it was noticed, examples of mirror did not have the same heterotopic function in *Ulysses* and for that reason they were not included in this section. In both Joyce’s and Hedayat’s novels senses of social, existential, and psychological alienations are embedded in places, liminal spaces and heterotopias of compensation. These places and spaces textually reveal symptoms of uprooted, dislocated and isolated individuals in an alienating society.

In the other analytical chapter, Chapter Four, which was about the language and communication of characters in *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl*, very interesting comparable results were found, too. Both Joyce and Hedayat gave voice to the colonized, non-elite, common people, and the disempowered in their novels. That is perhaps one of the reasons their language has parted and differed from their traditional languages and is considered modernist. However, the type of language and the types of concerns being discussed in their novels are very different. Besides, it seems that, specifically in *The Blind Owl*’s case, women are kept silent— or rather, they are not provided with equal number of incidents to express themselves. This linguistic alienation and silence of women in both novels shows itself in the character of Molly: except for her final monologue, we cannot directly see her in actual interpersonal relations and conversations anywhere in the novel. Another female character whose speech is not directly represented is Gerty MacDowell. In
her case she is talking in her mind or is reported by a third person narrator only; a third woman who is not allowed a voice in Joyce’s novel is Bloom’s secret correspondent lover, who is presented through writing only. The wife/cousin/beloved character of The Blind Owl is also shown in no conversation, just in very brief murmurings. There is no direct speech from this character apart from these murmurings, her utterances are always mediated by being reported through the mind or memories of the male protagonist. This chapter of the thesis thus showed that in both novels women’s language and language use were treated as marginalized cases and where their voices were mentioned they were frequently associated with the non-grammaticalised, semiotic phase of language (such as Molly’s singing, using sounds whose meanings are not understood, and ungrammatical stream of consciousness, and like the murmurings of the beloved in Hedayat) rather than the symbolic which is associated with the disciplined and standard language use. Thus, women’s language and voices in these two novels, one can claim, came from the liminal space between semiotic and symbolic. In these two novels, marginality, social alienation, and powerlessness of women characters are encoded in their silence and the language they express themselves with that is coming from the semiotic or is associated with _écriture féminine_.

Another similar point in these two novels was their complexity of narrative styles and extreme linguistic experimentations. Their alienating language use and modernist narrating style communicated the alienation of the situation of the characters and the novels in general. The inward looking narrative styles, such as stream of consciousness and interior monologues embed alienation of the characters who are unable or unwilling to express themselves in person-to-person communication. Both writers proved to be interested in the sort of meaning which is created by tools beyond conventional written language. Joyce’s frequent usage of fragmented visual written language, as shown in capitalized words and newspaper headlines, conveys the fact that the communication experience can be fragmenting and alienating too. It is different from the traditional signified and signifier relationship and the final closure for an ultimate meaning. On the other hand, Hedayat’s dense poetry-like language is full of ironical repetitions of scenes, events, people, and words, thus, creating an alienating effect for the readers and an
alienated way of communication of the narrator who is isolated and socially and psychologically alienated.

In both novels, in spite of the length and variety of narrative styles, predominance of interior monologues and stream of consciousness is symptomatic of a lack of genuine communication between the characters. Therefore, these styles could reflect the alienation of the characters in the novels too. In other words, constant displacement in language and narrative style in modernist novels such as *Ulysses* and *The Blind Owl* reflects the alienated position of the characters in a society where individuals are or feel excluded from unmediated or authentic means of communication.

Both of the novels respond to the oppressive influence of religion when the characters like Bloom, Molly, Stephen, and Hedayat’s protagonist demonstrate sensitivity toward the foreign languages of their religions: Latin and Arabic. In addition to the already estranging effects of foreign languages, when they are the languages of religions that have oppressing roles in society, they become more alienating for the individuals.

An aspiration of this thesis was to study the cases of Ireland’s and Iran’s modernism—to attain a better view of how alienation was reflected in their modernist literatures. The findings of this thesis indicate that further investigation of regional effects upon modernism could enhance our understanding of modernism in different places (like Ireland and Iran) and it would also be enriching to see these regional modernisms within the context of their broader geo-cultural contexts. That is, for instance, Iran’s modernization would have been introduced better, if we could include a short overview of what was going on with its neighbors such as Turkey, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia. This issue was very briefly touched upon in Ireland’s case in Europe, but only as far as mentioning the point that while Ireland’s neighbors were having a progressing modernization, Ireland had to deal with the colonizer’s oppressive influence as well as its struggles and civil fights for independence. The modernism of Ireland and Iran was studied here with little to no regard of what had been happening in their broader regions. A study of modernist literary responses in the neighboring countries of Ireland and Iran, to ascertain
whether these places’ responses were similar or very different would be a significant contribution to the field of modernist studies.

There are many concepts and terms related to the idea of alienation, such as migration, diaspora, depression and extreme loneliness, and more important than all exile. However, this thesis focused on alienation as the feeling or the state of being excluded; on individuals who feel internally fragmented and externally unrelated or unable to connect to the things, to other people, and to the institutions around them. Characters in these two novels were depicted in situations that suggest their powerlessness, relationlessness, indifference, and isolation in relation to other people or to the society they lived in. Thus, the most closely-related terms, exile and self-exile, were touched upon in the theory chapter and were related in the analytical chapters, but other terms were not investigated for the sake of adhering to the focuses of detailed research.

This research is suitable to be considered, expanded, and scrutinized in comparative studies departments, modernist associated departments and institutes, and Middle Eastern and Area study groups as it examines the literature and modernist cultures from two distinct backgrounds. In order to expand this research into a more comprehensive work, adding some other modernist writers such as Beckett from the Irish context and Bozorg Alavi, Sadeq Choobak, and Mahmoud Dowlatabadi from Iran could enrich and inform the ways in which alienation is reflected in the literature of that time and in those regions. Furthermore, as mentioned above, studies of this nature could also include the neighboring countries’ literature at the period of high modernism.

The case of women’s alienation as a separate subject within the study of modernism is another very attractive and rich point that could be more deeply delved into in future studies. The analyses carried out in this thesis have strongly indicated that women could be regarded as doubly-marginal and liminal figures in the literatures of early twentieth century Irish and Iranian literature, where alienation is remarkably represented by men.
This research aspired to study how a modernist literary text can encode alienation through places, spaces, and language use. Different experiences of the characters in these two novels resulted in similar outcomes; that is concerns with questions of oppressive ruling and religious systems where almost no free action is allowed, conservative and traditional writing modes, the marginality of women, and the marginality of the countries in relation to the experience of social changes reflect themselves in depicting the alienation of individuals in the novels through encoding such alienation through places and experimental language use. The study of these two modernist novels from different places proved that modernism caused similar artistic outcomes in different contexts and experiences, which is strong evidence for the universality of modernism.
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B. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

JAMES JOYCE’UN ULYSSES VE SADIK HİDAYET’İN KÖR BAYKUŞ’UNDAKİ DİL VE MEKÂNLARDA MODERNİST YABANCILAŞMANIN EDEBİ KODLAMASI


Son derece alışılmamış ve deneysel dilbilimsel tarzların kullanılanlığı, teknik ve biçimsel yenilikler ve konformist olmayan bu yöntemlerin sebep olduğu karmaşıklığın yanı sıra, bireylerin bilincine odaklanmaları Ulyesses ve Kör Baykuş’u özellikle modernist yabancılaşma incelemesi için uygun metinler yapmaktadır. Bu romanların, konformist olmayan ve alışılmamış yazım tarzları sonucu okurları üzerinde yaratıkları yabancılaştırıcı etkiler karakterlerinin yaşam ve zihinlerindeki yabancılaşma temsil etmektedir ve göstermektedir. Başka bir deyişle, bu iki roman okurları için yabancılaşmış bir dünya yarattığı gibi aynı zamanda roman kahramanlarının yabancılaşmış dünyalarını da temsil etmektedir. Yabancılaşmış bir dünya “kendisini bireylere önemsiz ve anlamsız, katılaşmış veya yoksullaşmış olarak sunar; kişinin kendisine ait olmayan bir dünya olarak, yani insanın “kendini evindeymiş gibi hissetmediği” ve üzerinde herhangi bir etkisinin olmadığı bir dünya” (Jaeggi 3).


İrlanda ve İran’da Modernite ve Edebi Modernizm başlıklı ikinci bölüm, bu iki roman için arka plan ve besleyici bir kaynak olarak İrlanda ve İran’da modernizm tarihinin ayrıntılı bir tectikitini sunmaktadır. Bu konuya ayrı bir bölümde yer verilmesinin sebebi bu bölgelerdeki moderne tecrübesinin, mevcut çalışmaların çoğunda egemen olan Anglo-Amerikan moderne tecrübesi ile karşılaştırıldığında kendi edebiyatlarında farklı ilgileri ve vurgu biçimlerini meydana getirmiş olmasıdır. İrlanda’da modernizm, Avrupa’nın ekonomik olarak daha gelişmiş ülkeleri ile aynı hattı takip etmediği gibi buralarda verilen karşılıklar da yine aynı olmamıştır. İrlanda’nın kolonyal tarihi kaçınılmaz olarak ülkeyi ekonomik, toplumsal, teknolojik ve siyasi olarak etkiledi (Shahan 33) — ve bu da Ulysses’in Dublin’inde temsıl edilmektedir. İngiliz hakimiyetinin İrlanda’nın modern hayatı, kültürü ve edebiyatına empoze edilmesi İran’da Batılılaşma anlamında gerçekleştirilirilenlerle paralellik arz etmektedir. Bu anlamda, iki ülkede de bir tür sömürgecilik tecrübesi edilmistiş; en azından İran’da kültürel bir sömürgecilik yahut yarım-colonyal bir moderne tecrübesi vuku bulmuştur. İran’da hız ve zoraki hayata geçilen modernleşme, geçiş evresinde olan bir toplumdaki bireyler üzerinde pek çok yabancılaştırıcı etkiler bıraktı. Üçüncü bölümde görüleceği gibi, İrlanda’da ise sömürgeci müdahale çok benzer tesirler bıraktı.

Ulysses ve Kör Baykuş’ta Yabancılaşma ve Kentsel Mekanlar başlıklı üçüncü bölüm Dublin ve Rey şehirlerindeki liminal mekanların ve bireylerin yabancılaşmasını pencere, kapı, deniz kıyısı ve nehir kenarı gibi liminal mekanlara yansımasının bir analizini sunuyor. Ulysses’in birçok bölümünde kapı, kapı aralığı ve pencerelerin inşa edilen mekanları görülmektedir ancak yukarıda sunulan analizler, tüm edebiyatta ev arayışında olan avare arketipinin adı ile adlandırılan bu romanda liminalligin ve yabancılaşmanın metinsel kodlamasının sıklığını ve karmaşıklığını göstermek için yeterlidir.

Kör Baykuş’a kahramanın yabancılaşması ve yalnızlıkının yanı sıra etrafındaki insanlardan uzak duruşu, duvarlar, penceler, kapılar, odalar, evler, caddeler, yollar ve mezarlıklar ve mezarlar gibi kendisini çevreleyen mekânlar aracılığıyla kodlanmış. Çevresi, yalnızlaşığı için bir sıkımak işlevi görmekte ve aynı zamanda da kendisine bir kimlik yaratmak ve tanımlamak için bir alan alan

Bu bölümde ötekiğin yeri olarak heterotopya fikrini yanı sıra kapalı mekanların spekülasyon ve tahayyül mekanları olarak incelenmesine de yer verilmektedir. Bu meseleler yabancılaşma ve bireylerin tecridi bağlamında tartışılabilir (Hayward 663), “kapı kapı doluşarak reklam için sipariş toplama” (U 134) işini yapması da onun Dublin’de özgü bir şekilde dolaşması ile yakından ilgilidir. “İrlanda metropolisinin kalbi” (147) Bloom’un geçici mekânıdır; bununla birlikte, Dublin’de yaşarken sık sık diğer vatanı olan İsrail ve hayal ülkesi hakkında hayal kurma ve iç gözlem yapma için kullanmaktadır; bu şekilde ortaya çıkarılan zihin dünyası, kendi etrafında parçalanmakta olan fiziksel mekân betimlediği esnada parçalanmakta olan bir zihin dünyasıdır.
yansıttıkları ve hakkında konuştukları tüm diğer alanlardan kesinlikle farklıdır. Ütopyalarla karşıltık içinde, onları heterotopya olarak adlandıracağım (3-4).


Hayallerinde Dublin’in içinde ve dışına doğru hareket etme özgürlüğünü ve rahatsızlığın yanı sıra, Bloom’un heterotopya tecrübesi ve başka bir hayali yere duydugu arzu, evlerinde ve ülkelerinde “daha fazla yabancı istemeyen” “Vatandaş” gibi Dublinlilerin ifadesinin yer bulduğu Dublin’de sosyal olarak yabancılaşmasını yansıtmaktadır (Schacht’in kişilerarasi ilişkilerin yokluğu nosyonyu (157) Bloom’un yabancılaşma hissine uymaktadır) (U 719-20). Bloom hâlâ ihtida etmiş bir Yahudi olarak ve memleketinde bir yabancı olarak görülmektedir. Sosyal yabancılaşma teorileri çerçevesinde, Bloom “kristalize olmuş bir bütünlük tecrübeinden” uzaktur (Fishman 6).

Liminallık, Dublin ve Rey’deki karakterin veya durumun iki romanda betimlenen marjinallığını ve tecridini yansıtmaktadır. Bu kentsel mekanların tecridini ve liminallığını sunmak suretiyle Joyce bireylerin sıkıntılı ekonomik durumlarının yanı sıra, nüfusu kalabalık Dublin’de yaşayan Leopold Bloom ve Stephen Dedalus gibi karakterlerin marjinallığını ve sosyal yabancılaşmasını da tasvir etmektedir. Rey şehri ise, romanın kahramanı tarafından Dublin’de
gördüğümüz gibi kalabalık olmayan ve boş bir şehir olarak betimlenmektedir. Öte yandan, Hidayet’in romanındaki kahramanın odasını ve pencere gibi liminal mekanlar, karakterin aşırı yalnızlığını ve de çevresi ve toplumuyla iletişim konusundaki talihsiz istekszizlik veya beceriksizlik hissini göstermektedir.


İki romanda damekânsal yabancılaşma farklı kılan şey, Joyce ve Hidayet’in vermeye çalıştıkları yabancılaşma tipidir. Kendisi de kesinlikle fiziksel olarak yalıtılmış ve yabancılaşmış olan Hidayet’in yabancılaşması, kendisini çoğunlukla kahramanın psikolojisinde ve zihinde yansıtmaktadır. Öte yandan, Joyce’un yabancılaşma tipi ise çok yönlüdür ve daha ağırlıklı olarak sosyal bir yabancılaşmadır. Dublin’dede faal bir toplumsal yaşam olmasına karşın, bireyler yalıtılmış bir kente, marjinalize edilmiş ve sömürgeleştirilmiş bir adada yabancılaşmış yaşılar sürdürmektedirler. Bu insanların psikolojik yabancılaşmaları tarihsel, siyasal, kültürel ve fiziksel yalıtılmışlıkları ve sürgün durumları ile beraber iterlemektedir.

Bu bölüm, genel olarak gösterdi ki ayrılık, zihinsel yabancılaşma ve liminallik kavramları sözkonusu olduğunda gerçek hayattaki yerler ve bu romanların arkasındaki yazarlar kurgusal yerlerinin ve karakterlerinin çoğu
özelliklerini ve tecrüblerini paylaşmaktadırlar. Ayrıca, soyutlanmışlık ve yabancılaşma hissi metnin içine yerleştirilmiş ve mekânların karakterler tarafından sunulan açıklamalarında yansıtılmıştır. Karakterlerin yabancılaşması ve mahallerin marjinalliği, sadece temalar veya kahramanların zihinsel ve toplumsal durumları aracılığıyla değil, Dublin ve Rey şehrinin yerleri ve mekânları aracılığıyla kodlanmış ve vücut bulmuştur.

İnsanların zihinleri ile çevreleri arasında aktif bir etkileşim olduğu iddia edilebileceğinden, çevrelere Ulysses ve Kör Baykuş’ taki karakterlerin yabancılaşmasını resmettiği söylemek mümkün görünüyor. Üçüncü bölümde gösterildiği gibi, Joyce’un nüfusu kalabalık Dublin’i, Hidayet’in ise sadece dağıtık bireyle anlatmasına karşın karakterlerin tecrit edilmişliğini hissi iki romandaki liminal mekan örnekleri aracılığıyla aktarılabilirmektedir.

Dördüncü bölümde, yabancılaşmanın bu iki romandaki dil kullanımı, sözcük seçimi ve anlatı teknikleri tarafından ve bunları içerisinde nasıl kodlandığının ve yerleştirildiğinin gösterilmesi amaçlandı. Bu şekilde, yabancılaşma dil ve anlatı tarzlarıyla aynı anda hem yeniden tekrarlanmakta hem de yansıtılmaktadır.
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Dil ve anlatı tarzlarının yabancılaştırıcı etkileri modernisttir ve kendilerini, sözcük ve anlama, işaret eden ve işaret edilen arasında kurulan geleneksel eşitlemeyi bozanın da dahil olduğu çeşitli şekillerde dışa vururlar. Bir başka deyişle, iç dönük anlatı tarzının yanında standart ve geleneksel olmayan dil kullanımı, dilin insanlar ve düşünceler arasında nasıl bağlanı kurduğu göstermektedir ve dilin, geleneksel olarak güvendi bir iletişim aracı olduğu şeklindeki önceden var olan ve sorgulanmayan rolü ile keskin bir karşılık içinde dilin kimi uzaklaştırıcı etkilerini sunmaktadır. Ayrıca, bu tür parçalı ve kesik iletişim kendi, karşılıklı/yüz yüze konuşmalardan çok bilinc ve içsel düşüncelerle ifade etmeyi tercih eden karakterlerin ruh hallerinin toplumsal yabancılaşmışlığı göstermektedir. Bu yüzden, Ulysses ve Kör Baykuş gibi modernist romanların dil ve anlatı tarzlarında görülen sürekli yer değiştirme, dilin karakterin yaşamını ve düşüncelerini etki etmeden, karakterlerin ruh hallerinin toplumsal yabancılaşmışlığı göstermektedir.

Sonuç bölümünde bu çalışmanın sonuçlarının bir özeti, Çalışmanın sonucunu bir özetinin yanı sıra araştırma boyunca karşılaşılan boşluklar ve sınırlılıkların tartışmasına yer verilmektedir. Sonuç bölümünün ama amarda bu romanların daha ileri okumaları için bazı öneriler ve bu çalışmada incelenen meselelerden başka ayrıntıların ve boyutların keşfedilip genişletilebileceği yeni fikirler sunmaktadır.

Aralarında bulunan çok sayıda kültürel, toplumsal ve jeopolitik farka rağmen İrlanda ve İran’da modernizm bu edebi eserlerde standart olmayan dil kullanımı, parçalanmış ve tamamlanmamış iletişim gibi bazı benzerlikler göstermektedir. Bu da diyalogdan ziyade kendilerini iç monologlarla ve biliç akışıyla ifade etmeyi tercih eden ve toplumsal olarak yabancılaşmış karakterlerine
işaret etmektedir. Bu iki modernist romanda yabancılaştırıcı kentsel mekanlar, standart olmayan anlatı tarzı ve konformist olmayan dil, sömürgeci müdahale ve dini ve otokratik yönetim gibi baskı faktörlerle dolu bir topluma dışlanmış veya yabancılaşmış hissedenden bireylerin yabancılaşmış konumlarını tasvir etmektedir.
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İrlanda ve İran modernleşmeleri, diğer Avrupa ve Batılı modernleşmelerle kıyaslandığında, İrlanda’nın kolonyal tarihini, İran’ın acı ve zora dayalı modernleşmesi ile İran’ın yarı-kolonyal durumunun ve gelenekten modernizme geçişteki yabancı müdahalelerin ettikli olduğu saptanmıştır. Bu iki ülkedeki özgün modernlik deneyimi tüm jeopolitik, kültürel ve tarihsel farklılıklar göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, başka bir bölümü ve odaklanmayı gerektirmiştir. İrlanda’nın kolonyal statüsü onun modernleşmesine yol açmıştır ve bunun sanat üzerinde modernizm olarak tezahür, diğer Avrupa ülkelerinde aynı zamanda olanlardan oldukça farklı olmuştur. İrlanda, sömürgecilerin saldırıları ve uzun süre devam eden bağımsızlık hareketlerinden dolayı sürekli kargaşa içinde olan bir ülke olmuştur. Bununla birlikte, İrlanda modernleşmesi dünyaca tanınmış üç yazarın, William B. Yeats, James Joyce ve Samuel Beckett, öncülük ettiği edebi modernleşmeyle ilişkilidir ve aslında bakılsursa bu isimler olmadan İrlanda modernleşmesi şu anda olduğu gibi algılanamazdı. Resim, mimari ve müzikte yaşanan diğer gelişmeler dil devriminde ve edebiyat alanında yaşananlara kıyasla daha az çarpıcıdır.

On dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonları ve yirmiçi yüzyılın başlarında gerçekleşen İran modernleşmesi ise zora dayalı ve acı ve zora dayalı modernleşme ile İran’ın yarı-kolonyal durumunun ve gelenekten modernizme geçişteki yabancı müdahalelerin ettikli olduğu saptanmıştır. Bu iki ülkedeki özgün modernlik deneyimi tüm jeopolitik, kültürel ve tarihsel farklılıklar göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, başka bir bölümü ve odaklanmayı gerektirmiştir. İrlanda’nın kolonyal statüsü onun modernleşmesine yol açmıştır ve bunun sanat üzerinde modernizm olarak tezahür, diğer Avrupa ülkelerinde aynı zamanda olanlardan oldukça farklı olmuştur. İrlanda, sömürgecilerin saldırıları ve uzun süre devam eden bağımsızlık hareketlerinden dolayı sürekli kargaşa içinde olan bir ülke olmuştur. Bununla birlikte, İrlanda modernleşmesi dünyaca tanınmış üç yazarın, William B. Yeats, James Joyce ve Samuel Beckett, öncülük ettiği edebi modernleşmeyle ilişkilidir ve aslında bakılsursa bu isimler olmadan İrlanda modernleşmesi şu anda olduğu gibi algılanamazdı. Resim, mimari ve müzikte yaşanan diğer gelişmeler dil devriminde ve edebiyat alanında yaşananlara kıyasla daha az çarpıcıdır.

Yabancılaşma ve Dublin ve Rey Şehri’nin kentsel uzamları üzerine olan üçüncü bölüm, romanlardaki iki şehrin bilince ait kentsel mekanlarının temsili hem bireyen yabancılaşmasını hem de bazı durumlarda mekanın kendisinin nasıl yabancılaştırıcısı olduğunu ortaya koyar. Kapılar, kapı aralıkları ve pencere gibi liminal alanlar yabancılaşma sonucunda yer değiştirme, yönünü kaybetme, anlam karmaşasına yol açar. *Ulysses*’de, bilince ait çeşitli mekan örnekleri bulunmaktadır ve bunlar, karakterlerin bilince aidiyetinin ve durumlarının bulanıklığının yanı sıra yalnızlıklarını ve yabancılaşma duygularını da yansıtmaktadırlar. Romanın başından itibaren (Haines, Mulligan ve Stephen birbirleriyle konuşmaya başladılar), on beşinci bölüme kadar (Circe) (Dublin’in genelevi mahallesi), betimlenen liminal mekanlar, yabancılaşma ve liminal alanları konu ettiği bu analitik bölümde olduğu gibi, kopma duygusu ve kişisel yabancılaşmayı dile getirirler. Öte yandan, *Kör Baykuş*’ta Rey Şehri Joyce’ün Dublin’inden daha izole ve çok daha az bir nüfusa sahip bir biçimde resmedilmiştir. Odasının iki penceresinin kente açılması sırasında söz edilmiş ve odak noktası, nerederse tümyle, kahramanın odası ve duvarlarıdır. Oda, kahraman tarafından türbe gibi betimlenmiştir, odasının penceresi gerçekte bir kasap manzarasını açmaktadır (karşıdaki kasap dükkanı); kentteki diğer evlerin pencereleri arkalarında hiç kimse yaşamışaormuşçasına iletişimde kapalı ve tehdit edici bir biçimde gösterilmiştir. Bu romanda, karakterin yabancılaşma ve kopma duygusu bu durumların liminallığı ve belirsizliği aracılığıyla aktarılmışken, kahramanın kendi heterotopyasını yaratmıştır; iç monologları açık bir biçimde odasının kapalı mekanında gerçekleşirken, çevresindeki şeyler ve evde bulunan insanlarla sahici bir ilişki
kurmayı beceremez, aşırı yabancılaşma ve yalnızlaşma belirtileri gösterir. Joyce ve Hidayet’in romanları yabancılaştırıcı bir toplumda kökünden koparılmış ve yalıtılmış bireyle rin semptomlarını ortaya koyarlar.


Bu iki romandaki bir diğer ortak nokta anlatı tarzlarının karmaşıklığı ve aşırı linguistik denemelerdir. Yabancılaştırıcı dil ve anlatım tarzları, karakterlerin ve
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genel olarak romanların yabancılaşmalarını ifade etmektedir. Her iki yazar da
geleneksel yazılı dilin ötesindeki araçlar tarafından yaratılmış anlamlara ilgi
duyduklar. Joyce’un, büyük harflerle yazılmış sözüklere ve gazete başlıklarında
görüldüğü gibi, sik sık kullandığı parçalı gorsel yazılı dil iletişimin terübesinin de
parçalanmış ve yabancılaştırıcı olabileceği göstermektedir. Bu tarz geleneksel
gösterilen ve gösterilen ilişkisinden farklıdır ve kesin bir anlam ulaşmayı
engellemektedir. Öte yandan, Hidayet’in yoğun şiirimsi dili ise sahnelerin,
olayların, insanların ve sözüklere ironik tekrarları ile doludur; bu yüzden de
okuyucular üzerinde yabancılaştırıcı bir etki ve anlatıcı için de yabancılaşmış bir
iletisim tarzı yaratmaktadır.

Uzunluklarına ve anlatı tarzlarının çeşitliliklerine rağmen, her iki romanda
da iç monologlarla bilinç aksını hakimiyeti, karakterler arasında sahici bir
iletisimin yokluğunu belirtir. Bundan dolayı, bu tarzlar romanlardaki
karakterlerin yabancılaşmasını da yansıtılmaktadır. Bir diğer deyişle, Ulysses ve
Kör Baykuş gibi modernist romanların dil ve anlatı tarzlarında görülen sürekli yer
değiştirme, dolaysız veya sahici iletişimin araçlarından dışlanmış olan veya
kendilerini bunlardan dışlanmış hissediren bireylerin olduğu bir toplumda
karakterlerin yabancılaşmiş konumunu yansıtmaktadır.

Bloom, Molly, Stephen ve Hidayet’in kahramanlarının dinlerinin yabancı dili
olan Latince ve Arapça konusunda hassasiyet göstermeleri her iki romanın da dinin
ezici etkisine karşılaşma anlamına gelmektedir. Yabancı dillerin zaten mevcut
olan yabancılaştırıcı etkilerinin yanında bir de bunlar toplumda baskıçılı rollere sahip
olan dillerin dillerinde olunca bireylere için daha da yabancılaştırıcı hale gelmektedir.

Göç, diyaspora, bunalım, aşın yalnızlık ve hepsinden öngörüсерi sürgün gibi
yabancılaşma fikri ile bağlantılı olan çok sayıda kavram ve terim bulunmaktadır.
Ancak bu tez, yabancılaşmaya dışlanmışlık hissi veya durumu olarak odaklandı. Bu
yüzden, en yakından ilgili terimler olarak sürgün ve gönülü sürgün terimlerine,
tezin teorik bölümünün yanı sıra analitik bölümlerde de ilintili olan yerlerde
değinildi ancak çalışmanın odagına sadık kalmak uğruna diğer terimlere yer
verilmemiştir.
İki farklı arkaplana sahip edebiyat ve modernist kültürleri incelemesi dolayısıyla bu araştırma, karşılaştırmalı çalışmalar bölümünde, modernism ile alakalı bölüm ve enstitülerde, Orta Doğu ve Bölge Çalışmaları alanlarında incelemeyi, genişletilmeye ve araştırılmaya elverişliydi. Bu araştırmayı daha da kapsamlı bir çalışma haline getirmek amacıyla İrlanda’dan Beckett ve İran’dan da Bozorg Alavi, Sadeq Choobak ve Mahmoud Dowlatabadi gibi modernist yazarlar bu çalışmaya dahil edilebilir; böylece bu zamanın ve bölgelerin edebiyatında yabancılaşmanın yansıtlama biçimleri daha da zenginleştirilmiş olur. Ayrıca yukarıda da ifade edildiği gibi, bu tür çalışmaları komşu ülkelerin yüksek modernizm dönemindeki edebiyatlarını da içerebilir.

Modernizm çalışmalarında aynı bir konu olarak kadınların yabancılaşması meselesi de gelecekteki araştırmalarda bağımsız ve derinlemesine bir şekilde incelenebilecek oldukça ilgi çekici ve zengin bir başka konudur. Bu araştırmada sunulan analiz, yirmi bir yüzyılın ilk yıllarında üretilen ve yabancılaşmanın dikkate değer bir şekilde erkekler tarafından temsil edildiği İrlanda ve İran edebiyatlarında kadınların çift-katmanlı bir şekilde dışlanmış ve madun figürler olabileceğinin altını özellikle çizdi.

yönetsel ve dinsel sistem sorunlarına ilişkin kaygılar, muhafazakâr ve geleneksel yazım tarzları, kadınların marjinalliği, ve toplumsal değişim tecrübesi ile bağlantılı olarak ülkelerin marjinalliği kendilerini, romanlardaki bireylerin yabancılaşmasını, bu yabancılaşmayı yerler ve deneyimsel dil kullanımı aracılığıyla betimlemeye yansıtmaktadırlar. İki farklı ülkeden bu iki modernist romanın incelenmesi, modernizmin farklı bağlamlar ve deneyimlerde benzer sanatsal sonuçlara sebep olduğunu ispatladı. Bu da modernizmin evrenselliğine dair güçlü bir kanittır.
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