In this chapter an attempt is made to consider the personalities of two young men in modern literature: Stephen Dedalus, the protagonist of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*¹ and Krishan Chander Azad the protagonist of the autobiographical novels considered in this thesis. In this connection it is interesting that Krishan has been referred to as an 'Indian Dedalus'.² This chapter therefore proposes to study the characters of Krishan and Stephen in the context of their growth to young manhood; consequently the study will compare two individual responses to understanding the life around them. The comparison, however, does not include a study of the two novelists as artists; their style, technique or other fictional achievements.

---


   Quotations used throughout this chapter are from this edition. The title has been abbreviated to 'PAIM' when referred to in the quotations.

The main reason for choosing Joyce, as a comparison to Anand comes from Anand himself:

"... I discovered James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, with the hero's insistence on going away to 'encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to gorge on the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race'. And I was inspired to begin a confessional novel of my own".  

Further, by their very nature, the autobiographical novels chronicle the protagonist's struggle to find his own way of life. Their stories present the individual's response to his environment and to the pressures exerted by that environment to cast him into a mould apparently accepted by custom and tradition. Both the autobiographical novels record the protagonist's struggle to resist these social pressures and to find a way independent of hitherto accepted norms. In fact Joyce and Anand happen to express Stephen's and Krishan's call to their tryst with destiny in similar terms:

---

"Welcome, O life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race". (PATH, p. 228)

"'Let me burn the metal in the fire of my soul and beat it into shape on the smithy of my conscience'"  
(MF, p. 571)

Moreover, in its broad outline, for Stephen as well as Krishan, life begins with the carefree happiness of childhood. Both Stephen and Krishan are more sensitive and intelligent than most normal children; which, coupled with an inquiring mind, inevitably leads them to ask questions. The protagonists' action is also against similar socio-political backdrops. Apart from being under political subjugation Krishan and Stephen inherit a heritage, rife with religious dissent, educational inferiority and ignorance, attempts for freedom, and an emotional reverence to 'nationalism'. Thus, the text of both the autobiographical novels as the growth or formation of character of the protagonist from early childhood to initial manhood in almost similar circumstances makes this comparison relevant to our study.
In this section the individual response of Stephen's rebellion has been articulated, as portrayed in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. The study seeks to trace the significant points of Stephen's rebellion: What he rebels against? How he rebels? What does he reject? And what is he ready to accept? This section will attempt to answer these questions by examining Stephen's growth and development before comparing Krishan's and Stephen's individual responses.

At the end of the autobiographical novel, an emphatic and resolute Stephen tells his friend Cranly:

"I will not serve that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church; and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can, using for my defence the only arms I allow myself to use - silence, exile, and cunning."

(*PAM*, p. 222)
In declaring his decision Stephen makes it clear that he has ceased to believe in his home, nation and religion. Moreover, he not only refuses to 'serve' but also wishes to go away, as it were, severing all connections in a self-imposed exile - How is it that Stephen grows up to 'no longer believe', making 'exile' worthwhile and justifiable ?.

The study will trace the growth of Stephen from childhood to young manhood to find his reasons for his final disenchantment. As a child Stephen is fond of his parents, 'Nice mother' and 'Gentleman' is his opinion about them; he also misses home while away at Clongowes. As a young school boy, Stephen characterises a sensitive, intelligent, and inquiring student who is given to contemplation and imagination. Thus, the vastness and meaning of the universe, his own place in the vastness, intrigue him almost metaphysically. Stephen's desire to know about things and his sensitivity to the limitations of his perception is manifested in his reaction to Wells' question whether he kissed his mother good night. The fact that he was laughed at makes him wonder:

"What was the right answer to the question? He had given two and still Wells laughed. But Wells must know the right answer"... (PAJM, p.13).
Therefore Stephen wants to know what is the right answer and the inability to comprehend the issue at hand pains him. Likewise whether it is Wells' question, the universe, God, or politics Stephen shows a great desire to understand the situation. This desire becomes poignant when coupled with an observation he makes:

"By thinking of things you could understand them"

(PATM, p.40)

Thus, Stephen recognizes his inability to comprehend everything, but wants to grow up to understand them; for growing up signifies to him a revelation of knowledge and understanding—a passage into life. Simultaneously, he has an uncanny awareness that a 'great part ... the nature of which he only dimly apprehended' awaits him in his future life. His resolve to grow and understand is, therefore, reinforced.

In this charged comprehension of Stephen's world an almost unsettling change thrusts itself when he is not sent back to Clongowes after one summer vacation owing to his father's dwindling finances. It shocks him to realize that lasting changes in his family and in himself were taking place. Stephen neither has a mature mind to understand the change in its
fullness, nor is he so young as to be oblivious to the situation. This makes him enormously insecure. On another level, Stephen’s reaction to the misfortune is qualified by his dimly apprehended premonition that something great and vastly different awaits him: He is angry that he is a victim of the ‘change in fortune’ but decides to bide his time, with patience, distancing himself from the surroundings, withdrawing deeper into his own world, detaching himself, as it were, spiritually. This conscious detachment from his surroundings of squalor and insincerity becomes the threshold for Stephen’s ideological interospection. Alone and lonely with ‘leisure and liberty’ at his disposal, he interacts with his environ sensitively. The ephiphanies in the second chapter, provides the details of his observation and its impact on him: He begins to see the normal trivialities, the insignificant details and the common vulgarity of supposedly average lives, and in that way detaches himself from it. Thus, his mental eye begins to separate the useless chaff from the grain of life and its meaning.

In the next development, Stephen is admitted to Belvedere College. His questions about life occupy him and isolate him further from his surroundings. The young boy’s precocious, inquiring mind, becomes the intelligent mind of an adolescent. The pointedness of Stephen’s isolation from his
father comes through clearly in the description of their visit to Cork: The serious-mature Stephen (the son), accompanies the childish-playful Simon (the father) - this ironic juxtaposition of Simon, saying that his son is a 'level headed thinking boy; and Stephen seeing his father and friends thinking 'His mind seemed older than theirs' (p.38); contains the key to the reason for Stephen's isolation from his father. His father becomes a source of humiliation and disappointment to him, not only because he, Simon Dedalus, cannot monetarily provide for his family, but also cannot as father guide his son. Ideologically Stephen can get no help from his father, who becomes symbolic of a whole generation of men harping empty sounding advice to be a good fellow, a good catholic, and a gentleman. In contrast, their own lives seemed to signify a futility of purpose, and a moral cheapness of attitudes. Stephen sees his father's empty and embracing bonhomie, cheap flirtatiousness, and emotional excessiveness as marking the futility of his own relationship with him. The distancing from father is only the first in the developing detachment from the other members of his family; Stephen is overwhelmed by so great a 'savage desire' that 'nothing was sacred'. Every relationship stands 'idle and alien' in the face of his lust which he 'burned to appease'.
Ultimately, Stephen at the young age of sixteen succumbs to the lure of the sensual world. He continues to sin and stops going to mass, but continues to lead the prayers to the Blessed Virgin at Sodality meetings. This obvious hypocrisy and travesty of prayer stares him in the face. He is often confronted with his life of sin and realises the possibility of eternal damnation, yet repentance is impossible for him. However, it is important to note that while Stephen appears to be choosing the devil, his subconscious sight on God has not shifted for one moment. His mind’s eye is continuously working out the argument of his own downfall, yet Stephen allows his mortal sin to eclipse his moral duty. The grim reality of his moral transgress cannot be escaped forever, and he comes face to face with his soul at the Retreat of Saint Francis Xavier.

Stephen hears four lectures on death, judgement, hell and heaven. Every word the preacher utters seems to him specially aimed at his way of life. Stephen’s heart-rending remorse, of his sin, leaves him thoroughly shaken after the Retreat. He confronts himself in his room with an aching heart, and tries to examine his conscience:

“Was that then he or an inhuman thing moved by a lower soul than his soul?” (PAIM, p. 128)
In this reaction Stephen realises that it was his lower soul, as it were, that had argued his sanction into committing a mortal sin by seeing 'subterfuge and falsehood' in the ordinary lives around him. On the contrary the Retreat upheld a higher soul, where an idealistic life of truth, beauty and wholeness seemed attainable. As a consequence he goes to a remote end of the town, and makes a confession to an old priest. The kindly priest absolves him of his guilt and leads him back to religious life again. Filled with joy and relief he receives Holy communion at Mass the following morning and resolves to begin a new life of sanctity.

An attempt to look at the earlier religious influences on Stephen as a young boy and adolescent, in the light of his transgression, may provide certain answers about his moral perspectives, and how he is not curtailed by them into committing a mortal sin. Stephen Dedalus is the eldest child of a large, comfortably rich Irish Catholic family. His religious teaching is acquired both at home and at the Jesuit educational institutions. Stephen's religious understanding has to be examined in the context of Ireland's political situation because his childhood years coincided with a time, that had become a
hot bed of argument and debate about Parnell. Whether the church should, or it should not, exert influence over politics became a do or die question. Often those who upheld the church's moral duty were 'implied' traitors of Ireland, and those who supported Parnell consequently appeared to vote against religion and God.

Against this background the study will consider Stephen's individual response as a child, when he witnesses an argument at his first Christmas dinner with the elders of his family. Dante argues for the church, while his father and Mr. Casey (a close friend of Simon Dedalus, and an ardent follower of Parnell) decry the interference of the church in matters other than religion:

"They have only themselves to blame, said Mr. Dedalus suavely. If they took a fool's advice they would confine their attention to religion."

4. Charles Stewart Parnell (1846-91) was the great advocate of Parliamentary Home Rule for Ireland. After a long time it appeared that the Irish had finally found a leader to carry them through. Unfortunately, Parnell was cited as a co-respondent in a divorce case by Captain O'Shea. Parnell's moral transgression was actively condemned by the church, which led to his downfall, and he died soon after. The Church's involvement in influencing the withdrawal of support to Parnell sparked off intense dispute.
It is religion, Dante said. They are doing their duty in warning the people.

We go to the house of God, Mr. Casey said, in all humility to pray to our Maker and not to hear election addresses.

It is religion, Dante said again. They are right. They must direct their flocks.

And Preach politics from the altar, is it? asked Mr. Dedalus.

Certainly, said Dante. It is a question of public morality. A priest would not be a priest if he did not tell his flock what is right and what is wrong.

(PAIM, p. 29)

This argument on Christmas day sets Stephen thinking, since religion to his mind is unquestionable and always correct. This is not the first time that Stephen is hearing the argument; even earlier he had heard it and had wondered who was right: Stephen knows that Dante defends the church because she thinks that Parnell is a bad man. Otherwise like his father, and Mr. Casey, Dante too was for Ireland. She had supported Parnell, until one day when she had 'ripped the green velvet back off the brush that was for Parnell' (p.15). On the other hand, he
cannot understand why Mr. Casey, 'is against the priests'; to Stephen, the priests could not be wrong, and so he infers that Dante must be right. After all, Dante had only recently withdrawn her support since she said Parnell was a bad man; but Stephen has doubts about Dante too: He had heard his father say, that she was a 'spoiled nun'. Moreover Dante forbade Stephen from playing with Eileen, because Eileen was a protestant; since Dante said that protestants made fun of the litany of the Blessed Virgin. But Stephen also cannot understand how a women could be a Tower of Ivory, House of Gold. This sets his mind in doubt about Dante and he wonders 'who was right then? By now the seeds of doubt about religion have been sown in Stephen's mind; he realises that there are sides even to the acceptance of religion.

However, the young Stephen continues to react with a sense of morality when he hears of the theft of the sacred wine from the chapel by the older boys. Nevertheless his reflex moral attitude is immediately contrasted by his feeling that it 'thrilled him to think of it'. Again something unthinkable, forbidden, and sacrilegious had been committed, despite the power of religion and God. On another plane, Stephen's perspective about priests, the life and teachings that they embodied,
begins to change with the growing awareness and understanding in his own life. Theory and practice stand out in dichotomies – anger is sin, but when a priest is angry, is it sin or is it not? Thus when Father Arnall is angry, is he pretending or is he allowed to be angry with idle boys? Slowly in his mind, priests who are above morality begin to come within its bounds. This is reinforced by the pandying incident, where he is unjustly punished and accused of being a 'lazy little schemer'. The injustice of the whole incident, despite his innocence, makes Stephen feel that even though the Prefect of Studies was a priest he had been unfair and cruel. He was 'blind' to the truth of the situation and had acted in anger and in untruth. Therefore, the premise that a priest could 'err' and need not always signify the truth, takes shape in Stephen’s mind. However, his sense of injustice is appeased when he complains to the rector who promises to speak to the prefect. Unfortunately when Stephen later learns that his serious complaint became a hilarious joke and source of amusement for the priests, it leaves a bad taste in his mouth – A tiny voice for justice is laughed at by the religious priests who ought to uphold justice.....

By the time Stephen is back for holidays, he already doesn’t share the piety of prayer with Uncle Charles. It is at
this point that Stephen does not go back to Clongowes because of his father's financial decline. He is secured admission at Belvedere, a local jesuit organisation. In his first two years at Belvedere, Stephen starts developing views independent of the views upheld by religious sanction. Thus, Stephen for the first time dares to call poet Byron the greatest poet despite his friends exclamation that Byron is a 'heretic and immoral too':

" - I don't care what he was, cried Stephen hotly".

(FAWM, p.75)

It is at this moment that Stephen makes a conscious choice: He chooses whom he considered the 'greatest poet' despite the poet being called 'heretic and immoral'. This does not imply that he begins to patronize all writers who also happen to be condemned by religious sanction. In lending support to Newman as the best prose writer, Stephen upholds a writer despite his close affiliations to the church. In effect, he appears to make literary judgements, independant of religious sanction, as it were, on the literary merit of the writer.

On the other hand Stephen also begins to feel that his father's attitude and mental shallowness have built the uncrossable bridge between them. In fact, he admits to feeling this gap:
Stephen also begins to see the 'likeness between his father's mind and that of this smiling well-dressed priest'. Against the background of his feelings about father, it is obvious how much the office of the priest (represented in this illusion by a 'smiling well-dressed priest') has taken a dip in Stephen's mind-scale of worthiness. Accordingly he articulates how deeply he feels let down by the type of life that his father and his masters uphold. Therefore, their counsel to him to be a gentleman and a good Catholic seem to be 'hollow sounding'.

It is at this stage that Stephen also comes to look at attempts for a 'movement towards national revival', to 'help to raise up her fallen language and tradition' as hollow sounding. On the other hand, the voices of his friends urging him to be a 'decent fellow'; and as leader of the college to protect them from blame or to beg them off; and to do his 'best to get free days for the school' are equally hollow sounding. The extent to which Stephen's mind is divorced from the common place mind of his adolescent friends is seen, when he refuses to accept the advice of his friend Heron to disobey
the summons of his teacher. Stephen insists on going because he 'cared little for such points of honour': To take umbrage for not being given importance as a senior student by the manner in which his teacher sends for him, seems to Stephen' a 'sorry anticipation of manhood'. Thus, he shows how divorced he is from the trivial actualities of life around him. It is at this point in his life that he simultaneously perceives his 'own futile isolation' from his family members. If the hollow sounding voices of those about him makes their advice pointless, it is the 'fierce longings of his heart' and the 'restless shame and rancour' that divides him from his family. By now he no longer cares that he was in 'moral sin' because otherwise too his life had become a 'tissue of subterfuge and falsehood'. Even his dream to encounter the 'tryst' seems to pass when the 'lust sprang up again'; and Stephen succumbs to the world of the prostitute. From this point, we have already seen how he comes back to a world of religion with vehemence and reinforced sanctity.

Stephen's obvious piety and his seriousness singles him out as an exceptional student of the college. Impressed by his demeanour he is summoned by the director of the college and asked whether he thinks he had a calling to a life of
priesthood. Stephen is momentarily thrilled to hear the
director and to consider what it means to be a priest. The
power of hearing confession, of absolution, of secret power
and knowledge thrills him. Poised on a threshold where his
decision will result in closing the pages of one world for the
other, we will examine Stephen's involvement with religion
after he returns to the fold.

Stephen conducts his life henceforth with religious
fervour in an 'increasing circle of works of supererogation'.
Everyday was dedicated to some religious practice and trial.
He begins to feel the reality of his experience, and 'God's
power of love'. He is cautious, however, not to allow the
'dangers of spiritual exaltation to overcome him and is
constantly striving to bring his senses under 'rigorous
discipline'. Thus, he bears with whatever is unpleasant, un-
comfortable, unpalatable, unbearable, by exposing himself to
such stimuli and attempts to overcome them. He realises that
this life had opened to him a capacity not to be tempted to
sin mortally. However, he is disappointed that having conquered
the temptations to mortal sins he is still subject to 'the
mercy of childish and unworthy imperfections'. He was not able
to suppress his anger at hearing his mother sneeze or at being
disturbed in his devotions. It was only by tremendous will-
power that he could desist expressing irritation at these 
trivialities. Stephen remembers his own masters showing such 
moments and it discourages him from the 'practice of humility, 
by the comparison'. But his greatest feeling of doubt and 
spiritual dryness occurs when he realises that despite this 
life he could not feel oneness with other lives, and 'merge 
his life in the common tide of other lives'. Yet again, he is 
beset by the temptation to sin and the thought that in one 
moment 'by a single act of consent' he could wipe out all his 
spiritual gains, gives him an intense sense of power. Neverthe-
less, with effort and will, Stephen 'won back his old conscious-
ness of his state of grace'. In this he is comforted to hear 
of similar experiences in the 'trails of Saints'. Thus Stephen 
feels he is still in the life with God despite these periods 
of doubt and spiritual dryness. However, he is called upon to 
confess again and again his mortal sin because his confession 
of the trivial sins does not fulfil the obligations of confes-
sion. This makes him feel that 'he would never be freed from 
it wholly, however holily he might live or whatever virtues or 
perfections he might attain'.(p.139).
Stephen's reinforced religious life also brings him into closer contact with the priests. His memory of them from his school days is that they were always intelligent and serious priests; athletic and high spirited prefects. He recalls that he had never heard a flippant word from his masters; they had on the other hand 'taught him Christian doctrine and urged him to live a good life'. They had 'led him back to grace' forgiven him for falling into grievous sin. Their presence in his life, be it in Clongowes or in Belvedere had always provided a comparative ideal to be reached. He had never once disobeyed them or questioned their opinions. However, Stephen cannot help noticing despite everything else that 'lately some of their judgements had sounded a little childish'. He recalls a priest answering a question about Victor Hugo's literary merit, by saying:

"Victor Hugo had never written half so well when he had turned against the church as he had written when he was a catholic". (PAIM, p.142)

The priest reinforces this judgement by finally commenting that Louis Veuillot had purer style than Victor Hugo according to

5. Louis Veuillot, a political Catholic paper which supported the Church in its right to interfere in Civil affairs. His style was supposed to be that of a first rate journalist.
some eminent French critics. This opinion and another about the moral exclusiveness of a life such as Lord Macaulay's, falls on Stephen's ears. The opinions make him feel a sense of 'regret and pity'. In this reaction Stephen acknowledges that his opinion about the subject concerned is vastly different; and in this acknowledgement he also begins to feel that he was 'slowly passing out of an accustomed world and were hearing its language for the last time'. At this moment, as it were, Stephen begins to unconsciously 'detach' himself from the world of the priests. In answering the director's question, Stephen only gives a final touch to his already completed canvas of detachment. Thus the reality of a priest's life brings a picturesque evocation:

"The troubling odour of the long corridors of Clongowes came back to him and he heard the discreet murmur of the burning gasflames. At once from every part of his being unrest began to irradiate".(PAWM, p. 145)

This instant of mental vision appears to be a choice either to walk the grave life symbolised by the 'troubling odour' of Clongowes and thus to ignore the 'discreet' call of another life of 'burning gasflames'. Instantaneously this recognition tunes him to the world of his visions and he knows that he
cannot submit his freedom for religious priesthood of the type he has come to know. Stephen realises that his destiny is to be a part of normal life, exclusive of such religious or social orders which inhibit his free spirit.

Stephen comes home to find his brothers and sisters lingering over the 'second watered tea' and confronts after a long time the realities of the home situation. He is overcome for an instant by a feeling of remorse, but he feels that in the example of his brothers and sisters who 'seemed weary' of life even before it had started; he detects an echo of the same situation in endless generations of children of his country. Thus, Stephen begins to see in his micro world the macro prison of his impending situation and life, in the Irish context.

After rejecting a call to take robes Stephen decides to join the university knowing fully well how much mother disapproves of this decision. Her 'listless silence' and 'mistrust' trouble him more than his 'father's pride'. He is thus affected by the emotions of his family members, and in that way curtailed in his freedom. Impatient to wait any longer for his father, who has gone to enquire about a place
for him in the university, Stephen sets off to the sea to be alone with himself. On the way he meets a group of Christian brothers and is filled with 'personal shame and commiseration' because they signify to him a world of piety, humbleness, and devotion contrasted to his situation. But the memory of the great artificer whose name he bore lifts his from the dejection and he realises that he will 'create proudly out of the freedom and power of his soul.... a living thing, new and soaring and beautiful, impapable, imperishable'. In this decision Stephen chooses the life of the creative artist. The final vindication of his choice is achieved as Stephen realises again his purpose in life in a moment of revelation that he experiences on the seashore. In that instant in which he recognizes the 'mortal beauty' embodied by the girl is revealed his new religion, and destiny of life. No wonder Stephen cannot help exclaiming in the truly conventional, religious expression of supreme happiness — 'Heavenly God': He is impelled to accept the robes of artistic priesthood, and fulfil its obligations:

"To live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life." (PATM, p. 156)
Stephen as a student of the university, pursues his end of artistic destiny, in meditations and musings about art, aesthetics and the theory thereof. Simultaneously he also becomes aware of the pressures of the environment in which nationalistic causes become a great force. These forces call upon Irishmen to be a fenian and also upholder of universal peace. The irony of the situation is not lost on Stephen who refuses to be a part of any of such activity. Subsequently, he disowns his duty as an Irish national refusing, 'to pay in my own life and person debts' made by his ancestors. In doing so he does not admit to be anti-Irish but refuses to accept the mantle of responsibility thrust by Irish history and tradition on every Irishman. Stephen's argument for doing so is the sad betrayal in generations of Irish history which withdrew support to its leaders in the manner of Parnell:

"When the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of nationality, language, religion, I shall try to fly by those nets". (PATM, p.184)

In choosing such a life Stephen has moments of fear and doubt but the call for his life urges him onwards. Stephen's individual response in refusing to honour his mother's wish, that
he make his Easter duty, contains his germinal position regarding all matters that he rejects. By refusing to participate in the religious ritual Stephen knows that he is hurting his mother. However, he cannot perform his duty as a mere ritual just to make her happy. In expressing his refusal to make communion Stephen, not only refuses to serve that which he no longer believes, but also refuses to pay false homage, and therefore, commit a sacrilege. It is in this balance of vision, to refuse to perform a ritual of the church in which he has lost faith, but simultaneously admitting that the church ritual may be more than mere ritual, that Stephen shows his depth of seriousness: In this reaction Stephen almost shows a moral idealism by refusing to 'perform', unlike scores of agnostic Christians who will go through the ritual in disbelief. His emphasis is not so much on his 'disbelief' as it is on his wish not to hypocritically perform religious duties. Stephen would rather make the mistake of rejecting all of religion, than make the mistake of being a conscious religious hypocrite; it is this that he expresses when he says:

"I do not fear to be alone or to be spurned for another or to leave whatever I have to leave. And I am not afraid to make a mistake, even a great mistake, a life long mistake and perhaps as long as eternity too:" (PAWM, p.223)
It is quintessentially this sort of choice — between becoming a part of that which he no longer believes, and that of refusing to pay 'false homage' whether to religion, to Irish nationalism, to world peace and to his family that impels Stephen into choosing exile. The revelation of artistic destiny to 'discover the mode of life or of art where by your spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom' gives purpose and meaning to his exile. In the final chapter Stephen completes the decision of his detachment by opting for exile and in it signifying physical as well as mental isolation. The effort of this detachment is evident when Stephen finally calls off his relationship with his girlfriend of ten years, as the final call before his take off into exile. The solitary priest of artistic calling, then calls out to his namesake Dedalus to 'stand him in good stead'.
In the earlier section Stephen Dedalus' individual response culminating in his decision to 'no longer believe' in his home, his fatherland, or his church has been outlined. This decision led Stephen to refuse to become a 'normal' son, a 'normal' Roman Catholic and a 'normal' Irishman, and completely disinherit family ties, religious faith and Irish shelter to pursue his aim to 'discover the mode of life or art whereby your spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom'. Similarly, the earlier three chapters have chronicled Krishan Chander's rebellion and rejection of his own tradition. This section compares Krishan and Stephen in the context of their rebellion. The comparison lays emphasis on their story of struggle because the heroes take issue with 'what is as it is' and ultimately refuse to find their way in conformity. This section will raise certain questions for comparison: What are their points of rebellion? How do they argue out their case for rebellion? How far does their rebellion portray verisimilitude and authenticity? In answering these questions can we get a comparative perspective of Krishan and Stephen as young men?
A comparative perspective of the totality of their rebellion shows that Stephen's case for rejection is built up over a longer time than Kristian's. Stephen's detachment and rejection of his familiar world begins in small ripples continuously gaining momentum through his experiences and understandings from early childhood onwards. In the process of his growth these ripples of doubt are momentarily calmed at various situations and points of his young life. However, the momentum reaches a crescendo when Stephen is faced with a possible life of priesthood. It is at this juncture that he takes the plunge into life and, not only rejects a religious vocation, but also takes the first step towards dissociating his life with that which he 'no longer believes'. In effect, Stephen's rejection is signified in that moment in which he refuses to take the robes of priesthood; but in actuality it is only an occasion that precipitates a long standing decision. The build up for this decision has been gathering force from the moment Stephen has consciously begun to interact with the world; thus he gathers evidence for his opinions, from his earliest doubt about Wells' laughter, his doubts about universe and God, his doubts about priestly opinions, his doubts about father's opinions, his doubts about Dante's opinions and the doubts
about his own opinions. It is when he is working out the doubt about his own opinion by living a life of religious supererogation that he begins to revert back and rely on the validity of his own judgement and purpose in life. It is this process that finds its destination when Stephen rejects religious priesthood for artistic priesthood. In effect the process of rejection has matured over the time from the days when Stephen was at school to the days when he enters the university. In the university he argues out his case in conversations and gives justification to his decisions. In the final analysis, therefore, Stephen embodies a young man who has dwelt over and taken his time to make his decision.

On the other hand, how does Krishan stand in a similar perspective? The articulation of Krishan's objections begin in the second autobiographical novel, the Morning Face which chronicles his life till the completion of matriculation. In the Morning Face itself, Krishan raises his objections to the religion and tradition of his society and articulates his rejection of them by deciding to become a 'supreme rebel'. In the beginning of the Confession of a Lover the rejection is complete by his decision to 'find out my own way'. It is also
clear that in the autobiographical novels *Confession of a Lover* and *The Bubble* Krishan's premise of rejection does not change from that which is articulated in *Morning Face*. In effect, therefore, Krishan's rejection begins and is finally formulated in the *Morning Face* itself. However, this is not to suggest a comparative default in Krishan because he so early articulates the points of rejection, but to show that he does not use the experiences of his life after matriculation to bear upon his decisions at all. In this process Krishan apparently justifies his decisions on the basis of evidence gathered in the span of life till the completion of his school education. In comparison to Stephen, therefore, Krishan appears to have come to conclusions when he is far younger than his western counterpart.

In the above context the question that follows is whether Krishan has been able to consider all the parameters influencing his rejection to the extent that Stephen does. An answer to this question will be sought in the manner in which Stephen and Krishan work out the case of their rejection of religious tradition.

Stephen's rejection of his religious tradition can be studied in two stages. The first stage is signified when he
consciously visits a prostitute thus committing a mortal sin by Roman Catholic tradition. In this process he at least by action appears to disregard the fact that his soul can be damned for eternity as a religious punishment. However, what is it that allows Stephen, despite his Roman Catholic beliefs to fall prey to a mortal temptation and risk eternal damnation? The answer to this question is contained in his own admission:

"He cared little that he was in mortal sin, that his life had grown to be a tissue of subterfuge and falsehood..." (Patm. pp. 90-91)

In admitting that 'his life had grown to be a tissue of subterfuge and falsehood' Stephen gives his reason for his mortal sin. This is so because at this stage in his life he had come to see the superficiality and insincerity of the other lives around him. The ideal upheld by those who guided him had made him look at life as 'subterfuge and falsehood': Since the dichotomy between ideal and practice whether in religion (as seen in the lives of the Jesuit priests), or in gentlemanly life (as seen in the life symbolised by his father) coupled with its relation to the political situation of Ireland, helps Stephen to become disenchanted and disillusioned with the life they represent. His idealistic vision of them slowly crumbles when he begins
to see the actuality of their lives and thus its limitations. This is reinforced by his already adolescent urge for sexual passion and gives him the justification that, by committing a mortal sin he was only rejecting a life of idealistic religion which was essentially what the others were doing too, albeit subtly. But Stephen is more serious and contemplative than he allowed himself credit for. The proof of this observation is justified when we see that he cannot face his own justification for the mortal sin and rejoins his religious faith after attending the Retreat. This begins his second stage of religious involvement and provides justification for his ultimate rejection.

In re-accepting the sanctity of religious life, Stephen is motivated, not only because he re-recognises the implications of committing a mortal sin against religious sanction; but because the Retreat upholds to him another life of greater religious intensity and truth than that which he had hitherto known. It opens to him a possibility of life which will transcend the existing 'subterfuge and falsehood' and offers him a life of wondrous openness, sincerity, truth and, therefore, unqualified freedom from being thethered to mediocrity. It is this vision
of wholeness, beauty and harmony in life that Stephen seeks, and he, therefore, takes to a religious life with vehemence and practises its rituals to the point of supererogation as prescribed by Catholic tradition. Unfortunately, Stephen is not able to find that which he seeks, and soon begins to see the obvious dichotomy between actuality and ideal once again despite fulfilling all the obligations of practice and ritual. He begins to get disenchanted because he sees how this life still contains 'subterfuge and falsehood': His failure to master himself, the failure of his masters to master themselves, the absence of an all abiding grace and oneness with his surroundings, together with the rigidity of religion which misrepresents opinions and literary judgements as in the case of Victor Hugo, Lord Byron. Stephen who holds a difference of opinion in these matters sees how religious conformity can misrepresent the truth — he sees how one has to sacrifice one's independence to be a part of the religious sect. These discordant notes stand out in loud mockery when he is on the threshold of priesthood. Stephen realises that by taking to religious robes he is again accepting a life of 'subterfuge and falsehood' — the very thing which we wants to abstain from. He knows that by accepting
a religious life he will be committing a conscious act of 'false homage' because he has not been able to reach the ideal religious life. Therefore, his life will become a religious life of medicore vision and understanding. This means the 'sacrifice of his freedom' because he has to conform, propagate and symbolise a life which is not the ideal. This convinces him that his destiny is to be elusive of social and religious orders. By working out a destiny of 'artistic priesthood' Stephen rejects 'religious priesthood', not because it is wrong, but because he himself cannot attain its ideal form. Thus, his stand in all matters becomes the stand he takes when he refuses to sign the petition for universal peace:

"My signature is of no account ... You are right to go your way. Leave me to go mine". (PAM, p. 180)

Finally Stephen's rejection of religion is a rejection of the religious way as practised and upheld by the church of his day. The emphasis here is that Stephen will only reject the travestial understanding and interpretation of religion that has come to be accepted as the religious way of his times. He will not, however, extend this rejection to the ideal religious tradition of his church which he himself failed to attain. Even
the manner of rejecting the travestial religion is based on personal experience, personal effort to reject the travestial and trial to achieve the ideal. This rejection is carried out in seriousness, in an effort to understand the other point of view in its full depth and scope.

In contrast, how does Krishan work out his case for rejecting the tradition of religious life of his forefathers? Krishan too takes issue with the practice of religion as he sees it in his young but sensitive life in Morning Face. He also sees the obvious dichotomy between what is preached and that which is practised in the lives of his parents, his neighbours and by priests, the supposed custodians of religious tradition. This together with illogical superstition, irrelevant practices, an immoral life style in the higher castes, a fanaticism about the caste system, capped by the inhuman practice of untouchability, all in the name of religion secures Krishan's decision to rebel against the religious life of his people. He wants to free himself from this immoral dictatorship of travestial religious sanction and become a human being. But how does he work out this endeavour?

Krishan who takes objection to the understanding and practice of religion of his day uses it as a basis, not only
to reject that which he finds amiss, but also the entire religious tradition of India. It is in this extent of rejection, that Krishan differs vastly from his western counterpart, who only rejects the fettered mediocrity of the religious understanding of his day and never its ideal form as a possible way of life. It is because Krishan rejects religion in its entirely that he even questions the existence of God with the doubt, placing emphasis on the surety of God's non-existence; While Stephen who has come 'not to believe' wonders, whether the ideal form has God behind the belief, placing emphasis on the possibility of His existence. Therefore, Stephen's rejection is a studied response while Krishan's appears to be a rushed one. Similarly a comparison of the manner in which Krishan rejects religious practice with that of Stephen's shows the lacuna in Krishan's understanding and argument, since his rebellion draws proof from personal interpretation, a refusal to consider the other point of view and a complete absence of personal religious involvement. Thus, his rebellious endeavour is marked by a complete absence of a consideration of the classical texts of Indian tradition (the Upanishads, the Gita, etc.) or an examination of the lives of India's innumerable saints, who
have chronicled their efforts to understand her religious tradition. Further, his rebellion takes argument from the practice of untouchability even in the face of the doctrine of the Arya Samaj and other faiths like Buddhism and Jainism; and finally refuses to even consider a contemporary endeavour by Gandhi to fight against the inhuman practice. In effect, his rebellion appears to be a pre-emption of the other points of view. On the other hand Stephen’s rejection draws sustenance from personal experiences, consideration and thoughtfullness of the other point of view, personal involvement and interpretation. It is in this qualitative difference that Krishan’s rebellion appears to be non-serious attempt. Therefore had Krishan like Stephen considered the various other points of view, and then built his rebellious rejection on the basis of his ideological difference with them, his endeavour would have contained the authenticity, verisimilitude and seriousness that characterises Stephen’s endeavour. In the final analysis, therefore, Krishan’s articulation of the parameters of his rebellion in the Morning Face itself appears to contain all the shortcomings of arriving at an early decision in so grave a matter.
Against this background the study attempts a comparison of the end that Krishan and Stephen want to achieve by rebelling against the accepted system of life; and what they are ready to sacrifice to achieve their ends. It is clear that both Stephen and Krishan want to attain a condition of freedom; a freedom that will permit them to be what they want to be, and what they wish to do. It is for freedom that Stephen ultimately decides, not only to discard religious priesthoood, but also religious life, family ties and national roots. Stephen believes that by becoming a part of normal Irish life his role as an Irishman, as a Roman Catholic and as Simon Dedalus's son is fettered to a role of 'subterfuge and falsehood' to utter insincerity and superficiality. He feels that he will be a cog in the Irish machine which has not only ceased production but also crushes to living death all those who desire to keep it running. It is the dead-end situation of Irish life whether in religion or in nationalistic struggle that compels Stephen to rebel from joining it and seek an alternative, which he articulates when he says:

"When a soul of man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of nationality, language, religion, I shall try to fly by those nets". (PAM, p.184)
This rebellion then becomes a call for freedom, because it is only a freedom from the quagmire of existing life in Ireland that Stephen can create and fulfil the obligations of the role of artistic priesthood and thereby create the conscience of his people. In desiring freedom Stephen's stress is not on the fact that it frees him from an obligation to his nation, to his religion and to his family. On the contrary his stress is on his tryst with destiny to discover another 'mode of life or of art whereby your spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom'. For this end, Stephen is ready to make the sacrifices it entails – he accepts loneliness, to the extent that he gives up friendship, not only of his peer mates, but that of his family and even that of the girl whom he has known for ten years. In accepting such loneliness Stephen gives up the pleasures and security arising from such relationships. In this sense he sacrifices immediate happiness to tread a lonely and dreary path in search of a way of life. In choosing this way, Stephen's seriousness and gravity is equally balanced by his acknowledgement that he may be committing a 'life long mistake' by his choice. His humility in accepting the possibility of a mistake against the background of his seriousness and commitment adds splendour to his endeavour.
On the other hand, how does Krishan define his freedom and what is he ready to sacrifice to achieve his end? Krishan’s first call for freedom begins in *Morning Face* to secure a release from the immorality of religious practices of his day. However, what begins as a moral rejection of immoral religious practices in Krishan’s case extends also to rejecting principles of religious and social restrictions prescribed for living in the Indian context. Therefore, Krishan’s rebellion calling for freedom wants to reject religion, not only in its travestial practices, but also in the restrictions that it prescribes for ideal human behaviour and way of life. It is in this idea of freedom that Krishan accepts the style of life symbolised by aunt Devaki or Mumtaz in the *Morning Face*. However, Krishan does not see the obvious disparity in trying to ask for freedom from travestial religious practice (because of its immorality) on the one hand, and also desire freedom to follow a way of life symbolised by aunt Devaki which is immoral in the ideal religious context. Therefore, freedom for Krishan, not only symbolises a denial of meaningless religious practices, but also an escape from its principles of limit. It is essentially this idea of freedom that Krishan begins to practise in *Confession of a Lover* and fully articulates in *The Bubble*. The
call for freedom, therefore, becomes a passport to a life of happiness and pleasure, a life lived without restrictions or principles of limit. In the background of Krishan’s life it appears that he is not ready to sacrifice anything that will affect his pursuit of happiness or pleasure. Krishan admits this plainly when he says:

"... If I was to confess the truth, ... I wanted the excitement of love making that is why I refused all relations, which forbade these things". (COL, p.205)

Thus Krishan appears to argue for freedom to be able to fulfil his desires and pleasures for which religion and social traditions become merely impediments to be demolished by freedom. It is also clear from his life till the end of The Bubble that Krishan never seems to reconsider the credibility of individual freedom as an alternate way of life, and therefore, does not admit that it may be a mistake as an alternate way of life. This is so, even in the face of Yasmin’s death and Irene’s life as an 'aesthetic experience'. In contrast Stephen’s humility to concede the possibility of his mistake despite his deep thought makes his endeavour solemn and full of mettle. His refusal to pay 'false homage' to the
Easter Sacrament in thought or action because of his views as contrasted with Krishan's incessant prayers to God in the face of sorrow makes Stephen's character striking by its internal strength, courage of conviction and singlemindedness of purpose.

In contrast, again Krishan's descriptive characteristics at the end of The Bubble are exactly opposed to his theoretical beliefs — Thus Krishan becomes a western educated young man almost going to the bar despite his vocal defiance of father's wish to make him into a 'sahib'. He never takes part (in the real sense) in the nationalistic struggle for independence, but claims that he went to jail for doing so. He claims to be disgusted by the inhuman practice of untouchability but refuses to consider the efforts that Gandhi and other religious faiths make to counter it. Krishan rejects morality in pursuing a relationship with Yasmin, but blames his moral indoctrination for his incapacity to accept Irene's bohemian life. Krishan quotes Gandhi and Poet Iqbal, maintaining to be influenced by them but also demands and advocates individual freedom without seeing the obvious disparity. In effect, Krishan's list of 'false homages' succeeds in showing how his life is one of 'subterfuge and falsehood'. Therefore, he appears to symbolise a young man who is less serious, less committed, less contemplative, less determined, and severely lacking that grain of
character and verisimilitude which strikes our imagination in Stephen's personality.

In the final analysis, the greatest objection against Krishan is that he appears to project an incomprehensive understanding of his own tradition and culture and this indicates the fraility of his attempt in comparison to Stephen's. Therefore, his alternative of 'individual freedom' as a cure for the Indian illness when the diagnosis is itself inconvincing is difficult to accept. It is a mere conjecture and a contemporary dream at this point, but, with Krishan's aspirations for rejuvenating Indian life, his decision to seek tutelage under Gandhi coupled with Stephen's seriousness and commitment signifies optimism for contemporary Indians. Providence in the Indian context may then look forward in hope and wisdom - will Anand, therefore, fulfill such a contemporary dream in his forthcoming autobiographical novels?