In her essay "Mr. Bennet and Mrs. Brown " the English female novelist Virginia Woolf famously wrote or announced : " On or about December, 1910 human character changed" ( 1950, 96 ). Actually, characters in fiction change too , and many critics take this date as the manifesto of the modernist era in literature and arts in England and Europe. Baruch Hochman , therefore , states that " modernism in the novel took hold shortly after 1910 " ( 1983 , 11 ) Warren Friedman , similarly , writes : " Woolf had in mind revolutions occurring at the time not only in all the arts but also in the way man thinks of his universe , his social organizations , and himself " , and adds : " She was in fact , heralding what came to be known as the age of modernism " ( 1975 , 3 ). This paper explores the narrative world of modernist fiction in an attempt to crystallize the new approaches to characterization adopted by four major modernist novelists; Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821 – 1881 ), Virginia Woolf ( 1882 – 1941 ) , James Joyce ( 1882 – 1941 ) and D.H. Lawrence ( 1885 – 1930 ).

Aristotle's argument in the Poetics about art as an imitation or representation of what happens in man's life authenticates character as a device used by writers to drive the narrative movement, and to effect transformations within the literary discourse. Character , in this respect, has been regarded as a social, moral and ethical being referring to individual and collective norms of behavior and motifs. Manifestations of this function of the character in the literary text have distinguished the art of fiction since its beginnings in the eighteenth century . This function has been expressed in the form of mutually interactive relations between imaginary persons, or fictional selves, and the fashioning of public or social selves governed by definite acceptable norms and conventions.. The question of the role of literary characters in the formation of good or evil individuals, has continuously remained one essential duty of the writer . It has been impossible to separate fiction from reality in the complex processes of self-fashioning through which every fictional figure or subject must go. The qualities and intensities of external reality can be seen to have had a major bearing on the writing and elaboration of
The main premise upon which the argument presented in this paper is based is that modern fiction witnesses an obvious shift of narrative interest from the representation of external reality to the portrayal of the internal reality of the character. The concept of character in modern texts subverts and transgresses the conventions of characterization in the novels of previous ages. There is a radical departure from the conventions of characterization in 18th and 19th-century fiction, where the fictional self is seen within the social, economic, moral, religious, political, cultural and intellectual constraints of a particular society, or what is reasonably called external reality. Such old-fashioned accounts of characters and events are considered so remote from the modern complicated reality, and no longer fascinate modernist novelists. Modernist novelists rather divert to the deep regions of the internal reality of the characters and their manifestations in their behavior and lifestyles. However, before getting involved in the exploration of the world of the selected modernist texts to follow the manifestations and echoes of this diversion to internal reality, the two basic concepts of external reality and internal reality are to be simply and briefly clarified. External reality, also called material reality, subsumes the objects of the physical environment. It refers to all the forces and objects outside the being of the character. It, accordingly, encompasses the different natural elements of the cosmic universe, like the sun, moon, stars, air, sky, earth, ocean, along with the physical patterns of life created by humans. Internal reality, on the other, refers to the conscious and unconscious streams of ideas and thoughts running deep in the human self. It corresponds to a collection of conscious and unconscious processes and representations, usually referred to as psychical reality. Thus, when it comes to internal reality, we have dreams, desires, needs, pleasures, thoughts, feelings, emotions, sensation, imagination, impressions, and memories.

The paper is not meant, however, to present a comparative analysis of these two concepts, which exist in a dialectical and sometimes paradoxical relation throughout the works of many writers, philosophers, psychologists, critics and scholars, especially in Freud's work. The paper seeks to prove the reliability of its main premise that modern fictions reveal an outstanding diversion to the exploration of the character's internal reality and its psychological manifestations. The researcher attempts to concretize the transformations and drives that force this diversion, and the innovations that modernism has introduced to the
representation of character in fiction. Argument is concerned with the question of the qualities of fictional characters in modernist fiction, with a special reference to some prominent modernist novelists. In novel, characterization can be said to have been conducted almost always around a representational function, and characters have conventionally been drawn to represent the social, economic, and psychological realities of individuals. The paper seeks to prove that this representational function of characterization is challenged and subverted in modern fiction to such a large extent that modern fiction can be claimed to put forth its own conventions regarding characterization. Hence, the study is to examine how modern fiction transgresses the conventions of novel characterization conducted in the earlier periods, and argues that characterization becomes in modern fiction a vehicle through which the text reverberates certain problematic internal psychological issues and concerns.

It has been always claimed in literary and critical studies that modernist novelists were less skilled in character creation than were their predecessors, at least in terms of appealing to the common reader. This is actually the result of the high degree of experimentation and new thinking on the part of modernist novelists. In fact the diversion of modernist novelists to the portrayal of internal reality creates considerable challenges to the reading and understanding of the plot and characters. The lack of apparent unity, the overwhelming complexity and multi-dimensionality of modern prose bring possible problems to the readers of modernist fiction. Modernist characters appear alien because their creators insist on their own uniqueness, and because they are often depicted as aliens in a disrupted and chaotic post-war society. The characters come close to the image of the modern man as "a heap of broken images" introduced by T.S.Eliot in line 22 of the second stanza of his famous poem "The Waste Land" (1922), and that of Willy Loman, given by Arthur Miller in his play "Death of A Salesman"(1949). Characters are never sustained by a solid social frame that gives shape and content to their fragmented experience. Modernist writers like Virginia Woolf, James Joyce and Henry James appear reluctant to display narrative solutions to their characters' problems. They mean, and have a desire, to change old conventions of writing, rejecting the traditional notion of plots with linear movement (beginning, middle, end). They are also reluctant to introduce clearly defined heroes or villains.

With the apparent diversion to internal reality, character undergoes a radical transformation in modern fiction, and loses the classical definite
borders of the conventions of characterization, marked by the realistic representation of the social realities of the individuals and their struggle for making a living in their society. The modern characters become completely far from the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries figures, who act and speak compatible with their economic, social, and cultural statuses. They, accordingly lose the conventions of novel characterization expressed by Ian Watt in *The Rise of the Novel*, when he sees novel-characterization as the realistic representation of the human experience in its realistic setting and socio-historical context. (1959, 32). They also miss the mimetic function of the art of fiction introduced by Henry James in “*The Art of Fiction*”, where he presents an anatomy of the nineteenth century novel and affirms the realistic orientation of the novel genre in general by claiming that “the only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does attempt to represent life” (2001, 856). They are completely different also from the characters of the significant and noteworthy Victorian novelist George Eliot, who in line with the realist tendency of the nineteenth century conventions of characterization, portrays in *Adam Bede* characters who represent the everyday struggle of ordinary people. She claims that, "there are few prophets in the world; few sublimely beautiful women; few heroes. I can’t afford to give all my love and reverence to such rarities: I want a great deal of those feelings for my everyday fellowmen, whose faces I know, whose hands I touch, for whom I have to make way with kindly courtesy" (1997, 154).

Thus, deprived of this conventional sense of external reality, modern novelists struggle to establish their own patterns of characterization, and thus set a new mode for characterization in novel. Characters are no longer representatives of the exceedingly idealized stereotypical image of the manners, morals, and the values of the nobility or the middle class down to earth ordinary lives, expressing the realistic orientation and tradition of the eighteenth and nineteenth–centuries fiction. The novel characterization can be said to have undergone a significant transformation with the emergence of modernism, an experimental and innovative movement that characterized the cultural atmosphere of the last decades of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The great historical, socio-economic, philosophical, and scientific events and changes which occurred in Europe during that time altered people’s lives and their perception of the world in a radical way. Novelists found themselves writing about a new complicated and confusing social reality. The experience of articulating characters in modernist fiction, therefore, comes under the shadows of great and unprecedented intellectual, political, social, cultural, psychological and economic transformations.
that enhanced the way for the rise of the modern spirit and its new rebellious concept of character. In his book *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach cites the changes that started to mobilize the interests of man and forms of existence. According to Auerbach, with the widening of man’s horizon, and the increase of his experience, a crisis of adjustment arose. There came all kinds of endeavors to undermine the religious, philosophical, ethical and economic principles, which were part of the traditional heritage, and which had maintained their position of authority through slow adaptation and transformation. Auerbach believes that "the tremendous tempo" of the changes proved the more confusing because they could not be surveyed as a whole. These changes, Auerbach, goes on, have created multiple consciousness that affected twentieth century thought and literature. (1974, 549)

A crucial element that has enhanced the move to the modern era is what Jeremy Hawthorn refers to as “the spread of literacy and formal education”, which allowed for “an awareness of alternative realities”. (1982, 46). In his book *The Georgian Scene*, Frank Swinnerton, similarly, refers to the importance of the Education Acts of 1870, 1981 and 1897, and also to the importance of journalism as factors of great significance in widening people’s consciousness (1934, 6-7). To these elements, William Frierson adds the impact of science and technology. He argues that “towards its end (19th century), the pace of living began to be quickened by the use of telephone, telegraph and automobile, and concludes that when scientific view had become a common knowledge it turned attention to a new and exciting conception of living. Man, as Frierson claims, started to doubt many of the facts and values of his society and to question the validity of its institutions (1965, 144).

Technological progress and scientific developments despite easing people’s lives in many respects, caused a significant disillusionment due to their being misemployed in the First World War, and thus resulting in a large number of casualty, economic loss as well as an intense physical and emotional destruction. Given this, the optimistic notion of an ordered, rational, and comprehensible world was replaced by a pessimistic perception of a chaotic and unordered image. Evidently, during the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century many forces acted to generate the new era of English modernist literature. The movement towards this era, has been, undoubtedly, accelerated by the outbreak of the First World War, which created the sense of confusion and uncertainty. This sense was aggravated by the scientific discoveries and the psychological findings of Freud and Jung about human behavior. Freud divided the human mind into three regions; the Id (unconscious), the Ego (
conscious personality) and the Super – Ego (conscience). He viewed dreams and neurotic symptoms as the result of drives rising from the Id, being repressed by the Ego and Super – Ego, and finding expression in displaced forms. Jung, a student of Freud, introduced the idea of the "Collective Consciousness" (a racial memory inherited by all members of the human family and connecting modern man with primeval roots). These ideas of Freud and Jung were highly influential on literary thought and on the concept of character. (See David Lodge, 1986, 35 & 174)

These socio-cultural, scientific, political, economic and psychological transformations that have facilitated the advance of modernism are extensively discussed by Douglas Hewitt in English Fiction of the Early Modern Period 1890 – 1940. Hewitt refers to the famine, wars and revolutions which broke out in various places of Europe throughout the nineteenth century. He refers to the theories of Freud that have affected the conceptions of personality and responsibility, and to Darwin’s ideas about the origin of species, which have shaken religious certainties and have weakened social and cultural stability. Hewitt also refers to the arguments for and against imperialism, which have been widespread between 1890 -1910, when Britain was at the height of its imperial power. (1992, 1-9)

As a result of these grand transformations, there has been what can be described as a breakdown of assumptions about continuity and stability. Hewitt records the impact of this on fiction when he states that: “We find writers like Joyce struggle for emancipation from orthodox, some like Bennet take the decline of religion for granted and some like Lawrence search angrily and wishfully for something to take its place (1992, 6) He also reveals its reflections on art in general, saying:

In the arts, the argument goes on, this was reflected in works which broke sharply with the conventions, both of technique and subject - matter … Much of the art of the period was marked by disjunction, fragmentatarness, the denial of logic, and the breaking of previously assumed patterns of response. Only such an age could have produced Picasso, Joyce, the Surrealists, Eliot, the Expressionists, and Serial Music. This modernist movement is to be found in all the arts and it is international in scope. (1992, 2-3)
In his argument about the notion of self, which constitutes one of the most focal questions of Western philosophy and modernist vision, Ihab Hassan states that the concept of self “has become an essentially contested category, continually revised, devised, supervised, or denied” (1988, 428). In modern fiction, the human self is no longer the plain and open one shaped by its external surrounding environment, one whose behavior and action can be easily detected, followed, articulated and explained by the novelists. The subconscious and unconscious drives, which outflow from the deep dark regions of the unconscious become responsible for much of the action of the character. Much of what the character does becomes, therefore, confusing, unpredictable, uncertain, fragmentary and difficult to describe. With the findings of the school of psychological analysis of Freud and Jung, the portrayal of character in modernist fiction witnessed a radical shift from the external reality to the internal sophisticated and fragmentary internal reality of the character. In fact, Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytical theory had a ground-breaking influence on the diversion to external reality in modernist fiction, especially on characterization. Freud’s discovery of the unconscious, his analysis of the psyche and dividing it into three components (Ed, Ego and Super-ego), and his interpretation of dreams to unfold the unconscious did not only mark a new epoch in understanding the human psyche, but also pushed the novelists towards the invention of new radical techniques through which the new modern narrative experience and its representative figures can be encompassed and articulated. According to Nicole Ward Jouve, contrary to the notion of ordered and rational human psyche, as perceived in the Enlightenment, the new perception of the human psyche as chaotic, repressive, irrational, and driven by impulses has led to new ways of looking at art and new ways of reading literary texts in particular” (2000, 245). This shift to the portrayal of the internal reality has become the core of the narrative vision, and it necessarily required new narrative techniques like the stream of consciousness, which made it possible for the novelists to follow the actions of the modern character, which became in the form of spontaneous overflow of ideas, thoughts, memories and recollections, driven from the subconscious and the unconscious in a highly confusing way. About this new emerging order, that was being shaped in the modern era, Malcolm Bradbury writes:

From about 1870 to the outbreak of the First World War, the shape of the new order was, as we can see, being increasingly exposed. Custom and inherited belief were more radically in
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dissolution than before; old ways of living were broken into by new ones on a large scale; the movement of change acquired the quality of rush. The multiple origins from which thought sprang, the solvency of old ideals in new circumstances, often brought about a sense of the relativity of values, and hence encouraged new notes of cultural despair, new kinds of irony, new feelings that civilization in the traditional sense was in question. (1972, 47)

Thus, the broad social, political, economic, psychological and technological changes took the modernist thought to a new image of the world and of man, and forced novelists to destroy and forsake old narrative techniques and look for new ones. Informed by the philosophical and psychological developments that took place at the time, the writers of the period applied experimentations in their fiction to cope with the spirit of the age. In her important essay “The Modern Fiction”, Virginia Woolf believes that, interested in the dark places of psychology, the modernist writers contested abiding by the conventional features of characterization such as lifelikeness and coherence. Instead, they inclined towards depicting the irregular and unorganized flow of thoughts, impressions, and emotions of characters by employing such narrative strategies as stream of consciousness and fragmented interior monologues. The motive became to represent the psychological realities of characters not their social and economic circumstances.(See Andrew McNeille, 1984, 162). In his study Postmodern Characters: A Study of Characterization in British and American Postmodern Fiction, Aleid Fokkema argues that postmodern fiction is marked by its problematization of narratives, the mediums of knowledge as well as conventional forms of representation. As regards characterization, Fokkema states, all of these modern problematics translate well into character in modern fiction. (1991, 44). It becomes outstanding, then, that the modern character becomes a tool through which a modern text problematizes self, reality, and their representations in fiction.

Raymond Federman states, in Surfiction: A Modern Position’s Criticism. Postmodern Essays, that character turns into a “word-being” in modern fiction. He, then, explains the transformation of the character into this word-being. The people of fiction (the fictitious beings), Federman argues, will no longer be called characters, who carry with them a fixed
personality, a stable set of social and psychological attributes (a name, a gender, a condition, a profession, a situation, a civic identity). These creatures will be as changeable, as volatile, as irrational, as nameless, as playful, as unpredictable, as fraudulent and frivolous as the discourse that makes them. This does not mean, however, that they will be mere puppets. On the contrary, their being will be more complex, more genuine, more authentic, more true to life. In fact because life and fiction are no longer distinguishable, these characters do not appear to be what they are: imitations of real people; they will be what they are: word-beings (1993, 44).

This elasticity and relativity of the concept of character in modernist fiction add further difficulties to the treatment of modernism in any scholarly work. Reviewing the works of major modernist novelists, one can see that no one definite concept of character can be applied on them all. It is true that novelists like Woolf, Joyce and Lawrence share some common traits, but in respect of the treatment of character, modernist novelists widely vary and differ. “The note for modernity “ says Malcolm Bradbury, “is clearer in some works than in others” (1972, xxxi). This is what George Lukacs also confesses in his essay “The Ideology of Modernism”, where he mentions that the ideology underlying modernism is not identical in all cases, and that “the ideology exists in extremely various, even contradictory forms as individual character manifests itself in life’s moments of decision, so too in literature “ (1957, 479). For this reason Douglas Hewitt does not organize his book English Fiction of the Early Modern Period 1890 – 1940 on a chronological basis. He justifies this by stating: “I do not detect any important line of chronological development. The writers who contributed most to the art of fiction in the period were extraordinarily different from each other “ (1992, 8). The critics, even, widely disagree over the dates of the beginning and the end of modernism, and who are its real representatives. In his argument about the emergence of modernism, Jeremy Hawthorn maintains that “pining precise dates to such changes is a risky business “ (1982, 43). Yet, due to the elusive nature of the concepts related to the era under study in this paper, it becomes of utmost importance to define the range to which the analysis can extend. The novelists chosen to represent the concept of character in the modernist fiction are Fyodor Dostoevsky, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce and D.H. Lawrence. They are the novelists whose fictional figures incarnate the spirit of modernism and its diversion to the portrayal of internal reality.

According to Jeremy Hawthorn "the individual's subjectivity and individuality are constructed in a social mould " (1982, 477) Such ideas
of the social frame of character witness drastic change in the modern era. The art of fiction becomes the field of quarrel between the modernist novelists and their predecessors, especially the Victorians, concerning the concept of character and the ways of projecting it, as Baruch Hochman believes. (1983, 11). There was an outstanding shift from the portrayal of external reality to the representation of the inner experiences of the character, which were dominated by symptoms of disintegration and contradiction (1983, 11). In his essay "The Ideology of Modernism", George Lukacs argues that in modern thought man is conceived as ahistorical being, and adds that this negation of history takes two different forms in modern literature:

First, the hero is strictly confined within the limits of his own experience. There is not for him—and apparently not for his creator—any pre-existent reality beyond his own self, acting upon him or being acted upon by him. Secondly, the hero himself is without personal history. He is thrown into the world meaninglessly. He does not develop through contact with the world; he neither forms nor is formed by it. (1957, 477)

Clearly enough, the solid memorable characters of the Victorian fiction disappear in the scene of modernism. Indefinite and infinite images of characters, overridden by internal senses of alienation and disintegration, come to the narrative experience. Solomon Fishman, in this sense, sees the modern character as one touched by the stigma of modern consciousness, which infects it with a sense of social disintegration. (1953, 123) These images lack the basic constituents of the character that Anthony Quinton records as "persistence and consistency in seeking to realize long-term aims" (1973, 3). The character who is embedded in his group, and does not need internalized thoughts or feelings, Harley Shands believes, is forsaken by "Avant–garde" (the French name for modernism), and is replaced by abstracted disembodied man, who lives in a world of immediate sensory experience (1978, 195). This character fails to meet the norms of successful characterization, and some critics and many readers see that the modernist novelists lack the talent of characterization and fail to create successful memorable characters. For instance, in "The Character of Character", Hélène Cixous claims that in contemporary literature the reader cannot find a hero, namely a character, whom he can identify with. Thus, Cixous...
defines “the death of the hero” as a death generally experienced by the reader as a murder, a loss, on which follows the reader’s quick withdrawal of his investment, since he sees nothing more to be done with a text that has no one in it, no one to talk to, to recognize, to identify with. (2011, 44). On a similar note, in “Character in Contemporary Fiction”, Brian Phillips points at “the decline of character” in contemporary fiction, and maintains that “while character remains essential to any idea of fictional narrative, and involvement in character remains the signature pleasure of fiction, still, when one opens the contemporary novel, character is not precisely one finds” (2004, 635). Such expressions as the death, decline, and absence of character apply to modernist fiction, and result from the fact that the modern character lacks the conventional representational character, whose very being is defined in relation to his ability to mirror the stereotypical patterns of real human beings. Modern character can be analyzed as an outcome of numerous sophistications that lie at the very heart of modernism, and modern perception of self proves to be the most problematic of them. In his book Literature, Structure, Sound and Sense, Lawrence Perrine presents what the modernist character is missing, when he writes:

A story is successful when the characters are dramatized … shown speaking and acting, as in drama … When most convincing, characterization observes three other principles. First, the characters are consistent in their behavior; they do not behave one way on one occasion and a different way on another unless there is clearly a sufficient reason for the change. Second, the characters are clearly motivated in whatever they do, especially when there is any change in their behavior: we must be able to understand the reasons for what they do, if not immediately, at least by the end of the story. Third, the characters are plausible or lifelike. The requirement of good fiction is that all characters be characterized fully enough to justify their roles in the story and make them convincing. (1984, 67 – 68)

In his book Character in English Literature, Christopher Gillie finds in modern fiction an image of character living in tension with alien
qualities in his experience “ (1967, 17). Baruch Hochman, similarly, sees in the works of modernist novelists like Lawrence, Woolf and Joyce, a world of dissolving fluidity, a world which is based on the portrayal of the shifting regions of the character and the elusion of the self. This makes him conceive the concept of character in modernist fiction as follows:

This conception focused on the play of the individual sensibility, the mobility of affective responses, and the flow of consciousness. It also stressed a range of unconscious motives that shape and inform the conscious self – the kind of responses that were analyzed by Freud and that included sexual, aggressive, and destructive feelings that had been pushed out of mind by earlier writers. The modernist conception of character often directs our consciousness away from the immediate context of social, moral, economic striving, and tends to subvert our sense of coherence in characters (1983, 12).

Compared with the image of the hero / heroine in Victorian fiction, John Parks believes, the main characters of the modernist fiction appear passive and are not oriented towards specific goals or ends (1984, 99). These characters, according to Baruch Hochman, are always imprisoned in perpetual cycle, and their search for an outlet never ends or leads to a satisfactory end (1983, 11). The character, in this sense, may come close to the concept of the “Anti – hero “ which is defined by Martin Gray as “ an unheroic protagonist of a play or a novel. A figure whose attractiveness or interest consists of the inability to perform deeds of bravery, courage or generosity ” (1993, 26). In his book An Introduction to Fiction, X.J. Kennedy sees characters in modernist fiction as “ mere shifting bundles of impulses “ (1991, 50). Jeremy Hawthorn believes that they are subject to a process of “ objectification “ that distorts them “ and adds:

This process of self- objectification can produce a complex rather than a simple unitary self; a self in which difficulties are subsumed and combined, identities which cannot even discourse with one
another. The crucial question this raises, is whether these different personae are complementary or contradictory – in tension or in agreement. A temporary answer to this question is that it will depend upon the social origins of these internalized identities: if the different identities represent different, and conflicting social forces then we can expect to find a conflict-ridden individual (1982, 105-106).

Actually, the characters who represent the concept of character in modernist fiction, like those of Woolf and Joyce, are always thrown into a world whose contradictory aspects are not less than the disintegration and fluidity of their inner selves. Unlike the Victorians, who put their characters in social frames that sustain them, the modern characters endure in a world without borders, and in a life without arrangement. Outstandingly enough, the novelists do not search for serious ways to structure the random circumstances of life. John Parks connects this to a new concept of reality, which he describes, saying:

Reality is not what realistic fiction said it was; neither is the self. Boundaries between reality and illusion are blurred; absolutes and certainties become relative and subjective...The witness of our serious writers is to a world that is normless, plot less and filled with liberating as well as terrifying possibilities (1984, 99).

In his essay, "Character and Modernism: Reading Woolf, Writing Woolf", H. Porter Abbott says: "In modernist texts - it is a story we know by heart - traditional character dissolved, giving way to entities like the infinite subjectivity of Finnegans Wake and the interoperating voices of Woolf's The Waves" (1993, 393). These infinite selves and voices are extremely far from the stereotyped characters called stock characters, and transgress Forester's flat and round characters in Aspects of the Novel (1972). The characters of the modernist fiction, accordingly, cannot be evaluated in terms of the rules of characterization dominating the fiction of the eighteenth century or that of the Victorian period.

The concept of character in modernist fiction must be viewed within a radical redefinition of the nature and function of characterization in the
modern era. Its frame of reference is the context of the new fiction, which David Daiches distinguishes in his book *The Novel of the Modern World* by three factors. The first is a new concept of time as continuous flow derived from Henri Bergson and William James. The second is a new view of consciousness derived from the work of Freud and Jung and concentrates on the multiplicity of consciousness. The third factor is the breakdown of public agreement about what the novelist ought to select.

Unlike the Victorians, who base their narration on significant incidents and situations in human life, the modernists see no significant experience or definite existence to be portrayed in their fiction. (1960, 20)

The concept of character in modernist fiction is drawn within a frame of a complex narrative structure and an elaboration of new fictional techniques. In her book *Sartre: Romantic Rationalist*, Iris Murdoch believes that the modernist novelist strives to create narrative tools that cope with the complex and sophisticated internal reality of the modern man (1965, 8). However, the most important narrative technique that has contributed much to the representation of character in modernist fiction is that of "The Stream of Consciousness". This technique which is named by William James in *The Principles of Psychology* (1890), refers to "the attempt to convey all the contents of the character's mind – memory, sense perceptions, intuitions, thoughts – often at random." (See, Martin Gray, 1993, 274) This technique, sometimes, interchanges with the technique of "Interior Monologue", which Gray describes as "an attempt to convey in words the process of consciousness or thought as a means of narrating a story" (150). These two techniques, which appear to be one or at least to be congruent, have been used by major modernist novelists like Woolf and Joyce. They, evidently, suit the elusive nature of both the structure and the character in modernist fiction. They also maintain consistency with the psychological drift that characterizes modernist fiction in its treatment of character. In fact the character, which is defined by X. J. Kennedy as "an imagined person who inhabits a story" (1991, 47), stirs up clouds of controversy in the critical studies of modernist fiction. Its fluid existence is always a source of embarrassment and confusion. Laurence Perrine, in this respect, expounds that "reading for character is more difficult than reading for plot, for character is much more complex, variable and ambiguous." (1984, 65). This is actually what the following reading and analysis of characterization in the works of selected representative modernist novelists reveals. For the nature of this paper and its limited space Dostoevsky, Woolf, Joyce and Lawrence are chosen for this purpose.
The Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821 – 1881) is a novelist whose work represents a transitional stage, a stage which takes fiction far from the nineteenth century and brings it close to the spirit of modernism, where the novelists divert to the portrayal of the internal reality of the character. Dostoevsky's work maintains evident glimpses of the pressures that were to become crucial in modernist fiction. Harry Garvin praises his philosophical and psychological perspectives in novels like *The Idiot* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. He compares Dostoevsky’s treatment of character in *The Brothers Karamazov*, in particular, to that of Joyce in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and also to Albert Camus’s contribution in *La Peste* (1979, 11).

In *The Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoevsky acts much as a modernist novelist than as a nineteenth century's. He bases his whole characterization on the portrayal of inner contradictions and conflicts of the characters, and maintains an outstanding psychological dimension in his projection of their action. Dostoevsky's recognition of the nature of man in a chaotic human society comes very close to the concept of the psychologically - disintegrated characters of modernist fiction. This recognition is expressed by the character Elder Zossima who characterizes the image of man in his age, saying:

> All men are separated into self-contained units, everyone crawls into his own role … hides himself away and hides away everything he possesses, and ends by keeping himself at a distance from other people and keeping people at a distance from him. (1976, 357).

It is the image of modern society, where everyone is imprisoned in his own self or say his own shell, and the society becomes one made up of privacies isolated and alienated from each other. The outstanding move towards inwardness, with all the expected complexities of the inner regions of the subconscious and the unconscious leads to the final representation of characters suffering from undiagnosed sophisticated psychological illness, and to the collapse of the stereotypical image of the memorable characters of the Victorian novels. Jeremy Hawthorn conceives this image of character portrayed by Dostoevsky in the novel as a real modernist one. He comments on Elder Zossima's vision of man, saying: "The new element here is the perception of the self – destructive nature of privatization in a divided society, and this element is prophetic of many later developments in the modernist novel. (1982, 48).

Through the mystery attending the murder of Karamazov, Dostoevsky presents an image of the currents of ideas and impressions running deep...
in the unconscious regions of his characters. He penetrates deep in their psyches to reveal much of the repressed feelings and senses; an attitude which colors the works of later modernist novelists like Woolf and Joyce. Erich Auerbach looks at Dostoevsky’s characters and sees in them a violation of the conventions of characterizations in nineteenth-century realist art, and confesses that "this sort of thing has nothing whatever in common with the enlightened bourgeoisie of Central or Western Europe". (1974, 523)

In the character of Ivan Karamazov, we can trace out all the traits featuring the concept of character in modernist fiction. This eccentric character becomes, clearly, the incarnation of the conflict-ridden modern character. Dostoevsky manages to acquaint the reader with the complex psychological patterns of conflict and tension that might reside in a modern character. He introduces him to the reader, stating: "An eccentric sometimes expresses the very sum and substance of certain period, while the other people of the same period for some reason or another do not seem to belong to it." (1976, xxv) Jeremy Hawthorn reveals his admiration for Dostoevsky's portrayal of Ivan as a good representative of the diversion to internal reality in modernist fiction, saying:

Dostoevsky gives us Ivan, in the early stages of nervous breakdown, talking to a hallucinated versions of core part of himself … This fondness for depiction of eccentrics can be explained by noting how the portrayal of eccentrics allows Dostoevsky to make public and manifest what is more normally concealed within a character's inner psyche, but without making the reader feel that he or she is somehow being subjected to a rather mechanical contrivance. (1982, 49)

According to Leslie Shepard, Dostoevsky shows us characters that yield to contradictions, simply because it is the negations and inconsistencies that interest him the most. Dostoevsky’s creations experience emotions that are each other's opposites, almost simultaneously. He is able to see the ego’s duality, and to detect the contradictions that all of us have inside, but that we try to deny in order to resemble the model". (See Harry Garvin, 1979, 124). This modernist consciousness that colors Dostoevsky's vision of character is, similarly, stressed by Jeremy Hawthorn, who believes that the recognition of conflict is central to
Dostoevsky's view of humanity in his own time, both for the individual and for humanity at large. (1982, 49)

Virginia Woolf (1682 – 1941) is a touchstone of modernism and the concept of character in modernist fiction. She is the novelist who announced in 1910 that human character changed, a date which many critics and scholars see as the real beginning of modernism, and as a declaration of the diversion to the modernist vision of character and the shift from focusing upon the external reality to the deep sophisticated internal reality of man. Woolf is also the novelist whose suicide in 1941, is taken by some critics as the end of the modern era. Makiko Mino, one of the critics who take Woolf as a test case of the concept of character in modernist fiction, writes in his book *Virginia Woolf Problem of the Subject*: "Woolfian personality is never essentialist. The quest always involves a sense of the impossibility of fixing the essence; there is no inherent substantiality to the personality" (1987, 157). Following the path that Woolf major characters take in novels like *Mrs. Dalloway*, *To the Lighthouse*, and *Orlando*, one can easily discover that Woolf's treatment of character is colored by an outstanding psychological insight. Her works clearly echo Freud's theories about the workings of the human mind and the unconscious and conscious personality. Baruch Hochman, in this respect, finds in Woolf's texts "the movement of consciousness and perception within time and through time." (1983, 13)

The female characters of Mrs. Dalloway in *Mrs. Dalloway* and Mrs. Ramsay in *To the Lighthouse* are two examples of how modernist fiction extremely diverts to the portrayal of the internal reality of the character. They are highly authentic representatives of the concept of character in modernist fiction. Both are portrayed as elusive selves and as missing the solidarity of the famous and memorable nineteenth-century female figures like Maggie Tulliver in George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*, Tess in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the Durbervilles*, and Jane Eyre in Emily Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. They appear ambivalent and disintegrated and move towards no definite goals or ends in life. Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway and Mrs. Ramsay reflect their author's belief in that "life is not a series of gigantic symmetrically arranged" but "a luminous halo; a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end." (David Lodge, 1986, 88) It is difficult to see in them more than a spontaneous overflow of ideas and recollections, or say a flood of conscious and unconscious stuff, which never contribute to the articulation of an image of character which has a definite frame or memorable existence. Molly Hoff, thus, argues that "characterization in *Mrs. Dalloway*, often serves as a metaphoric device that blurs the boundaries between the literal and figurative" and adds that "the multiple
facets of each personality affirm that these characters are inevitably over determined " ( 2000, 148 ) Such type of characters makes Warren Friedman look at the world of modernist fiction as " a fictional world at odds with inherited concepts of author , plot , character and time " ( 1975 ,9 ).

In her important essay " Modern Fiction ", Virginia Woolf says that in her novels she attempts to capture the " aura " of personality , the gaze around the "gig- lamps ", rather than the solid beings . ( David Lodge , 1986 , 88 ). In her diaries she , similarly , maintains the same end and states : " One's personality seems to echo out across space " ( Ann Oliver Bell, 1984, 70 ). The characters of Woolf divert in an unprecedented way to their internal realities which flow in a highly confusing way to the reader. They appear as mere voices rather than influential characters who move the plot of the text to an intended climax or end. There is , actually no plot to encompass them and put them on the track of a linear movement. This evident fluidity of Woolf's characters and their internal world appears also in her novel The Waves ( 1931 ). It is a text which presents six characters ; Louis , Susan , Jinny , Rhoda , Nivelle , and Bernard , who melt into each other and their individual autonomy collapses. In her essay " Virginia Woolf 's The Waves : to Defer that Appalling Moment ", Lisa Marie comments on the six characters or voices of The Waves , who are totally lost between acceptance and rejection of their own existence , saying :

In The Waves , the collapse of subjective presence occurs on both a thematic and a structural level . Structurally , the voices of the text have none of the traditional novelistic supports to sustain them – no descriptive setting , plot , or characterization beyond what they themselves say .( 1998 , 77 )

It is this collapse of the identity of the character and its limits which also features the character of the" androgyny" in Woolf's highly experimental novel Orlando , where it is even difficult to identify the character or to know its sex , male or female . Woolf's rejection of the definite boundaries of the character is taken to the extreme in Orlando , where she presents an image of unmarried Elizabethan lord who changes into a woman . Through this character of the " androgyny " , Woolf incarnates the fluid and disruptive nature of the internal reality of the human character , and takes it to be the only practical norm of characterization in modernist
fiction. X. J.Kennely, in this sense, refers to Woolf's belief that in all times and throughout history, the character of man has been elusive and fluid. He writes that "the usual limits of character are playfully violated in Orlando, a novel whose protagonist, defying time, lives right on from Elizabethan days into the present, changing in mid story from a man into a woman." (1991,50) H.Porter Abbott also expounds that the enemy of Woolf's art is "the fixed, the mechanical and the solely conventional." (1993,402)

James Joyce (1882–1941) is another major modernist novelist whose works represent the diversion to internal reality in modernism, and who contributes much to the crystallization of the concept of character in modernist fiction. His art, like that of Woolf, confirms the innocence of the idea of character—catching in modernist narratives. By the use of the stream of consciousness-narrative technique and other innovative mechanics of characterizations, Joyce breaks away from the traditional concepts of character representation, and introduces to modernist fiction what we may call the character as an infinite being. Baruch Hochman describes Joyce as "the most self-consistent of the modernists". He also shows the long distance that separates Joyce from the Victorian novelists, when he writes: "Clearly, Joyce has come a long way from the Victorians and from the traditional modes of narrative as well as of characterization. The distance he has come can possibly best be measured by juxtaposing Ulysses with its governing source or model, Homer's Odyssey." (1983, 207)

Joyce's philosophy of characterization is wonderfully expressed in novels like A Portrait of the Artist as A Young Man (1916), Ulysses (1922) and Finnegans Wake (1939). In A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Stephen Dedalus, unlike the characters of Woolf, appears as an anxious figure who clings to a real sense of being. Yet, in his search, Stephen loses contact with the actual world, and his strife becomes an end in itself. In his essay "Joyce's A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man", Anthony Kearney stresses Joyce's attitude to take his text far from the accepted norms of the conventional narratives and to create his own vision of reality. He, accordingly, writes: "Stephen, if he is to make a good as a writer, cannot just fly above the ordinary world, he has to live and work with it." (1997,35). Through a kind of reflective consciousness, Joyce drowns Stephen in a flood of fluid inward experiences. Stephen, thus, remains, like most modernist narrative voices and characters, unable to step forward toward a definite meaningful end. He accepts the difficult challenge, but ends as an isolated figure. Baruch Hochman, thus, comments:

In *Ulysses*, Joyce makes the main three characters, Bloom, Stephen and Molly no more than speaking voices. Their world, as Baruch Hochman states, is "a world where everything is elusive and impalpable as its protagonists' dreams." (1983, 197) We see them move across the city of Dublin, meet and chat, but the only thing they maintain is that they break the limits of themselves and others without being able to effect any definite identity. Unlike the hero of the Greek *Odyssey*, who wanders the seas fighting monsters in Homer's epic, Leopold Bloom wanders the streets of Dublin in *Ulysses* aimlessly. He is no more than a moving consciousness. Douglas Hewitt, therefore, believes that Joyce presents in *Ulysses* "the simultaneity of the experiences of many people who are acquainted but at the moment separated" (1992, 150). Perry Meisel also stresses that the elusive frame of the characters' experiences can never lead to a solid being. He also adds that "not only does Joyce presume no dissociation of sensibility, he also presumes neither wishful origins nor wishful resolutions." (1987, 146)

According to Baruch Hochman, *Ulysses* is one of the chief monuments of the modernist vision of the self and its condition in the world. It directs the attention to the condition of being rather than to the condition of particular beings. Hochman sees that the whole sections of the text are dedicated mainly to "dramatize the slipperiness not only of the individual consciousness, but of the communal consciousness as well". These sections "Hochman believes," show how Bloom, Stephen and the rest of Dublin are engulfed in the content of their psyches and their personal history intensifying the difficulty of getting reality under control by any method" (1983, 199–200).

In *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce's characters are thrown into unprecedented experience of loss. In a study entitled *The Decentered Universe of Finnegans Wake: A Structuralist Analysis*, Margot Norris reveals a major difference between the characters of this novel and other characters of Joyce's fiction. The book shows that in *A Portrait* and *Ulysses*, the characters are alienated from the world because of an assault on the self from without, that leads to isolation and exile. In *Finnegans Wake*, "the
self " as Norris believes, " becomes increasingly imperiled from within. " Actually, the figures of the novel appear as if people in dreams, and there is no specific frame that governs the relationship between the self and other. They, like other characters of Joyce, incarnate the author's belief that the modernist character is an infinite being sheltered in his own internal reality. (1976, 73)

D. H. Lawrence (1885 - 1930) is another novelist whose treatment of character brings him close to the concept of character in modernist fiction, and makes him one of the writers who explore the internal reality of his narrative figures focusing on their complex psychic processes rather than on the internal reality of their societies. Actually, the fiction of this novelist of a high caliber and his concept of character may be seen under one title, " the unstable ego ". In a letter to Edward Garnett on June 5, 1914, D.H. Lawrence introduces his view of the unstable ego, as well as his whole governing philosophy of characterization. He says:

Somehow – that which is physic – non human in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old – fashioned human element – which causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and makes him consistent. The certain moral scheme is what I object. You mustn’t look in my novel for the old stable ego of the character. There is another ego, according to whose action the individual is unrecognizable … (like as diamond and coal are the same pure single element of carbon. The ordinary novel would trace the history of the diamond – but I say, 'Diamond what! This is carbon'. And my diamond might be coal or soot, and my theme is carbon. (See Miriam Abbott, 1975, 289 – 296).

So, Lawrence is after the carbon not the diamond of the human character, the life which is actually lived not the one imagined, as he maintains in his essay " Morality and the Novel " (David Lodge, 1986, 127). Lawrence's carbon consciousness is expressed in most of his novels, especially in Sons and Lovers (1913), The Rainbow (1915), Women in Love (1920) and Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928). In these works, Lawrence takes the man / woman relationship as the core of his narrative and his characterization. In " Morality and the Novel ", he affirms that " the great relationship, for humanity, will always be the relationship
between man and woman" (See David Lodge, 1986, 136). In his treatment of this relationship, Lawrence introduces a new morality that violates the moral and social codes that, customarily, govern this relationship. The morality that underlies his concept of character in Lady Chatterley's Lover is expressed as follows:

Men and women will be forever subtly and chantingly related to one another; no need to yoke them with any 'bond' at all. The only morality is to have man true to his manhood, woman to her womanhood, and let the relationship form of itself, in all honour. For it is, to each, life itself. (David Lodge, 131)

Lawrence's concept of the unstable ego is obviously expressed in Women in Love. Gerald, Gudrun, Birkin and Ursula appear as characters of dual nature, and the ego is always in search for union that can end its disintegration. This quest is the only power that actually stimulates the relationship between one character and another. According to Christopher Gillie, the main interest of Lawrence in the novel is to draw the breaking down of the character's ego and the attempts to reform it. Gillie also believes that by Lawrence's time, the social references had become confused, contradictory, meaningless, no longer cohesive and therefore no longer definitive. The stable ego was no longer stable (1967, 200).

In Sons and Lovers, Lawrence explores the complex world of the unconscious. In terms of a deep psychological insight, he treats the mother/sons relationship. Through the character of Gertrude Morel and her obsessive love to her sons, Lawrence shows that the character's action is sometimes shaped by unconscious stirrings that are beyond the control of reason. Through Gerturde, Lawrence exposes his concept of the unstable ego. In her relationship with her sons, Gertrude seeks a union that can substitute the loss that her ego feels with Morel. This motive, however, remains unconscious, for Lawrence believes that the inner being remains a dark part of man's character. He expresses this idea in one of his essays, saying:

I'm supposed to be a sensible being. Yet, I carry a whole waste-paper basket of ideas at the top of my head, and in some other part of my anatomy, the dark continent of my self. I have a whole stormy chaos of feelings. And with those
self – same feelings I simply don't get a chance. (See Edmund McDonald, 1961, 756)

In view of the analysis given above about the treatment of character in the selected works of the prominent and major modernist novelists; Dostoevsky, Woolf, Joyce and Lawrence, it becomes evident that characterization in modernist fiction witnesses a real shift of interest from the nineteenth-century representation of external reality to the portrayal of internal reality. As it is evident, modernist novelists, influenced by the illustrated forces that have enhanced the rise of modernism, divert to internal reality and see the character as a flux of complex internal processes that come to the surface in a highly disintegrated and confusing way. This type of characters appears fluid and elusive and without clear limits of self or identity. They are, however, consistent with the chaotic setting in which they live and act, and the social reality which is not in any sense systematic or coherent.
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