Angloamericanae Journal
Vol. 11, No. 1, 2026, pp. 17-23
http://aaj.ielas.org/index.php/Angloamericanae
ISSN: 2545-4218

ENGLISH MODERNISM

Agron Zeqiri
Associate Professor, Faculty of Philology, Department of English Language and Literature
State University of Tetova, Republic of North Macedonia
Email: agron.zeqiri@unite.edu.mk

Received: 2026-02-17 Accepted: 2026-03-13 Published online: 2026-03-16

Abstract

Modernism can be extensively characterized as the global social development that grabbed hold in the late nineteenth century and arrived at its top just before World War I. In the mid-twentieth century, authors, for example, Henry James and Virginia Woolf, tried different things with shifts in schedule and story perspectives. Social change requested likewise changes in verbal plans and in essential styles of articulation, and that's just the beginning. The advanced novel trials with everything—and it does as such interminably, out of a feeling that structures should maintain changing in control to match innovation, to keep individuals newly and effectively mindful of it, and to find each additional opportunity advancement may make. To match innovation, notwithstanding, was just as important for the point, for the cutting-edge writer likewise needed to oppose it—or even reclaim it. The quintessentially present-day novel will in general encapsulate some redemptive expectation, some wish to reestablish importance or completeness or magnificence to the cutting-edge world. This is probably the most important aspect of literary works; they try to bring forward the issues that people were facing during the time those works were written, and at the same time, they try to criticize those social and historical developments, especially when the human being is downgraded morally. All these aspects make up the groundwork of our study, which we believe to explain and clarify with enough argumentation so readers of any background can understand and appreciate the importance of the modern English novel.

Keywords: modernism, novels, English literature, history, society, etc.

Author's and Analysis

Ezra Pound and he invented the word 'Vorticism' to describe a movement that was a by-product of Imagism. Pound defined the development thus in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1914: '*The image is not an idea. It is a radiant node or cluster; it is what I can, and must perforce, call a VORTEX, from which, and into which, ideas are continually rushing.*' Lewis edited the periodical, Blast, from 1914 to 1915. He was a painter of distinction known for portraits of Eliot, Pound, Edith Sitwell, and Joyce, and for celebrated cubist landscapes.

I am a novelist, painter, sculptor, philosopher, draughtsman, critic, politician, journalist, and pamphleteer, all rolled into one, like one of those portmanteau-men of the Italian Renaissance.

So, Lewis presented his credentials in introducing his lively autobiographical book, *Blasting and Bombadiering* (1937), which sheds light on his involvement with Eliot, Joyce, Pound, Ford, Hulme, and T. E. Lawrence, and upon his dislike for D. H. Lawrence. Lewis's

Angloamericanae Journal
Vol. 11, No. 1, 2026, pp. 17-23
http://aaj.ielas.org/index.php/Angloamericanae
ISSN: 2545-4218

emphasis upon intellect and objectivity made sympathy for Lawrence impossible. For Lewis, the new movement was an attempt to get away from romantic art and into classical art, from political propaganda and into 'the detachment of true literature.' Lewis expressed his views in philosophical and critical works like *Time and Western Man* (1927), *Men Without Art* (1934), and *The Writer and the Absolute* (1952), and returned again to autobiography in *Rude Assignment* (1950). His public persona was that of an angry, aggressive prophet, loftily impatient with the artistic nonsense that bemused the masses and enriched its purveyors. He was burdened with an intelligence equally sensitive to the shallowness of current fashions and of discredited past conventions. His first novel, *Tarr* (1918), portrayed the bohemian life of pre-war Paris with devastating frankness and with a deft stylistic flamboyance. Lewis can be incisive and epigrammatic. His prose sometimes has a staccato explosiveness, and the reader is carried along on a current of restless energy. But the briskness soon loses its freshness. Awareness of the author rubbing his hands in self-congratulation intrudes upon the reader's responses. The lack of human sympathy gives Lewis's novels a wearying aridity. The managerial cleverness with which human beings are manipulated and mocked is not the badge of magnanimity or sensibility. Lewis's abrasiveness, the cutting satirical edge, and the detachment alike from the ethos of convention, of Bloomsbury, of Lawrentian primitiveness, and of Forsterian liberalism, were not calculated to win friends.

In Apes of God (1930), he directed his fire in comic irony on the arty circles of the 1920s. But around the turn of the decade, he had already published *Childermass* (1928), the first volume of an intended tetralogy, *The Human Age*, of which two more volumes appeared long afterwards in 1955—Monstre Gai and Malign Fiesta. The trilogy is set in a fantastic region beyond the grave. Two pilgrims from earth, Pullman and Satters, are present at an absurd tribunal outside a city, where a grotesque examiner and his rebellious examinees confront each other with nightmare dialectic.

The men get inside the city in Monstre Gai to discover that it is under attack from Hell, whither they flee in Malign Fiesta. Moral, political, and philosophical themes adumbrated have their bearing on our twentieth-century world. But for all Lewis's sense of the menace of rottenness and the process of human corruption, the lack of clear moral affirmatives, defined or implicit, to counterpoise the satire, detracts from overall clarity and cohesiveness. He was “the master” that young writers called Henry James, who, by 1900 or so, was considered master of the art of fiction.

Not only had he mastered the workmanship, as it were, but he also made it, by assisting with demonstrating that fiction was, truth be told, a fine art. It hadn't forever been so: before the day of James' initial books—Washington Square and The Portrait of a Lady, for instance, distributed in 1880–1—individuals didn't keep an eye on putting fiction on a standard with verse, music, or painting. Those were serious arts; the novel, on the other hand, was something less—engaging and edifying in its way, but not workmanship. Be that as it may, by the 1880s this had started to change, particularly in

the work crafted by one author regularly called the dad of modern fiction: Gustave Flaubert.

In Madame Bovary (1857) and other works, Flaubert showed James and the remainder of the world that fiction could become an issue of fine creative preparation and execution—of stories intensely envisioned, painstakingly outlined, equivocal in importance, and intricate in their philosophical plans. This purposeful imaginativeness was, of course, additionally working somewhere else, for instance, in the Russian author Ivan Turgenev, whose Fathers and Sons (1862) brought to the clever a new intensity of feeling, a recently exact sort of perception, a perfect combination of the complicated and the basic, and a supporting skepticism; in the English writer George Eliot, whose *Middlemarch* (1871) made society's constructions an object of sharp logical and moral investigation; and in the American essayist Nathaniel Hawthorne, whose *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) gave fiction's passionate life rich new emblematic and emotional influence.

These and other hesitantly cunning authors were incredible impacts on Henry James when he set off to hoist fiction to the higher status it would appreciate as a type of current craftsmanship. Which he did not just by composing lovely books, but also by clarifying precisely how fiction could change life. In a paper called "*The specialty of fiction*" (1884), James posited that fiction could even make reality, or add to its importance, and that it deserved "stylish" status. He demanded that "fiction is one of the fine arts, meriting in its turn every one of the distinctions and remittances that have been until recently saved for the effective calling of music, poetry, painting, and engineering," and by saying why and how, he reflected a turning point in the historical backdrop of fiction. 1 Specifically, he pushed the point implied in the creative power and fine investigation of Flaubert, Eliot, and others: that fiction was not simply an engaging portrayal of life but something that could "contend with life" and enhance it, capturing life for better purposes. This commendation—this new mission for the anecdotal creative mind—was critical to the introduction of the modern novel, on the grounds that it implied fiction could recover life by refining, enriching, or increasing it.

As others came to concur with James or to arrive at comparative resolutions by different means, the novel would transform from a natural type of diversion into a gathering for new real factors. What James himself did toward this end was advance the "cognizance" of the book. Until recently, never had a writer wandered such a long way into the heads of characters, and never had an author had such a huge amount to report about the intricacy, nuance, and immeasurability of what he found there. Less guileful fiction would invest significantly less energy with characters' thoughts and sentiments and undeniably additional time on plot. Indeed, thoughts and sentiments would come up just to the extent that they could propel the story. However, in James's fiction, the concept of "awareness" itself became the central focus of the story.

For him—and for some authors of things to come—fiction had meaning just to the degree that its characters were "finely mindful and luxuriously dependable," and just to the degree that the writer could follow every one of the subtleties of their fine mental mindfulness. "Their being finely mindful … makes totally the power of their experience, gives the limit of sense to what in particular comes to pass for them," and enriches the novel with the most extravagant reality. One incitement of James' advantage in cognizance was contemporary brain research's new hypothesis of psyche. Brain science had started to see thought recently less as an issue of purposeful units of consideration and more as an oblivious, blended stream. In Principles of Psychology (1890) by William James (Henry's sibling and Gertrude Stein's teacher), awareness is portrayed as "of an overflowing variety of articles and relations," streaming like a stream: "Cognizance, then, at that point, doesn't appear to itself cleaved up in bits … It is not much; it streams. "Waterway" or "stream" are the representations by which it is most normally portrayed. In discussing it henceforth, let us call it the surge of thought, of cognizance, or of emotional life."

This perspective with regards to awareness affected Henry James' feeling of its intricacy (however, the impact presumably worked the other way too), and as we will see, it would later urge journalists to write in a "continuous flow" style. What's more, this perspective turned into the predominant one in brain research, which presently considered mental life to be something undeniably darker and liquid, undeniably less even and lucid, than individuals had expected it to be. Considerations developed themselves out of sensations and discernments in dubious ways; wants were regularly obscure to the people who felt them or prone to change in flighty ways. As Judith Ryan says in The Vanishing Subject: Early Psychology and Literary Modernism, despite the fact that it had once appeared to be steady, presently "the self [was] something like a heap of tactile impressions problematically gathered and continually compromised with conceivable disintegration."

These new mental revelations represented an issue: in the event that the brain was presently less dependent upon lucid and direct clarifications, how could you portray it? Fiction offered a response. Fiction, truth be told, appeared to be somehow or another the best spot to foster the styles and points of view important to show and convey the unusual existence of the mind. The current novel grew better approaches to perform thought, to design out dangerous successions of feeling, and to get behind eyes restricted by moral visual impairment or sharp with understanding; it fostered the recent fads and strategies important to world equity to the care's "dissolving" intricacy.

These James brought to bear—in The Ambassadors (1903), for example, one of his last great works. The plot of The Ambassadors is fairly simple. A young American man has gone to Europe and, to the dismay of his family, not come back. Another man is sent to retrieve him (to serve, that is, as the family’s ambassador). The second man, however, is bewitched by Europe as well and does not do his job: he stays too. Seven Modern

Novelists: Henry James's comments on the future of the novel came, of course, the year that future got off to a perilous start. World War I put modernity into crisis—or showed how terrible a crisis modernity could be.

New powers of technological destruction made themselves shockingly and horribly felt, and old traditions seemed powerless to stop them. Just a few years before, culture had seemed to reach new heights of civilization, inspiring advances in all areas of human endeavor, making peace and prosperity seem permanent. But World War I changed all that, proving that modernity's civilized side was well matched by the potential for great chaos and evil. The war's violence was unprecedented, its causes absurd, and the result was profound disillusionment.

Conclusion

It places life into never-ending motion, moving it ever ahead to new developments, groundbreaking thoughts, and better approaches for residing, making any second appear to be possibly basic. Science and innovation consistently make better approaches to seeing, working, and thinking; moving worldwide governmental issues makes new societies and new struggles at any point; new ages happily abandon customs. Stable powers are no more: God kicked the bucket quite a while in the past, it appears, and gentry have evaporated, leaving instead of their customs just confidence in change. Henry Adams—a late relative of a significant American privileged—summarized this change when he composed of himself, "*When he came to ask himself what he genuinely thought, he felt that he had no faith … that the possibility of one form, law, order, or sequence had no more incentive for him than the possibility of none; that what he esteemed most was motion, and that what pulled in his brain was change.*"

This shift from order and reliability to change and development fundamentally defined what progress meant, and it was both disturbing and motivating. Would this new example for presence improve human culture or obliterate it? Would it bring steady advancement, dynamic opportunity, and unadulterated chance—or shocks and injury, catastrophe, struggle, and war? When it annihilated customary practices, services, and propensities, and when it broke the succession of culture, what might supplant them? What might follow? Social change requested likewise changes in verbal game plans and in fundamental styles of articulation, and the sky is the limit from there. The cutting-edge novel trials with everything—and it does as such unendingly, out of a feeling that structures should maintain changing in control to match innovation, to keep individuals newly and effectively mindful of it, and to find each additional opportunity advancement may create. The "formal" contrast here is most clear in the manner in which the principal present-day books were intended to vary from the standard. To the cutting-edge author, a large portion of the fiction composed around 1900 or 1910 had become lifeless and silly, for some reasons. It appeared to take things at the gradual speed of a past lifestyle;

it appeared to remain on a superficial level, never going into mental profundity; it appeared to be wasteful, larded over with verbiage that fended reality off; it recounted its accounts from a lofty position, according to the perspective of some incomprehensible, all-knowing, divine spectator; it claimed to recount a consistent story beginning to end; and it generally set a positive last twist on things, in slick and clean endings. Present-day authors needed to break with these flat customs.

They didn't feel that all books of the past were silly: "*Our fight isn't with the works of art,*" Virginia Woolf noted, but with the played-out novel of the new past, since it had neglected to stay aware of reality. The overall agreement among the more youthful authors around 1910 was that fiction needed to abandon its bogus soundness, its traditional smugness, and its unmodern viewpoint if it somehow happened to recover significance and importance. So, they took the novel and accelerated its speed or made it a recurring pattern like reality; they made its sentences as dangerous as the developments of the human brain; they let the plot go arbitrary, recounted their accounts according to changing perspectives, and started or finished them suddenly.

They composed things like the principal line of Portrait of the Artist, where Joyce plays with the "some time ago" starting to give the vibe of life in a cycle, and they composed books like Jacob's Room, which fabricates character through unique impressions instead of easing back into objective examination.

References

Briggs, J. (2005). *Virginia Woolf: An inner life*. London, UK: Penguin.

Brooke-Rose, C. (1980). Where do we go from here? *Granta, 3*.

De Man, P. (1991). The resistance to theory. In D. Lodge (Ed.), *Modern criticism and theory* (pp. 361–363). London, UK & New York, NY: Longman.

Eco, U. (1992). Interpretation and overinterpretation. In S. Collini (Ed.), *Interpretation and overinterpretation* (pp. 23–151). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eisner, J., & Cardinal, R. (1994). *The cultures of collecting*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

Eliot, T. S. (1919). Reflections on contemporary poetry. *The Egoist*, July, 39–40.

Eliot, T. S. (1972). On Virginia Woolf (1942). In J. R. Noble (Ed.), *Recollections of Virginia Woolf by her contemporaries* (pp. 119–122). London, UK.

Ellmann, R., & Feidelson, C. (Eds.). (1965). *The modern tradition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

FitzGerald, M. (1995). *Making modernism: Picasso and the creation of the market for twentieth-century art*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fleishman, A. (1975). *Virginia Woolf: A critical reading*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ford, F. M. (1924). *Joseph Conrad: A personal remembrance*. London, UK: Duckworth.

Forster, E. M. (1927). *Aspects of the novel*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fry, R. (1957). An essay in aesthetics (1909). In *Vision and design* (pp. 16–38). London, UK: Chatto & Windus.

Nabokov, V. (1980). On a book entitled *Lolita* (1956). In *Lolita* (pp. 316–317). New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Showalter, E. (2002). Lad-lit. In Z. Leader (Ed.), *On modern British fiction* (pp. 60–76). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Woolf, V. (1925). Modern fiction (1919). In *The common reader* (pp. 184–195). London, UK: Hogarth Press.

Woolf, V. (1950). Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown. In *The captain's deathbed and other essays* (pp. 94–119). New York, NY.

Zwerdling, A. (1986). *Virginia Woolf and the real world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.