

# INDIVIDUALISM AND THE NOVEL: A SKETCH OF THE INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND TO MODERN FICTION

DANIEL SHANAHAN

UDK 82-32.09

Individualism was born in the Renaissance and it passed through several stages until it reached its present status. Individualism-subjectivity is present in the modern, 20th century, novel, but it was very much present also in the novel of the last century. In our century we are aware of crumbling of the dam of traditional narrative and, connected therewith, the rise of novelistic experiments is an attempt »to find ways of putting the reader in the mind of a novel's main character or characters«, who are usually »anti-heroes«. A large number of both English and American authors illustrate such examples.

When Leonardo da Vinci began his study of birds in flight during the later half of the 15th Century, it symbolized a major step forward in the evolution of man's self-image. For Leonardo did not, as men in pre-Christian and medieval times might have done, turn to superstition, myth, or even Divine guidance for an explanation of how birds managed to defy gravity and soar. Instead, Leonardo relied entirely on his own perception, his intuition and his imagination to evolve a theory of flight. He put his faith, not in God or gods, not in demons or spirits, but in his own human capacity for reasoned observation and experience. This was an act of profound self-confidence. In fact, the entire Renaissance can be seen as a celebration of a new-found human self-confidence; the Renaissance exudes a belief that the individual himself is capable of deeper understanding, that individual perceptions are valuable, and that *individualism* — not superstition, myth nor religion — provides the most reliable base for man's philosophical speculations. As Jacob Burckhardt puts it in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*,

In face of all objective facts, of laws and restraints of whatever kind, renaissance man retains the feeling of his own sovereignty, and in each single instance forms his decision independently, according as honour or interest, passion or calculation, revenge or renunciation, gain the upper hand in his mind.

... within this individualism has grown up a modern standard of good and evil - a sense of moral responsibility...<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (Vienna: The Phaidon Press, 1937), p. 238.

In other words, where man once looked into the clouds, or the wind, or the darkness for moral direction, with the Renaissance he began to look into himself, and modern *individualism* was born.

Burkhardt's suggestion that the modern world inherited the Renaissance' belief in individualism hardly needs much evidence to support it, for the Enlightenment — the philosophical period during which man attempted to substantiate the premises he had already embraced in the Renaissance — set the stage for the modern world. And from Descartes, who set the stage for the Enlightenment,<sup>2</sup> to Kant, who exhausted Enlightenment principles and thereby opened the door to Romanticism, the emphasis is on the individual and his struggle to live a moral life which is personally, individually satisfying. David Hume opens his *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* with a discussion of the limits of that understanding that would have pleased Augustine had it been followed with a ringing reminder of the inaccessibility of the ways of God to the mind of man. But Hume proves himself anathema to the teachings of Augustine when he uses the inaccessibility of metaphysics and philosophy — at least as they have been known up to the 18th Century — to prove them of secondary importance: *experience* — personal, individual experience — is the only validation for truth that Hume can accept. Enlightenment thought can be seen (and not disparagingly so) as a voluminous gloss to the artistic premises of the Renaissance. Hume's essay and Hamlet's dilemma, for instance, stem from the same philosophical question: About what can I be certain; what can I know? And both presume that man's certainty and his knowledge are consequential in and of themselves — a premise Augustine could hardly accept.

But if the Enlightenment spent much of its time glossing and analysing Renaissance beliefs, it also initiated a literary innovation of its own, and one that equals the Renaissance, both in its importance for the modern world, and in its commitment to individualism. For the Enlightenment witnessed what Ian Watt, in his study of the 18th Century British novel, calls »the rise of the novel«. In his book, Watt puts his finger on what is perhaps the single most important feature of the novel; he says,

---

<sup>2</sup> Note Ian Watt's comment: »The greatness of Escartes was primarily one of method, of the thoroughness of his determination to accept nothing on trust; and his *Discourse on Method* (1637) and his *Meditations* did much to bring about the modern assumption whereby the pursuit of truth is conceived of as a wholly inividual matter, logically independent of the tradition of past thought, and indeed as more likely to be arrived at by a departure from it.« Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, (London: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 13.

## INDIVIDUALISM AND THE NOVEL: A SKETCH OF THE INTELLECTUAL

The novel is the form of literature which most fully reflects this individualist and innovating reorientation. Previous literary forms had reflected the general tendency of their cultures to make conformity to traditional practice the major test of truth... This literary traditionalism was first and most fully challenged by the novel, whose primary criterion was truth to individual experience...<sup>3</sup>

Watt is suggesting that the novel arose out of an, intellectual climate that favored the individual and his own personal experience; and a quick look at the major novels of the 18th Century bears this point out. *Clarissa*, *Tom Jones*, *Pamela*, *Moll Flanders*, *The Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*<sup>4</sup> all reflect a faithfulness to the criteria Watt sees developing for this new, individualistic form: the importance of plot (or »what the characters might plausibly be expected to do«); the existence of particular, individual characters rather than generalized »types«; the importance of time and space as they are experienced and perceived by the individual; the use of language to produce a sense of immediacy rather than of figurative wholeness.

In other words, the rise of the novel can be said to reflect the rising tide of individualism inherited from the Renaissance and brought under the scrutinizing eye of the philosopher in the Enlightenment. The novel is the artistic upshot of the Renaissance' new-found faith in the individual and the Enlightenment's desire to explore that faith by refining its focus and exposing more of its detail. Starting from the premises of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the novel both began to develop with greater subtlety the belief that man need not rely on myth and superstition to understand and interpret reality. Both assert that man's own experience and insight are more reliable than incantations, ritual or prophecy.

## II

History demonstrates that few, if any, ideas enjoy perpetual currency, and the premises upon which the novel was based were no exception. The celebration of self-reliant individualism itself grew out of the long, agonizingly slow civilizing process begun when the spread of Christianity took spiritual concerns out of the hands of the traditionalists of the dying ancient world and revitalized man's moral side by emphasizing a personal, individual realation ship with the seed of self-confidence sowed by Christianity flowered in the the seed of self-confidence sowed by Christianity flowered in the Renaissance. However, the very fact that Enlightenment philosophy occupied itself with a thorough analysis of the larger and broader

<sup>3</sup> Watt, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Walter Allen in *The English Novel* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1958), p. 123.

assumptions of the Renaissance suggested that a post-mortem on individualism was being conducted; the flower had bloomed, the fruit had nourished man, and now little remained but to analyze the entire process.<sup>4</sup>

As a child of individualism, brought into the world after individualism had reached its zenith, the novel might have been still-born. But quite to the contrary, it proved itself well-suited to the emerging climate of the 19th and 20th Centuries. For, after the brief Indian summer enjoyed by individualism in the Romantic movement, the 19th Century began to demonstrate an impatience with the subjectivity inherent in individualism. From Marx to Freud, the emphasis was on critical objectivity, a broader overview, and a rejection of the moral relativity into which individualism threatened to lead modern man. Marx, the visionary radical, and Freud, the brooding conservative, shared an overriding insistence that both the individual and society be extracted from the uncritical subjectivity which accompanied individualism. In the last analysis, neither felt that subjective, personal interpretations of reality could produce a reliable strategy for life; both saw the need for objectification of man's perceptions. And no art form proved itself more suited to expressing these intellectual concerns than the novel.

Born into the optimism about the individual and his perceptions that pervaded the Enlightenment, the novel was carried along by — and carried with it — the momentum created by that optimism. The novel emerged into the intellectual heyday of the philosophical premises which established its *raison d'être*, and enjoyed, at least for a time, a climate of opinion very favorable to its aims. In view of this, it is remarkable that the novel did not suffer the same rejection experienced, both by the rationalism of the Enlightenment philosophers, and by the poetry of the 18th Century, when the climate changed in the 19th Century. For, if anything, the novel realized even greater success during the 19th Century than it had in the 18th, despite the individualistic premises upon which it was based.

The reasons for the novel's successful adaption to the climate of the 19th Century (and later the 20th) are both too numerous and complex to be discussed in so brief a survey as this. However, two reasons can be singled out as the most influential. The first, and the most obvious, is the fact that as a new form the novel generated interest and excitement, both among artists and audiences; where poetry had begun, during the 18th Century, to circumscribe and suffocate itself in a web of normative rules and forms, the novel was still in the process of defining itself when the 19th Century began. Thus the novel became a magnet for innovative minds, minds that were dissatisfied with the status quo. The second reason is suggested by Watt when he demonstrates in the second chapter of his book,

## INDIVIDUALISM AND THE NOVEL: A SKETCH OF THE INTELLECTUAL

»The Reading Public and the Rise of the Novel«, that the novel's growth was based in large part on the fact that the reading public increased rapidly over the mid — and late — 18th Century. The novel very rapidly became a public form, accessible to a wider and wider audience, and as such it quickly became a public forum, a place where the prevailing ideas of the time found expression. In short, the novel's youth, and the platform it provided for the prevailing intellectual climate, not only allowed it to survive the shift away from the individualistic biases into which it had been born, they insured that it would become an influential voice as the new wave of anti-individualism swept man into the 20th Century.

Thus the great novels of the 19th Century in England begin to turn a sceptical eye on individualism and the extreme subjectivity that accompanies it, both as they appear in individuals themselves, and in the way that they produce a thoroughly unself-critical society. In Jane Austen's *Emma* and *Pride and Prejudice*, the themes are representative: a bright and intelligent young woman, a bit too sure of herself, and even more unwilling to work for a more objective appraisal of those around her, becomes embroiled in an intrigue of her own making; after a certain amount of humiliation, the young woman's character becomes tempered with the wisdom of self-criticism; and she makes herself worthy of our admiration and respect. Austen says of Emma Woodhouse,

The real evils, indeed, of Emma's situation were the power of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself: these were the disadvantages which threatened alloy to her many enjoyments.<sup>4</sup>

Austen was a master of voicing concern over the lack of self-awareness suffered by the individual in 19th Century England. Other novels focused on the personal and societal subjectivity that developed a symbiotic relationship, one feeding on the other. In Dickens' *Bleak House*, Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*, and Eliot's *Middlemarch*, for instance, we get broad, sweeping, Tolstoy-like panoramas of a society that is lost in its subjectivity because it is made up of individuals who are, themselves, victims of their own individualistic subjectivity. Faced by complacency and the threat of absolute moral relativism in the society around them, 19th Century authors become moralists as well as artists, and like the thinkers of their time, they see criticism as their primary task.

By the middle of the 19th Century, America — that individualistic political child of the Enlightenment — had begun to develop a sense of intellectual independence from England that produced a flurry of novels that rank among the best in the English language. Energized by the political individualism that had character-

alized America from its inception, and torn by the growing disenchantment with individualistic democracy that lie beneath the surface, the American novel emerged as a genre with a peculiar tension that was more akin to the sensibility of the European novel (primarily the French, German and Russian) than to the English. However, the intellectual concerns were the same: the problems created by individualism and subjectivity, here dramatized as obstacles to the realization of a true democratic society.

The three greatest novels of the 19th Century in America develop this tension between the needs of the individual and the needs of a democratic society. In *The Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne evokes a tragic poignancy with his portrait of two Puritan lovers, one a paragon of spiritual strength, the other a spiritual pauper, both of whom suffer for their defiance of the norms of the society in which they live, and neither of whom enjoy absolute certainty that society is wrong in persecuting them. Hawthorne refuses to allow a simple solution to the question of his lovers' guilt or innocence, preferring instead to let the tension he creates infect the reader with the unanswered question. The same is true of Melville's *Moby-Dick*, although Melville confronts the democratic question more directly, forcing us to walk a thin line between Ahab's destructive, but somehow compelling madness, and the safety of the ship and crew who seem so willing to deliver their fates into Ahab's hands. Melville's question is the same as Hawthorne's: does America's commitment to individualism force it to accept the destruction of society by the subjectivity that accompanies that individualism? Neither writer gives an unequivocal answer, but the brooding darkness of their work attests to the deep doubts they had about the future of a society based on individualism and democracy at the same time. Twain takes those doubts a step further, in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. In this American version of Dickens' parade of grotesques, we see society peopled by moral paupers bent on material gain; in a society of individualism gone wild, the truly moral individual finds himself in Nature, and ultimately decides that escape from civilization into the wilderness is the only avenue open to him.

Perhaps Henry James did more than any one author to bridge the differences between the American and British novels. Standing on the brink of what we consider the »modern novel«, James had,

... a dominant psychological element which is rooted in the moral awareness of someone like George Eliot and just stops short of breaking the dam of traditional narrative and overflowing into stream of consciousness.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Sonja Basic, »Henry James between Old and New«; *Studia Romanica et Anglicana Zagrabiensia*, No. 41—42, July—December 1978.

Thus his style was able to link the old with the new, the purely moralistic with the innovation of psychological insight, in a way that allowed the British and American novelists to feel a unity of purpose that has lasted until the present. Using his gift for psychological insight, James took audiences more deeply into the minds of the subjective individualists he saw society producing, and his novels support the earlier judgements of Dickens, Thackeray, Eliot, Twain and others, that an atomized society of alienated individuals is a self-perpetuating, multicelled creature that grows out society and the individual's lack of self-critical objectivity. Figures like Isabel Archer in *A Portrait of a Lady* are the heirs of the legacy left by Emma Woodhouse; however, their intrigues are deeper, the complications more disasterous, and the chance for redemption far more in doubt than those of their precursors.

### III

The »dam of traditional narrative« which Sonja Bašić says Henry James did not break, crumbled convincingly at the open of the 20th Century. Taking the criterion of »truth to individual experience«<sup>6</sup> to its logical extreme, novelists strove to *recreate* individual experience in all its color and complexity. With greater and greater frequency, they turned to experimental techniques in an attempt to find ways of putting the reader in the mind of a novel's main character or characters, thereby allowing him to experience such characters' reality first-hand, as a participant rather than as an observer. But the 20th Century novelists were also interested in creating objectivity in their readers; they inherited the function of criticism that had been embraced by their predecessors. Thus 20th Century American and British writers provide us with critical portraits, works that portray subjective individualism in an extremely sceptical light.

Joseph Conrad begins this tradition with *Lord Jim*, a novel two steps beyond James and one step short of stream of consciousness. The narrator, Marlow, is the moral conscience of the novel; the novel itself is the story of that moral conscience as it tries to come to grips with the moral problem of a well-intentioned young man, Jim, whose individualism has blinded him to his own moral equivocations. Marlow is not as unreliable, nor Jim as morally culpable, as figures we find in novels further into the century, but Conrad's method is nearly identical to that of later »stream-of-consciousness« writers: involve the reader deeply in the subjective moral questions raised by a central figure (most often, the »narrator«, reliable or otherwise), then force the reader to discover for himself a way in which he can form a judgement about the moral questions involved.

<sup>6</sup> See Watt, above.

In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, James Joyce combines the figures of moral questioner and blind individualist into one. Stephen Dedalus, the young man/artist whom we see unfolding through Joyce's stream-of-consciousness narrative, sees himself on an aesthetic quest, but fails to recognize the moral subjectivity inherent in the extreme individualism that characterizes his quest. Joyce does recognize that subjectivity, and the novel is laced with wry, comic irony as the author pokes fun at Stephen's excessive self-absorption; for the reader, however, the task is the same one he faces in Conrad's fiction. Brought into close intimacy with Stephen by Joyce's stream-of-consciousness style, the reader must detach himself from Stephen enough to recognize the flaw in Stephen's character. Finally, the reader must do what Stephen fails to do: distance himself from Stephen's individualism enough to recognize it as a moral stumbling block.

Virginia Woolf, like Joyce, uses stream-of-consciousness narrative, but her novels more often use a number of characters, each of whom suffers, to a greater or lesser degree, from the individualistic subjectivity of their time; taken together, all of them make up the alienated, atomistic society that characterizes 20th Century Britain as »manners«, the already much-inflated currency of the 19th Century, become the hollow gesturings of men and women ill-equipped to deal with modern life. With varying degrees of success, though in a more traditional style, this same critical portrait of society emerges from other novelists in Britain: D. H. Lawrence, E. M. Forster, Ford Maddox Ford, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell among them.

In America, F. Scott Fitzgerald, John Dos Passos, Nathanael West, Ernest Hemingway and Sherwood Anderson each write as a critical response to the individualism which, after the close of the frontier in the late 19th Century, exacerbates the problems faced by a rapidly changing, technologically advanced society. Anderson chooses small-town America on the verge of being engulfed in the modern world, but still rural enough to feel isolated from the mainstream of American life. He develops miniature portraits of individuals trapped in a subjective view of the changes taking place around them, and so obsessively individualistic that they adopt a position of detached aloofness; underneath the aloof veneer, they are turbulent cauldrons of confusion and emotional pain. Nathanael West, in a tragically short career, strove to develop the ironic stance toward his subjects that Sherwood Anderson adopted toward his; however, West chose to write about individuals in the mainstream of change, and his work is thus filled with a more biting irony — and a greater sense of apocalypse lying in wait over the horizon. West focuses his attention on the grotesque figures in American society, from the ruthless social climbers to the failures mired in self-pity.

At first glance, West's novels seem disarmingly simple and straightforward, so much so that his work was ignored for some time after his early death. However, repeated readings of West reveal a complex vision that is highly critical of the society which produces figures such as those that people West's works.

John Dos Passos is unique in America for having developed a style that combines the irony of West, the social criticism of a Twain, and the intimacy with his subject of a Joyce. Dos Passos' subject is America, America as a social entity, a social animal with a life, a pulse, and a mind all its own; and his style can be best characterized as »social stream-of-consciousness«. Using techniques that attempt to capture the dynamism of film and the social commentary of the avant-garde sociologist, Dos Passos takes us into the psyche of America in the same way that Joyce takes us into the psyche of Stephen Dedalus. What he finds there is a society eminently lacking in self-awareness, obsessively bent on pursuing its own collapse.

F. Scott Fitzgerald and Ernest Hemingway are probably the two most widely read American authors of the 20th Century. As writers they learned their craft well, developing extremely readable, carefully controlled styles which made them popular successes in their own time, and enduring literary figures in the decades following. Fitzgerald focused his attention on the narcissism of the Jazz Age and the frustration and boredom of fashionable, newly-rich East Coast society. Hemingway centers himself on the static malaise of expatriot Americans searching, albeit individualistically, for meaning in a Europe that is rapidly following them down the road to moral decay. But perhaps the greatest achievement of the 20th Century American novel belongs to the Southern writer, William Faulkner. Faulkner's reputation in his own time was not equal to that of Hemingway or Fitzgerald,<sup>7</sup> but nearly a half century since the publication of his best works (*The Sound and the Fury*, *Light In August*, and *Absalom, Absalom!*) appreciation for his novels continues to grow and expand. In his subtle use of the decay of Southern society — a society steeped in narcissism and subjective self-pity — Faulkner creates a metaphor for the decadence that plagues a modern world bent on remaining individualistic and morally subjective. Two of his three best novels use the stream-of-consciousness technique to deliver a scathing indictment of the subjective malaise into which the American South fell after its defeat in a civil war which was based on self-righteous indignation rather than moral outrage. Criticizing the South's complete lack of self-awareness and its refusal to take even the slightest steps toward cultivating a self-critical attitude, the

<sup>7</sup> See, for instance, Alfred Kazin, *On Native Grounds* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1942).

South represents modern man in all his stubborn willfulness and pain, trapped by outdated values which he will not discard and tortured by those same values as they destroy the moral fibre of his being. In terms of both artistry and critical purpose, Faulkner's best work ranks with Gide, Hesse and Camus.

Lingering nostalgia for the heroic mode in literature sometimes prompts the student of modern fiction to ask why, in the face of individualism's decline, the novel cannot simply produce a »non-individualistic« hero with whom we could sympathize. Why are we asked to cope with individualistic »anti-heroes« whom one must instinctively mistrust and, ultimately, judge? The question is two-fold, and requires a two-fold answer.

First, the novel cannot simply produce a non-individualistic hero because society itself — indeed, history itself — has not yet evolved a clear vision of what a hero in a non-individualistic world would be. Certainly there are clear signs of what direction the new intellectual millenium will follow: greater objectivity and a more complete rootedness in scientific knowledge promises to be the dominant feature of the intellectual climate of the future. But to attempt to predict what kind of art that climate will produce — let alone what kind of hero will evolve in future fiction—would be equivalent to someone in the 1st Century B. C. trying to predict that a Dante would one day emerge from the spread of Essene doctrine.

Today artists and readers alike inhabit a world torn by the contradictions between the premises of the past, and the shortcomings those premises have revealed in the present. Ours is an age of criticism and reordering of priorities, and therein lies the key to the question, »Why are we asked to cope with individualistic anti-heroes?« Living, as Hesse has put it, »caught between two ages,« we face the task of extracting ourselves from the excessive subjectivity that is individualism's heritage. The novel, through its use of subjective, individualistic anti-heroes, forces us to be objective about our natural sympathy for fictional characters, and thus allows us the opportunity to exercise the critical faculties we so desperately need as we move away from individualism.

Early in a reading of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, for instance, we may find ourselves taken in by Stephen Dedalus, won over by his romanticism, and swept away by the dream-like state he creates as a buffer between him and the real world. But as we become more deeply involved in the novel, we become attuned to the irony with which Joyce treats his young »hero«; our sympathy with Stephen becomes tempered by that irony, and we finally emerge a step or two removed from the subjectivity Stephen characterizes. Ultimately, we experience a revolution in the way we respond to fiction and to life: we learn to be suspect of dreamy nether-

-worlds; we learn to modulate our emotions rather than to be swept away by them; and we learn to bring critical awareness to bear in any encounter, fictional or otherwise

In an age that offers worn out and platitudinous certainties to those in search of deeper understanding of their world, the novel offers only the certainty of criticism. The novel forces us to reassess our premises, the first step toward constructing a new world-view. Reading modern fiction, we learn what the Greeks tell us in tragedy, what Marx tells us in the dialectic, that nothing is permanent; life is flux, out of which the indomitable human spirit forges purpose and direction. Modern fiction is an unapologetic mixture of conflicting elements; it merges the old with the new as a means of enlarging our critical awareness. In so doing, it offers us what all great literature offers us: the opportunity to grow.

## D. SHANAHAN

### *Daniel Shanahan: INDIVIDUALIZAM I ROMAN: KRATAK PRIKAZ INTELEKTUALNE POZADINE MODERNE PROZNE KNJIŽEVNOSTI*

#### S a ž e t a k

Moderni individualizam pojavio se u renesansi kad se čovjek počeo sve više okretati prema sebi. Prolazio je kroz različite faze, a osobito je bilo značajno vrijeme prosvjetiteljstva (18. stoljeće) kada su nastale i neke značajne filozofske rasprave. Pojava romana je dakle povezana s rastućim valom individualizma, jer oboje ističe čovjekov osobni doživljaj i iskustvo kao pouzdanije oslonce od raznih rituala i proricanja.

Međutim, 19. je stoljeće počelo iskazivati nepovjerenje prema subjektivnosti individualizma. Marx i Freud su isticali »kritičku objektivnost« i obojica su smatrali da subjektivne, osobne interpretacije stvarnosti ne mogu biti pouzdani vodiči u životu. Ipak je roman ostao vodeća literarna vrsta u 19. i 20. stoljeću. Kao razlozi za to ističe se sve brojnija čitalačka publika i nespupanost romana pravilima i normama, kao što je bio slučaj kod poezije. Za ilustraciju svojih postavki autor navodi djela nekih engleskih romanopisaca 19. stoljeća (Dickens, Thackeray, Austen, Eliot) i američke romane iz istog razdoblja (Hawthorne, Melville, Twain). Henry James je učinio najviše na smanjenju razlika između američkog i engleskog romana, ali je ipak ostao »na rubu modernog romana«. Brana tradicionalne pripovjedačke tehnike raspala se početkom 20. stoljeća, najprije u djelima Conrada, a kasnije i u djelima Joycea i V. Woolf, a u Americi u djelima F. Scotta Fitzgeralda, Nathanaela Westa, Johna Dos Passosa, Ernesta Hemingwaya i Williama Faulknera. Pokušava se i odgovoriti na pitanje: zašto moderan roman ne može stvoriti »neindividualističkog junaka« i zašto se čitalac modernog romana mora susretati s »anti-junakom« u romanu 20. stoljeća.