

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL

INSTITUTO DE LETRAS

Nº 5 MARÇO 1991
CADERNOS DO IL

Revisão
Prof. Tereza Lemos
Direção do Instituto de Letras
Prof. Ana Maria de Mello e Souza

Coordenadora
Prof. Elza F. de A. ...
Comissão Editorial
Prof. ...
Prof. ...
Prof. ...

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL

INSTITUTO DE LETRAS

Nº 5 MARÇO 1991

⁴Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1920), I, 72.

⁵Henry James, *Literary Reviews and Essays on American, English and French Literature*, ed. Albert Mordell (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1957), p. 214.

⁶Henry James, *The American* (New York: Penguin Books, 1933 rpt), p. 33. My italics.

⁷*The American*, p.34.

⁸*Ibid.*, p.35.

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²*Ibid.* p. 53.

¹³R.P. Blackmur, *Studies in Henry James*, ed. Veronica A. Makowsky (New York: New Directions, 1983), p. 176.

¹⁴*The American*, p. 62.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 281.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 142.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 309.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 111.

²⁰Henry James, *The Europeans* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1878), pp. 34-5.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 187.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 176.

DE OLIVEIRA, Ubiratan Paiva¹

A PARALLEL BETWEEN *THE PORTRAIT OF A LADY* AND *THE RISE OF SILAS LAPHAM*

It might seem strange at first sight the attempt to make a parallel between Henry James's *The Portrait of a Lady* and William Dean Howells's *The Rise of Silas Lapham*. Our intention in trying to make the comparison between the two works was not to reach a conclusion as which one of the books was better. What has called our attention, besides the fact of the publication of the books having been separated by a short period of time, was the presence of some similar aspects and themes in them.

First of all, we noticed that both main characters, Isabel Archer and Silas Lapham, show a very similar development and, in the end, both achieve something through the sacrifice of something else. There are other characters in the two books who also show some points of contact with one another. The use of the new house as a symbol of Lapham's material rise can be paralleled with the use James makes of the houses which appear in his work as representative of the development of the drama. They are both novels of manners and, finally, wealth and marriage are subjects raised in both works, facts which also allowed us to establish some points of contact between them.

As a method for the achievement of our intention, we decided to begin with the analysis of each one of the books separately, in order to have an idea of the whole of each novel. This analysis, though, does not aim to be complete and definitive, but being mainly centered in the observation of the points stated above, in order to establish, in a final section, the contact between the two works.

The Portrait of a Lady

According to Arnold Kettle, "*The Portrait of a Lady* is a novel about destiny. Or, to use a concept rather more in tone with the language of the book itself, it is a novel about freedom."¹ Isabel Archer is a character presented from the beginning as someone who aspires to shape her destiny through her capacity of choice. She

¹ Prof. do Depto. de Línguas Modernas do IL - UFRGS

wants to acquire knowledge in order to experience life and, through her consciousness, be able to choose. She is "a young person of many theories; her imagination was remarkably active;"² or: "She was always planning out her development, desiring her own perfection, observing her own progress."³ Above all, it is expressed that she wants to become someone special, a person of whom no one would be capable of naming a defect; someone who would always do the things properly: "She had an infinite hope that she should never do anything wrong."⁴

We realise that Isabel shows a great preoccupation with herself, even giving the impression of selfishness. And, in fact, it is this self-centeredness, this egotism, that will happen to be the cause of her destiny, as Leon Edel points out: "In the largest sense, egotism and power are the real subjects of *The Portrait of a Lady*, concealed behind a mask of free will and determinism."⁵

The descriptions we are given from her grandmother's house in Albany and of the Dutch House, the school across the street, reinforce the tendencies shown by Isabel for the expansion of the self, not to submit and to exert her capacity of choice. She does not stay in school more than one day, a fact that shows both her ideal of liberty and her self-centeredness.

The house is big, but it does not offer Isabel the expansion so much wanted. She does not show a tendency to do as the others do: the place that she chooses to read is the office, a chamber that "was properly entered from the second door of the house, . . . fastened by bolts."⁶ The place is really too small for the dreams of Isabel's to expand, since she is a girl who cannot allow herself to be kept imprisoned.

The office is a place of her own preference, though. And the description of her choice of it as refuge gives a foreboding of the real drama she will have to go through: "At this time she might have had the whole house to choose from, and the room she had selected was the most joyless chamber it contained."⁷ As we are told, the house is very large, offering many possibilities, but Isabel chooses, as she wants to, the most joyless chamber in it, just as, later, she will choose the most joyless path of those which are offered to her.

The environment is, in fact, too narrow for that girl whose imagination has "a certain garden-like quality, a suggestion of perfume and murmuring boughs, of shading bowers and lengthening vistas"⁸ and, having been offered by her aunt the possibility of expanding her horizons, she accepts to go to Gardencourt, the perfect place for her imagination and freedom to blossom. As F.W. Dupee points out: "Between herself and Albany stands the greatness of Gardencourt, the Touchett's English estate, with its myriad rooms and illimitable lawns and vistas, the scene of her first entry into a larger world."⁹

This entrance into a larger world introduces the remarkable feature in Isabel's character, the one which will be the reason for her final choice: her determination

to become a lady, to have a place in the European world. After being practically forced by Mrs. Touchett to accompany her when she decides to go to bed, Isabel shows her determination to shape her own future, as well as her need for knowledge and her ultimate aspiration. Says Mrs. Touchett:

"Very likely not. You are too fond of your liberty."

"Yes, I think I am very fond of it. But I always want to know the things one shouldn't do."

"So as to do them?" asked her aunt.

"So as to choose," said Isabel.¹⁰

It is thus clear that Isabel looks for freedom that will allow her to shape her future according to her own will. The hints of the danger that such decision might involve are already found at this point, though. When informing her uncle of her refusal of Warburton's proposal, Mr. Touchett's final comment to Isabel can also be considered as a foreboding of what will become of her expectations: "There is room everywhere, my dear, if you will pay for it. I sometimes think I have paid too much for this. Perhaps you also might have to pay too much. 'Perhaps I might,' the girl replied."¹¹

Isabel's expectations of life are thus very high. We cannot expect her to resign her freedom while she has not seen enough of the world and learned what is important for her. It is through experience that she will acquire the power to choose.

Therefore, she cannot accept either of her two suitors, for what they represent will not bring her what she wants. They will not be a contribution to her quest for perfection. Both of them offer her an easy and comfortable life. The difference between them is that Goodwood represents sexual passion, while Warburton offers her social position, security, but neither of the suitors would be of any help in her search for knowledge and freedom. On the contrary, what they represent are limits that would be interposed in her path, as Leon Edel observes. For him, Goodwood is "monotonously masculine; and if Isabel finds his sheer sexual force attractive it is also terrifying. Passion, or sex, as with Roderick, is not freedom."¹² Still according to Edel, what Lord Warburton has to offer is not freedom either, for "social position in a hierarchical society represented a strong threat to a woman powerful enough and egotistical enough to believe that she has "an orbit of her own."¹³

Isabel's refusal of her two suitors establishes her full remarkableness, as someone with a higher goal in life than that of being effaced in the role of a wife. Even though the life that Goodwood offers her would perhaps give her freedom, as Oscar Cargill points out: "her association with the Touchetts has brought her another spectacle of the frustration and emptiness of complete liberty - the barren spectacle of her aunt. Mrs. Touchett provides the ultimate illustration of complete freedom in marriage such as Caspar Goodwood offers."¹⁴ What Cargill means is that Isabel does not want an empty independence, such as her aunt's, the kind that she would have with Goodwood, for he would be a busier businessman than her

uncle. That empty independence does not appeal to Isabel, it is clear from her marriage and her final decision, but we cannot agree with Cargill when he says that she would find freedom by marrying Goodwood, for he would represent the enslavement of physical passion and would not be the perfect companion for her search of perfection through knowledge. Or, as she remarks to Goodwood himself: "I don't wish to be a mere sheep in the flock; I wish to choose my fate and know something of human affairs beyond what other people think it compatible with propriety to tell me."¹⁵

The liberation of Isabel is almost complete up to this point. In order to be complete, so that she may have "a little wind in her sails,"¹⁶ her cousin Ralph asks his father to diminish his part of his inheritance so that Isabel can be financially liberated. Mr. Touchett finally agrees with his son, but he also gives a first suggestion of "a possible weakness in Isabel Archer's moral constitution,"¹⁷ according to Dorothea Krook, by asking Ralph: "Isabel is a sweet young girl, but do you think she is as good as that?"¹⁸ Krook relates the question to Isabel's future drama and considers that the old man's words must be viewed as Isabel's "share of moral responsibility for the disaster that overtakes her"¹⁹

With Mr. Touchett's death, Isabel, the girl "who knew nothing about bills,"²⁰ has in her hands all the necessary means to fulfil her aspirations, but, before she comes to inherit the money, Mme. Merle appears in her path, a fact that strikes us as one more expression of James's genius: between Isabel and the financial liberation, someone who will happen to be an obstacle to her freedom is introduced at the exact moment. The impression caused by Mme. Merle upon Isabel is the best possible and, therefore, she will play an enormous influence upon the young lady, for whom she was "a woman of ardent impulses, kept in admirable order. What an ideal combination!"²¹

This happens to be the turning point in the book. Everything that has happened up to now stands as a preparation for the second part. As F.W. Dupee points out, the action shifts "from the epic spirit of the first half - in which Isabel invades and conquers the old world - to the dramatic mood of the second half, where she writhes in an old world that has turned into a sort of Hell."²²

The description of Osmond's villa in Florence, which precedes his appearance in the novel, will furnish us with some details about his character: "this ancient, solid, weather-worn, yet imposing front, had a somewhat incommunicative character. It was the mask of the house; it was not its face."²³ With this description of the house, we are prepared to find someone who wears an outward look, but whose inner feelings are other than the ones which are shown from the outside. This is the man whom Isabel finally chooses to be her husband.

Why does Isabel marry Osmond? It seems to be the logical conclusion after all the preparation she has gone through. Her former suitors could have offered her position, but they would not satisfy her need for experience and knowledge as she

thought an aesthete would. There is also the opposition of the others: Mrs. Touchett, Ralph, Miss Stackpole. She would not allow other people's interference in her affairs. She wanted to exert her full capacity of choice and she did it. She had become rich and she would use her money in the best possible way, which would allow both her and her husband to grow: "Mr. Osmond is simply a man- he is not a proprietor!"²⁴ Says Dorothea Krook:

Isabel's reasons for marrying Gilbert Osmond: The first, as we saw, is her ardent desire to enlarge and enrich her experience of life, to grow in wisdom and virtue under the guidance of this most superior of men. The second is her desire, equally ardent, to serve. More specifically, it is the desire to do something with her money that will be at once useful and imaginative; most specifically, to use her money in the service of someone she loves.²⁵

As she points out to Ralph when he tries to convince her not to marry Osmond: "I have only one ambition - to be free to follow out a good feeling."²⁶ Her good feelings being expressed by her desire to be useful with her money.

So Isabel has experienced freedom and has come to the point to conclude that sheer liberty is not what she wants. She wants the freedom to choose, though, and she does it. Perhaps with the same feeling that Ralph had towards her when he asked his father to change his will, the feeling of being useful: "One must choose a corner and cultivate that."²⁷

Three years pass and the impression is that the marriage has become a failure. Mr. and Mrs. Osmond live in "a dark and massive structure . . . a dungeon . . . a kind of domestic fortress, which bore a stern old Roman name, which smelt of historic deeds, of crime and craft and violence . . ."²⁸ These are impressions that come to us by means of Rosier's mind, preoccupied that he is with his loved one, Pansy. But what is Pansy's function in the novel besides serving as a parallel to Isabel? She is the girl kept in a convent in order to be molded by her father's will into an obedient girl with suppressed ideas. One more object in his dilettante's collection.

We are told that the Osmonds had lost a child in the meantime, a fact which comes to reinforce the idea of failure by adding that of sterility of the couple who do not use the same bedroom. The problem is that Isabel's ideas could not be suppressed as Osmond wished and now he is not able to add so fine pieces to his collection as he used to do before their marriage: "He was fond of the old, the consecrated, the transmitted; so was she, but she pretended to do what she chose with it."²⁹

The subject of Pansy's marriage is raised to be the supreme point of disagreement between husband and wife, maintaining the theme as central to the drama, the girl's case always appearing as an externalization of Isabel's condition: "Thus James supplied Isabel and her husband with a definite field of action on

which to develop their deadly moral differences, and thus he kept the marriage theme alive throughout the novel. Marriage, then, is the axis on which the Portrait turns," says F. W. Dupee.³⁰

The fact is that Isabel will not suppress her own ideas and become a mere subservient wife. She had already refused two other suitors who offered her a similar situation. She does not want to become another fine piece on the shelf of a dilettante, who, egotist as he is, will not admit the liberation of his own wife, the molder that he is of a small, perfect world of his own. Leon Edel gives a perfect account of the situation:

Isabel and Osmond had been attracted to one another because each saw in the other a mirror-image of self. The two had experienced an irresistible need for each other and in the end they cannot suffer each other. Power may be attracted by power, but it cannot endure it. Each insists on supremacy. Osmond tries to bend Isabel to his will. She cannot be bent. Her kind of power refuses to be subjugated: it exerts its own kind of subjugation. His, more devious, returns perpetually to the assault. The impasse is complete.³¹

The truth comes little by little to Isabel's knowledge. She comes to know that she has not chosen, as had been her desire, but she had been used by others, specifically by her husband and Mme. Merle's machinations. The whole picture is finally shown to Isabel, and it is a picture she has not fully painted, as she had supposed. Here James achieves what Joseph Warren Beach calls the method of revelation. He observes:

You have rather a sense of being present at the gradual unveiling of a picture, or the gradual uncovering of a wall-painting which had been whitewashed over and is now being restored to view. The picture was all there from the start; there is nothing new being produced; there is no progress in that sense. The stages are merely those by which the exhibitor or the restorer of the picture uncovers now one, now another portion of the wall or canvas, until finally the whole appears in its intelligible completeness.³²

For Isabel, the picture of the whole situation where she finds herself is complete. But she is the one who will give the last stroke of paint in order that the picture becomes what she had the ambition to produce: the portrait of a Lady! In order to achieve what she proposes, Isabel "will make the best of a bad situation, a best that will principally involve attitude."³³ Ralph's imminent death will bring her the chance to give that last stroke of paint. Even though forbidden to go to England by her husband, Isabel decides to go, and there, on the lawns of Gardencourt she has her freedom again in her hands. There would not be a better setting for Goodwood's final attempt to conquer her. But he does not represent freedom, either, nor the realization of Isabel's highest ambition, as F. O. Matthiessen points out:

That conveys James's awareness of how Isabel, in spite of her marriage, has remained essentially virginal, and how her resistance and flight from Caspar are partly fear of sexual possession. But the fierce attraction she also feels in this passage would inevitably operate likewise for a girl of her temperament, in making her do what she conceived to be her duty, and sending her back to her husband.³⁴

Why does Isabel go back to her husband? Let us examine some opinions about the fact.

For Leon Edel, Isabel and Osmond are, "for all their differences, two sides of the same coin, two studies in egotism,"³⁵ which brings to mind Mr. Touchett's question to Ralph when of their talk about the change of the will. It would be the realization that not only Osmond was guilty of the situation, but Isabel also, due to her temperament.

For Dorothea Krook, "the tragic effect in the drama depends upon our recognising that the hero shall be in some sense and in some degree responsible for the fate that overtakes him."³⁶ Edel and Krook agree, thus, that Isabel had at least some guilt in her situation. Nevertheless, what really matters is her decision, having already left her husband and having a whole new horizon in front of her, as her presence at Gardencourt suggests.

Arnold Kettle's contribution might also be of some help: "What Isabel finally chooses is something represented by a high cold word like duty or resignation, the duty of an empty vow, the resignation of the defeated, and that in making her choice she is paying a final sacrificial tribute to her own ruined conception of freedom."³⁷ And Oscar Cargill completes:

Beside the prospect of an empty independence like her aunt's . . . keeping the forms of her duty to her husband and her promise to Pansy, with all its entails, seems to Isabel to afford a more meaningful life. "Certain obligations were involved in the very fact of marriage," she had thought, "and were quite independent of the quantity of enjoyment extracted from it." Duty has meaning for Isabel - this is the lesson she has derived from her experience - and sheer liberty has none.³⁸

To escape her fate would not be the right attitude to take for that girl who longed "to find herself some day in a difficult position, so that she might have the pleasure of being as heroic as the occasion demanded."³⁹ She not only performs her duty, but she also attends to Pansy's needs and to her own promise to go back. But, most of all, she is faithful to her desire to choose: she realises that, without her going back, that last stroke of paint on the portrait would not be given and, therefore, the picture finally unveiled would not be the one she expected. Her last decision confirms Edel's and Krook's points of view: there is a great deal of "the desire to think well of herself"⁴⁰ in her return.

That is why, as Arnold Kettle puts it, her fate "suggests that it has, if not inevitability, at least a kind of glory to it. So that when Isabel takes her decision to return to Rome the dominant sense is not of the waste and degradation of a splendid spirit, but of a kind of inverted triumph."⁴¹

The Rise of Silas Lapham

Howells's book begins with Lapham's interview by a journalist, a fact that states his material rise. It lets us assume that Silas has already reached the point so much aimed at in business life: success. Through the interview we get to know of the Laphams' humble origins and how Silas had become the great and rich businessman that he is now. We are also told of the role that Persis, his wife, has played in his business career: "I used to tell her it wa'n't the seventy-five per cent of purr-ox-eyed of iron in the ore that made that paint go; it was the seventy-five per cent of pur-ox-eyed of iron in her."⁴²

It shows throughout the interview that his success is due to the unity of the family, where his wife plays an important part, as well as his resolution to stay in the old place of his family, which expresses respect for tradition. Although his own brothers had gone West as soon as they were old enough to do it, Silas had decided to stay: "but I hung on to New England, and I hung on to the old farm, not because the paint-mine was on it, but because the old house was - and the groves."⁴³

The interview also indicates, in its very beginning, that Lapham already shows some signs of material corruption, when he tells the journalist, "I guess you wouldn't want my life without the money."⁴⁴ Those principles of unity, the family, and tradition, have a new element in Lapham's life that give it some sort of a stain. As the interview finishes, we already have a hint of his pride and business situation as he takes the journalist home on his buggy, regretting the impossibility of speeding the horse in that part of town, a feeling of triumph pervading this habit of his of trotting down the Boston streets.

According to Kermit Vanderbilt, at the end of the interview, "Howells has accomplished the miracle of fiction in which a sharply realized hero suddenly emerges from the page full born."⁴⁵ In fact, except for the Coreys, all the other characters have already been introduced, and Lapham appears as a rough-hewn, ungrammatical businessman not ashamed of his origins. Vanderbilt also points out that "Silas does submit a small doubt whether his first million would have arrived without a certain assist from accident and fate."⁴⁶

By the end of the first chapter, we already have a complete idea of Lapham's character. He is someone who believes in the miracle of the American Dream and, therefore, has built himself a fortune. His paint is his pride and, with it, he intends to cover the whole world, no limits thus existing for his ambition: with his money,

he will be able to buy anything he wants.

Alexander Harvey says that Howells's "study of the career and the character of Silas Lapham is the most successful treatment the native American has ever received in fiction."⁴⁷ That the character is marvellously built, there can be no doubt about, but, although carrying some truth in his comments, we think that Harvey exaggerates when he goes further:

He is a true native American of Anglo-Saxon origin, this Silas, reared in all the terrible "arrivism" for which our country has come to stand. Like the breed to which he belongs, Silas Lapham is destitute of the combination of psychological insight with imagination and fancy. Incarnate in him is the unredeemed ugliness of the material prosperity of his type and of his race. He is the characteristic product of a people without genius. The emptiness, the forlornness, the dreariness and the dullness of the domestic life of the "successful" American are vividly experienced for us vicariously through the ordeals of Silas Lapham. He is a typical American in his ignorance of human nature, of beauty, of ideas. His conception of life takes the form of an enthusiasm for the paint he sells. Everything should be coated with that. As far as he can be said to have a theory or conception of culture at all, it is a coat of paint.⁴⁸

The concepts expressed by Harvey about the type Lapham stands for are mostly correct. We think he goes too far when he limits the type to native Americans of Anglo-Saxon origin, giving a racial connotation that we do not find in the book. Lapham represents an American, there can be no doubt, but what he really for is the businessman who becomes blind through ambition, a type we find anywhere and that, perhaps because of material progress, has become very common in America. His ignorance of human nature, beauty and ideas is due to the type of corruption he represents, but not to the fact of his being American and, more than that, Anglo-Saxon. Apart from these aspects, we think Harvey's opinions are according to the truth, transparent throughout the interview, which gives us, as George N. Bennet remarks, "hints that Lapham is losing the objectivity necessary to prevent not only the disease of empty social ambition but the more serious corruption of materialism."⁴⁹

The Laphams lived in an unfashionable neighbourhood and had not a social life. Their two daughters had gone to the public schools and their idea was that they should do, and were conscious of having done, the best they could for the children: "The very strength of their mutual affection was a barrier to worldly knowledge; they dressed for one another; they equipped their house for their own satisfaction; they lived richly to themselves, not because they were selfish, but because they did not know how to do otherwise."⁵⁰ It is unity and privacy that is going to be poisoned by empty social ambition and, only with Lapham's return to them he will find his moral rise, as George N. Bennet says: "It is, in fact, the very strength of the mutual affection uniting the family in self-sufficiency which contributes to their social

ignorance, and one of the complications of theme is the disruption of this solidarity."⁵¹

Due to the special interest which one of their daughters shows in the young Corey, the Laphams, for the first time, feel the necessity of leading a social life. When the Corey lady comes to pay a visit to the Laphams, she leaves them with a shade of doubt when she says that her coachman did not know the way to their house, their friends not living in that part of town.

The effect of Mrs. Corey's remark is so great that Silas and Persis decide to build a new house in a very fashionable area. The house begins to be raised and the couple goes to see it, enjoying the view of their future home. A shade comes to their way, though, in the form of a man whom they meet at the moment they arrive. The man is no one else but Rogers, Lapham's former partner whom he had dismissed after having overcome a crisis with the help of that very same man's money. The fact remained as Persis's only complaint of her husband's behaviour and the meeting brings this almost forgotten detail to surface, producing a first foreboding of what is going to happen, and establishing the new house as the symbol, not only of Lapham's worldly success, but also of his moral degradation: "And don't you ask me to go to that house with you anymore. You can sell it, for all me. I sha'n't live in it. There is blood on it."⁵²

The difficulties of married life then come to the first line of Howells's preoccupations in the book. He opens the fourth chapter with comments about Silas and Persis's situation as a married couple. He emphasises the condition that marriage gives to people to establish a relation that could be subjected to a daily strain without being destroyed. The same situation outside of marriage would result, after some time, in the complete desintegration of such a relationship. It is at this point, perfectly in accordance with the mood of the chapter, that Howells states that Lapham's marriage to Persis had represented "a rise in life for him,"⁵³ bearing as she did her full share of their common burden.

We are also told that Persis had played the part of Silas's conscience when of the affair of his partnership with Rogers, and also that she had always carried the case in her mind as something which awaited justice: "Happy is the man for ever after who can choose the ideal, the unselfish part in such an exigency! Lapham could not rise to it."⁵⁴ The affair remained as a stain in their lives, Lapham always needing to claim his honesty when he refers to it, Howells leaving us a hint that Lapham's moral rise has yet to come.

Olov W. Fryckstedt makes the following comment about Persis: "Howells has drawn many portraits of strong women who watch over their husbands' actions and never allow them to deviate the least bit from the narrow path of the highest morality . . . Mrs. Lapham never lets Silas rest as long as she thinks that he is acting, or tempted to act, out of vain and selfish motives."⁵⁵ When Lapham wants to show off by offering a cheque of five-hundred dollars for charity, Persis, according to her role

as stated above, tears it and does not let him give more than one-hundred dollars.

The same way that we have been informed that the house is doomed not to be inhabited, that is, by a chance encounter in front of it, some of the most important scenes in the novel are going to take place in it. It is there that Tom Corey re-enters the Laphams' lives. Lapham, while showing the construction to the young man, gives evidence that material success has come up to his head: "We don't intend to have any second best,"⁵⁶ or, "if money can do it, I guess I'm going to be suited."⁵⁷

Howells's use of the word *rise* is again shown here, as a representation of Lapham's worldly victory, and his invitation to Tom to see the house is the material portraiture of Silas's attempt to climb the social ladder by means of his relationship with the Coreys and, evidently, through his money: "Come up," said the Colonel, rising, "and look round if you'd like to."⁵⁸ Lapham does not waste time and invites the young man to see them at home. Mrs. Lapham, though, notices her husband's behaviour and tries to make him realise the social differences between them and the Coreys.

The appearance of Tom Corey introduces a subplot of great importance in the novel, one that will establish the balance between the main themes in the book, the social and moral ones. In order to summarize the subplot, we can say that it consists in Tom's falling in love with Penelope, the elder of Lapham's two daughters, while everyone, including the girls thought him to be in love with Irene.

Tom looks for Lapham at his office and gets the job. Lapham, feeling himself flattered, invites and takes the young man along to his house on the beach. Persis, always acting as sort of her husband's conscience, wants to know if he had urged Tom to go with him, worried that she is that Lapham is too much preoccupied with his social climbing:

He knew who the Coreys were very well, and, in his simple, brutal way had long hated their name as a symbol of splendour which, unless . . . should live to see at least three generations of his descendants gilded with mineral paint, he could not hope to realise in his own.⁵⁹

Tom starts working hard at Lapham's place and the latter does not make any difference in relation to Tom as compared to his other employees. Nevertheless, he brags about the fact, flattered that he is by having old Phillips Corey's grandson working for him, although Persis always tries to ridicule such a tendency of his. Not allowed by his wife to invite the young man to Nantasket, he compensates by taking the young man triumphantly in his buggy, Tom silencing his traditions and talking about the Colonel's favorite topics: his paint, horse and the new house.

And it is at the new house that Tom meets Irene again, the girl getting herself convinced of his love when alone with him. Tom offers her a shaving as if it were a flower. She puts it in her belt and takes it home. Everett Carter comments about

this scene:

The shaving from the house, a sliver of the major symbol, became the symbol for the sliver of personal morality which is part of the larger morality of social living.

For as the shaving is to the whole house, so is the complexity of the personal ethic to the social. And it is the social ethic which Howells tried to understand through writing Silas Lapham.⁶⁰

In fact, what Carter tells us is that the novel presents growing from self-interest to the interest of our fellowman and, finally, to the interest of a group with which you have or not ties, to the interest of society.

Lapham seems to go losing control over his actions, anxious that he is to rise socially. He is concerned about inviting the Coreys to dinner, his wife always playing the conscience part, trying to make him understand that, due to the Coreys' superior social position, they should wait for their initiative. As Lapham spends more and more money, once again we find a foreboding in his wife's words: "You've lost your head, Silas Lapham, and if you don't look out you'll lose your money too."⁶¹

Knowing that her husband, not satisfied with the fortune he has already accomplished, started investing in stocks, Persis advises him to stop with it, not without making a moral judgement of his actions: "When did you take up gambling for a living?"⁶²

The only great regret Mrs. Lapham had concerning her husband is redeemed: Rogers goes after Lapham for help and Silas lends him the money he needs, lifting a weight from his and his wife's conscience, which is expressed by his saying, "Well, I don't know when it's done me so much good to shake hands with anybody."⁶³

According to Everett Carter's opinion, this happens to be the first act of empathy necessary to redeem Lapham, easy to be performed because it happens on a personal basis. Nevertheless, Lapham does not admit he had been wrong before. The scene of his moral decay is complete, as George N. Bennet points out: "the outward signs of Silas Lapham's corruption are his attempts to buy his way out of moral responsibility through a deliberately unwise loan to a former partner and victim."⁶⁴

Lapham's pride grows when he receives Bromfield's visit at his office and, once again, he mentions the possibility of some dinner to his wife, who manages to dissuade him of his intent. As she complains of Tom's delay in declaring his intentions towards his daughter, Lapham's ambition and pride manifest themselves again: "I'm worth nigh on to a million, and I've made it every cent myself; and my girls are the equals of anybody, don't care who it is."⁶⁵ He is convinced that he can

buy everything with his money and social position is definitely his aim.

The Coreys show the other side of the medal, discontented that they are with Tom's choice. The same way as Lapham represents the social climber, they stand for a decaying aristocracy, having to control their expenses in order not to get ruined, but never allowing themselves to get rid of social prejudices. Their position, although respecting Tom's decision, is of disapproval, which will be confirmed even after the marriage is accomplished, when no one in the family will get along well with Penelope. The behaviour confirms James W. Tuttleton's words when he says: "It is in fact the power of love that triumphs over the conventions of society, as is so often the case in the comedy of manners."⁶⁶ Their complaints are about the Laphams' ungrammaticalness, their lack of wine at the table, and other things of the same sort. For them, manners count more than the qualities of character. Futility and meaninglessness pervade their world, a world doomed to disappear. The marriage of Tom and Pen, the representatives of the best from each class, symbolizes the world of the future: her vigor, morality and some intellect and his amalgam of culture and new businessman.

After paying the Laphams a visit and discussing the matter over with her husband, Mrs. Corey decides to offer them dinner, that will be placed not only in a central position in the book, but also representing the turning point in Lapham's situation, as Everett Carter observes: "It was the end of Lapham's dreams of success in Society and the beginning of his realization of the demands of Society."⁶⁷

After receiving the invitation and until the very hour of the dinner, the Laphams find themselves involved in the most futile of problems concerning the correct procedure in order not to fail in their social introduction, problems like Mrs. Lapham's doubts on how to find the proper phrasing to accept the invitation, their doubts about the right clothes for the occasion, reaching the limit of their buying a book of etiquette, for even Lapham himself begins to be afflicted by such things, concerning which he had always been indifferent.

The awkwardness of the situation and, mainly, the real drama that the doubt about wearing or not gloves constitutes to Silas, represents the totally false position at which the Laphams find themselves, led by the drive of the Colonel in having the doors of society opened for him. The whole scene, which indeed provokes a real suspense, is a stroke of genius on Howells's part to show us the inadequacy of Silas's attempt.

A very important character is introduced then, one whose words will represent the beginning of Lapham's redemption, besides the fact that he will also appear as the person who will solve the drama of the subplot and, finally, provide Lapham with the moral strength necessary to redeem and perform the closing spiritual interview that will establish a great contrast with the worldly interview in the beginning.

This person is Rev. Sewell, who, coincidentally enough, has a domestic situation

very similar to Lapham's in what concerns the relations between himself and his wife, reinforcing Persis's role as the conscience of the couple; Olov W. Fryckstedt comments: "Rev. Sewell's domestic situation is similar, only Mrs. Sewell is a much more fearful judge than Mrs. Lapham; once the minister thinks that it must be less terrible to confront the Lord on the day of judgement than to face one's wife pitiless scrutiny."⁶⁸

Lapham ends up by making a fool of himself, drunk, and his dreams of social rise come to an end. He realises that he cannot buy anything he wants by the mere fact of being rich. His apologies to Tom represent, as George N. Bennet says, "a renewed sense of humility, a renewed sense of distinction between himself and his money."⁶⁹ Lapham, after having gone near the bottom, has his moment of moral rebirth, that will provide him with the courage and strength necessary to overcome his moment of supreme crisis.

The situation also serves to assure Tom's integrity of character. He meditates upon the whole subject and is able to overcome his inherited social prejudices, and to decide to give the decisive step in his life, by declaring his love to Penelope, which will change the center of interest in the novel to the subplot for some time.

Penelope is taken by surprise and decides to sacrifice the love that she had kept secret so that her sister did not suffer. A little before, the two young people had discussed the same book which had been a subject of conversation at the Coreys' dinner - "Tears, Idle Tears". Although having considered a forced situation that the character in the novel had given her lover up to another who had cared for him first, Pen, by her attitude, repeats the situation, and a family crisis arises, the Laphams not knowing how to solve it.

Silas reminds himself of Rev. Sewell and it is from him that they will receive the solution for the problem, which is nothing more than common sense and pragmatism: economy of pain, which will allow less people to suffer, instead of making all people involved suffer through renunciation. Therefore, Irene must give up Tom.

After having been informed of the situation and, completely distressed, Irene goes for a walk with her father until they finally reach the new house. There they stop and stay looking up at its facade which is already shown and, again, we have a foreboding that the house will never be inhabited, this time through Irene's words: "I shall never live in it"⁷⁰

The family drama over, the field is open for Lapham's material bankruptcy and consequent moral rise. The money that Lapham had lent Rogers, his endless expenses with the new house and his investments in stocks put him in bad financial situation. He will envisage four possible solutions for the crisis, but, in the end, as most of these possible solutions fail, he decides, by his own choice, to assume the whole responsibility for the consequences, and, therefore, going through a moral

rise, while his material kingdom falls to pieces. Everett Carter defines Lapham's attempts to save his fortune as "an aethical struggle between a tempting devil and a redeeming God."⁷¹

Lapham envisages salvation in selling the new house, the embodiment of his dream of social rise. Informed of the existence of a possible buyer, Lapham decides to pay a last visit to it. Meditating upon his whole situation, "above all, Lapham detected the peculiar odour of his own paint."⁷² The house and his business are thus mingled in one and only thing. Deciding to try the chimney, what else does he find, in order to make the fire, than shavings, left by the carpenters. While he looks at the fire, his pride invades him again and he decides to keep the house and try to raise the money and buy out his West Virginian competitors. He does not put out the fire properly, though, and, due to his own action, the house burns and nothing remains of it but the walls.

Lapham goes bankrupt, but due to his honesty and strength of character in the midst of adversity, he has gone through a moral rise, for he decides to assume the responsibility for the fact and not let other people pay for his losses. James Tuttleton summarizes the whole drama in a few words:

The focus of the novel is the character of the representative American businessman under pressure to use jungle methods to maintain his fortune. The novel reveals him to be basically honest but tempted to do wrong, occasionally succumbing, perhaps, but capable of triumphing over human weakness by deliberately chosen, ethically motivated conduct based on a sense of fair play and Christian charity.⁷³

In fact, the greatness of Lapham's behaviour lies in his having, by his own and only choice, rejected a materialistic world that, although offering him some perfectly legal possibilities of financial salvation, for a moral rise, accepting to suffer the consequences so that a great number of other people do not lose. By so doing, he returns to the traditional principles that had guided his life in the beginning and to the preoccupation with the unity of the family and the good of his children, the unity being restored with the return of Irene.

The end of the novel brings another interview. This time, though, it is not a worldly interview performed by a journalist. Its spiritual characteristic is expressed by the presence of Rev. Sewell, who, with his philosophy of the economy of pain, had furnished Lapham with the means, not only to solve the problems within his own family, but also his reaching a stature in relation to himself, his family, the world. Instead of material gains, Lapham encounters spiritual compensations for himself and his family. As Everett Carter says, Lapham has risen "to a sense of the morality which binds the social world together, making it imperative that we live for others and not for ourselves."⁷⁴

The Portrait and the Rise

Arnold Kettle tries to summarize what *The Portrait* is all about by saying that "the main themes indicated in the first chapters are the importance of wealth, the difficulty of marriage and - fundamental to the other two - the problem of freedom or independence."⁷⁵ In these three main themes, in our opinion, we can establish a relationship between both James's and Howells's works.

The importance of wealth is fundamental in both books. It is the fact that Isabel has become rich that will raise the idea in Mme. Merle's mind to propitiate Gilbert Osmond a good marriage and, by so doing, securing the future of her own daughter, Pansy. Wealth, that according to Ralph Touchett's idea, was supposed to furnish Isabel with the necessary means to enlarge her experience and exert her freedom fully, will, on the contrary, be the cause for her imprisonment in the Palazzo Roccanera, by her own choice, it is true, but as a consequence of a sense of duty and, why not, to her susceptibility to appearances, a sense of doing the right thing in order not to have her own image stained, as Dorothea Krook remarks:

Isabel Archer is too susceptible - just that shade too susceptible - to fine appearances, to a brilliant surface, to the appeal, in short, of the merely aesthetic, to be morally altogether sound. And this is perhaps what old Mr. Touchett dimly recognised when he asked Ralph whether he really thought his cousin Isabel was "so good as that"; and for this Isabel has to suffer, and through her suffering learn that the aesthetic is not coextensive with the moral, and that the touchstone of taste is not the touchstone by which a good life can be lived.⁷⁶

Wealth brings also to Lapham the wrong impression that he can buy everything with his money. It is by the fall of his material achievement that Lapham realises the existence of higher things in life. It is also through a sense of duty to the others that, despite provoking his material failure, he will have the chance to choose and grow as a moral being.

As we can see, wealth leads both main characters to the situation where they must finally choose. And both chose the way that implies duty to other human beings, although representing a great amount of personal sacrifice. Through their final decisions, both Silas and Isabel rise as characters, for, having the necessary freedom to choose, they decide to take the path of responsibility and exert their independence with a noble purpose, leaving empty freedom aside.

The difficulty of marriage is a theme clearly expressed in both books. In James's, we find not only the situation of Isabel and Gilbert Osmond, but we also have references to the problem through other characters, like the Touchetts, who lead practically separate lives, Mrs. Touchett perhaps representing the total and useless freedom from which Isabel escapes in the end. Countess Gemini is another character whose matrimonial problems are evident. And, of course, Mme. Merle

cannot be forgotten.

The situation between Isabel and Osmond can be defined as the clash between two strong wills. A narcissistic tendency is present in both of them and does not allow either to submit to the other's will. Isabel will not give her ideas up, although Osmond's attempt to suppress them. So their marriage results merely external, functioning only to provide them with a secure social position, which is most of what Osmond wants of it, and reinforced by Isabel's decision to appear as a lady. There is no intimacy between them, though, and their marriage results sterile, the child they lose representing its premature failure.

In *The Rise*, we have an opposite view of a couple. No one can say that the Laphams are not a united couple and their family well-integrated. Nevertheless, the difficulties, the doubts, all these things, are clear throughout the novel. Persis functions as a kind of conscience of her husband, pointing out what she thinks are his faults, as it is the case with his having dismissed Roger, a fact that remains as a stain in their relationship until the moment when Lapham realises he had done wrong. Even the conscience is not free of mistakes, though, as we are informed by Persis's suspicions concerning "Mrs. M."

The final impression that Persis and Silas leave us is that of a well-balanced couple, two parallel forces striving together to achieve common results, no one showing any tendency to submit the other.

The marriage of Tom and Penelope presents another sort of problem: the differences between social classes. Although the Coreys' behaviour can be considered as perfectly correct when they decide not to interfere with Tom's decision, the differences remain, and Tom and Pen will be reminded of them throughout their lives. As Vanderbilt points out: "We are given subtle assurance that sentimental-romantic fiction will find no place in this ideal marriage."⁷⁷

A parallel can be traced in the affair of Pansy's marriage. Although having a considerable sum of money, Rosier is considered as not acceptable by Osmond, because he does not achieve the necessary status that his ambitions demand.

In Howells's book we have a so considered aristocratic Boston family who, although not enjoying the young man's decision, does not interfere because it is not the right thing to do, for individual freedom must be respected. That is, despite their social prejudices, they act accordingly to certain rules of respect for other people's choices.

Osmond, on the contrary, is not only a *déraciné*, but someone without any fortune before his marriage. Ambition has come up to his head and he will do everything to have the unstained image that he has envisaged for himself. He will send his daughter back to the convent and try to shape her as he pleases. Would that be the real difference between authentic aristocracy and the newly acquired

through wealth?

From this point of view Osmond's image resembles that of Lapham's corruption through material gains. They both think about buying their way to society through their money.

We can also find some resemblances between Osmond and Tom's father, Bromfield Corey. They are both useless dilettantes who do not work and live on somebody else's means, be it through inheritance or marriage. The former is a collector of *objets d'art* who only thinks of enriching his collection, not only with objects but also with people whom he intends to turn into objects. The latter is a painter who does not paint, a talker above all things who disapproves of other people's attempts to enter his closed circle, because these people do not show the superficial qualities of his class.

Osmond gets married because of money, and he also thinks his daughter should marry someone chosen by himself, preference given to rich men, and, most of all, noble. Corey is ironical, but in the midst of his ironies, he expresses the point of view of those of his kind, as when he says to his son: "I supposed you wished the girl's money, and here you are, basely seeking to go into business with her father."⁷⁸ That is, marrying the girl with the selfish aim of achieving financial advantages would bring no harm but mixing-up with her father through business would be shameful. A further parallel can be traced between Corey, the painter who does not paint, and Lapham's paint. The former's art is not only useless, but sterile, for it does not produce anything, while Lapham's paint, although not having a noble characteristic, is used everywhere.

James W. Tuttleton calls our attention when he classifies both works as novels of manners, although pointing out that *The Portrait* represents the turning point in James's career, when he "shifted the field, that is, from the external world of manners and customs to the impact of manners on the consciousness of his personae . . . It is clearly a novel of manners in its attention to social rituals."⁷⁹ In relation to *The Rise*, he says: "As a novel of manners, it has few equals in the nineteenth century for accuracy of social observation and comprehensiveness of social detail."⁸⁰ We have thus a confirmation of the comments made about the Coreys and Gilbert Osmond, but the parallels concerning manners do not stop there. When Tuttleton points out that "Isabel's resistance to the conventions of Gardencourt and her wish for knowledge so as to choose whether or not she will observe them,"⁸¹ it brings to our mind Penelope and her tendency to mock Mrs. Corey's behaviour and also the situation she finds among her husband's family after their marriage. Or, when referring to "Henrietta Stackpole's *boarding-house manners*,"⁸² do these words not remind us of the Laphams' difficulties before the dinner at the Coreys' and Silas's own behaviour and also of his ungrammaticalness? Do "the deferential manners of the Molineux ladies"⁸³ not bring to our minds the Corey girls, although perhaps to establish a contrast between them?

In Howells, the house is used as a symbol of Lapham's material success. As he grows richer, the house increases its costs and gives the impression that it will never be concluded. The same way as Silas loses control over his ambition, believing himself able to buy anything with his money, the control of the building of the house changes from his hands to the architect's. The ready image that he had of the house when he decided to build it gives way to the architect's ideas, until it ends by having practically nothing of the original. And, as the forebodings were telling the truth, when of Lapham's bankruptcy, the symbol of his richness is ruined too, victim of his own hands.

James does not make use of a symbol as such, but we can follow Isabel's development through the places she inhabits. When she spends only one day at the Dutch House and does not want to return anymore, we have a hint of her desire for freedom, a girl who will not allow brick walls around her.

At her grandmother's house, though, there are so many places to read, but she chooses the mysterious office, which was not an agreeable place, according to the description. Nevertheless, the scene is a foreboding of her future situation: with so many places to choose, she chooses the most joyless chamber in the house.

Gardencourt, with its spaciousness and endless lawns and vistas, represents the expansion of horizons in the girl's life and also the liberty that she seeks. In contrast, Osmond's house in Florence has a mask, not a face, and the Palazzo Roccanera has a prison-like aspect, a perfect setting for Osmond's collection of objects.

According to F.W. Dupee, James's "novel is well named: it is supremely devoted to portraiture."⁸⁴ Isabel Archer is the girl, or, better, the lady portrayed, just as we can say that Lapham is also portrayed. Howells's novel is also devoted to portraiture and we also find similarities and differences between the two main characters that allow us to establish a parallel between them.

Silas has humble origins, but what distinguishes him from his brothers is his determination to stay in the family place, while the others leave, a fact to reinforce his love for tradition and the unity of the family. Isabel has not so humble origins, but she is poor when her aunt invites her to go to Europe. Unlike Silas, she has never had a permanent home, but she was also fond of the old, the consecrated. She distinguishes herself from her sisters by her love of books, her desire for knowledge.

Lapham believes in the freedom of the American Dream, that allows anyone to become whatever he wants as long as he works his way to deserve it. He is the self-made man. Isabel wants to exert her freedom to choose, to experience life in order to expand her mind and achieve self-realisation.

Both Isabel and Silas find themselves one day the owners of enormous fortunes which will apparently allow them the realisation of all their dreams. Nevertheless, the

fortunes they acquire are the instruments that will provoke their greatest mistakes: Silas is corrupted by his money; Isabel is chosen when she believes to be choosing.

Between Isabel and her freedom, Mme. Merle interposes, just like Rogers returns to Silas's life the moment he intends to rise socially.

Lapham, in his great moment of crisis, when he is given the opportunity to choose between saving his money at the expense of somebody else's loss, or taking the responsibility upon himself, he chooses to be the victim, although the other way would not be illegal. He chooses the moral way, though, that is why he rises, for he refuses to sacrifice others, since he has a moral duty to society and he returns to his origins with no stains upon his character.

Isabel also faces a moral dilemma: to be free again, as she had always wanted, but enjoying an empty kind of liberty, or go back to her husband, as a lady would do. She decides to be faithful not only to the ones who need her, like Pansy, but also to herself, by choosing, as she had always desired to be able to do. By so doing, despite the fact that Leon Edel points out that she is "doomed to live,"²⁵ she also rises to the stature of a lady, for, after all, "she had an infinite hope that she should never do anything wrong."²⁶

NOTES

¹ Arnold Kettle, *An Introduction to the English Novel* (London : Hutchinson University, 1953), II, p. 19.

² Henry James, *The Portrait of a Lady* (New York : NAM Signet, 1963), p. 46.

³ James, p. 50.

⁴ James, p. 48.

⁵ Leon Edel, *Henry James* (New York : J.B. Lippincott, 1962), II, p. 427.

⁶ James, p. 23.

⁷ James, p. 24.

⁸ James, p. 50.

⁹ F.W. Dupee, *Henry James* (Westport, Connecticut : Greenwood Press, 1973), pp. 127-128.

¹⁰ James, p. 63.

¹¹ James, p. 106.

¹² James, p. 423.

¹³ Edel, p. 423.

¹⁴ Oscar Cargill, *The Novels of Henry James* (New York: MacMillan, 1961), p. 104.

¹⁵ James, p. 149.

¹⁶ James, p. 169.

¹⁷ Dorothea Krook, *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James* (Cambridge : Cambridge University, 1962), p. 37.

¹⁸ James, p. 172.

¹⁹ Krook, p. 38.

²⁰ James, p. 22.

²¹ James, p. 163.

²² Dupee, p. 114.

²³ James, p. 209.

²⁴ James, p. 321.

²⁵ Krook, p. 44.

²⁶ James, p. 320.

²⁷ James, p. 316.

²⁸ James, p. 336.

²⁹ Dupee, p. 115.

³⁰ Dupee, p. 121.

- ³¹ Edel, p. 427.
- ³² Joseph Warren Beach, *The Method of Henry James* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1918), p. 39.
- ³³ E.M. Snell, *The Modern Fables of Henry James* (Cambridge, Massachussets, "n.p.", 1935), p. 63.
- ³⁴ F.O. Mathiessen, *Henry James : The Major Phase* (London : Oxford University, 1944), pp. 179-180.
- ³⁵ Edel, p. 426.
- ³⁶ Krook, p. 51.
- ³⁷ Kettle, p. 31.
- ³⁸ Cargill, p. 104.
- ³⁹ James, p. 48.
- ⁴⁰ James, p. 47.
- ⁴¹ Kettle, p. 34.
- ⁴² William Dean Howells, *The Rise of Silas Lapham* (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin, 1884), p. 17.
- ⁴³ Howells, p. 7.
- ⁴⁴ Howells, p. 2.
- ⁴⁵ Kermit Vanderbilt, *The Achievement of William Dean Howells : a Reinterpretation* (Princeton, Princeton University, 1968), p. 98.
- ⁴⁶ Vanderbilt, p. 98.
- ⁴⁷ Alexander Harvey, *William Dean Howells : a Study of the Achievement of a Literary Artist* (Folcroft, Pa., The Folcroft Press, 1969), p. 154.
- ⁴⁸ Harvey, pp. 154-155.
- ⁴⁹ George N. Bennet, *William Dean Howells : the Development of a Novelist* (Norman : University of Oklahoma, 1959), p. 152.
- ⁵⁰ Howells, p. 35.

- ⁵¹ Bennet, p. 154.
- ⁵² Howells, p. 65.
- ⁵³ Howells, p. 66.
- ⁵⁴ Howells, p. 67.
- ⁵⁵ Olov W. Fryckstedt, *In Quest of America : a Study of Howells' Early Development as a Novelist* (Upsala : Ivor Haeggstroms, 1958), p. 220.
- ⁵⁶ Howells, p. 73.
- ⁵⁷ Howells, p. 74.
- ⁵⁸ Howells, p. 72.
- ⁵⁹ Howells, pp. 127-128.
- ⁶⁰ Everett Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism* (New York : J.B. Lippincott, 1954), p. 165.
- ⁶¹ Howells, p. 181.
- ⁶² Howells, p. 181.
- ⁶³ Howells, p. 184.
- ⁶⁴ Bennet, p. 150.
- ⁶⁵ Howells, p. 217.
- ⁶⁶ James W. Tuttleton, *The Novel of Manners in America* (New York : W.W. Norton, 1974), p. 118.
- ⁶⁷ Carter, pp. 166-167.
- ⁶⁸ Fryckstedt, p. 220.
- ⁶⁹ Bennet, p. 155.
- ⁷⁰ Howells, p. 345.
- ⁷¹ Carter, p. 167.
- ⁷² Howells, p. 438.

⁷³ Tuttleton, p. 110.

⁷⁴ Carter, p. 165.

⁷⁵ Kettle, p. 21.

⁷⁶ Krook, p. 59.

⁷⁷ Vanderbilt, p. 137.

⁷⁸ Howells, p. 92.

⁷⁹ Tuttleton, p. 82.

⁸⁰ Tuttleton, p. 110.

⁸¹ Tuttleton, p. 82.

⁸² Tuttleton, p. 82.

⁸³ Tuttleton, p. 82.

⁸⁴ Dupee, p. 114.

⁸⁵ Leon Edel, *Henry James* (New York : J.B. Lippincott, 1972), V, p. 28.

⁸⁶ James, p. 48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beach, Joseph Warren. *The Method of Henry James*. New Haven : Yale University Press, 1918.

Bennet, George N. *William Dean Howells : the Development of a Novelist*. Norman : University of Oklahoma Press, 1959.

Cady, Edwin H. Cady. *The Realist at War : the Mature Years 1885 - 1920 of William Dean Howells*. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1958.

Carter, Everett. *Howells and the Age of Realism*. New York : J.B. Lippincott, 1954.

Cargill, Oscar. *The Novels of Henry James*. New York : MacMillan, 1961.

Dupee, F.W. *Henry James*. Westport, Connecticut : Greenwood Press, 1973.

Edel, Leon. *Henry James*. New York : J.B. Lippincott, 1962. 5 vols.

Fryckstedt, Olov W. *In Quest of America : a Study of Howells' Early Development as a Novelist* Upsala :Ivor Haeggstroms, 1958.

Harvey, Alexander. *William Dean Howells : a Study of the Achievement of a Literary Artist*. Folcroft, Pa., The Folcroft Press, 1969.

Howells, William Dean. *The Rise of Silas Lapham*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1884.

James, Henry. *The Portrait of a Lady*. New York : NAM Signet, 1963.

Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel*. London : Hutchinson University Library, 1953. 2 vols.

Krook, Dorothea. *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Mattiessen, F.O. *Henry James : The Major Phase*. London : Oxford University Press, 1944.

Putt, S. Gorley. *Henry James : a Reader's Guide*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Cornell University Press, 1966.

Snell, E.M. *The Modern Fables of Henry James*. Cambridge, Mass. : "n.p.", 1935.

Tuttleton, James W. *The Novel of Manners in America*. New York : W.W. Norton, 1974.

Vanderbilt, Kermit. *The Achievement of William Dean Howells : a reinterpretation*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968.