Joseph A. Dowling

W. D. HOWELLS' LITERARY REPUTATION IN ENGLAND, 1882 - 1897

When W. D. Howells declared in 1882[1] that the new realistic novel was superior to the art of such sacrosanct figures as Dickens and Thackeray, he provoked the conservative English critics into a prolonged and often vicious controversy. Certainly, the immediate reaction of a significant number of British periodicals was that of outrage, and in some literary circles resentment simmered on for many years.[2] Nor did the publication of his critical essays from the "Editor's Study" in 1891[3] help to alleviate the bitterness of the exchange. Both Professor Murray and Professor Cargill have discussed the effect that Howells' defence of James had upon James's reputation in England,[4] but little has been said about Howells, who was, after all, the central figure in the literary debate.[5] It would seem helpful, both for an understanding of Howells' standing in British literary circles and for shedding further light upon the "realism war",[6] to examine what the British periodical reviewers thought of Howells in the period between the publication of *A Modern Instance* and *The Landlord at Lion's Head*.

Although there was undoubtedly a strong reaction against Howells' *Century* article, it is misleading to equate the florid statements of the more conservative British periodicals, written in a moment of polemical anger, with the whole of British literary opinion. Howells, to be sure, took quite a drubbing in *Blackwood's*, the *Quarterly Review*, the *National Review*, and the *Temple Bar Magazine*,[7] which significantly enough categorized the "new fiction" as a "literature of decay."[8] This statement of the *Temple Bar Magazine* amply illustrates one important element in the opposition to realism,—the feeling, sometimes conscious and sometimes not, that this new theory of fiction was another manifestation of the rapid technological and ideological shifts of the late nineteenth century. Realism was, indeed, closely related to scepticism and agnosticism. As Cady has noted, the second generation of New England intellectuals could not make the superficial reconciliation with Darwinism that Lowell, the elder Holmes, and Norton had made: "They were not sure . . . Agnosticism was their church . . . . They tended, consciously or not, to use Occam's Razor and to insist on pluralism and relativity, on the

fallibility and individuality of the human mind in an immensely complex world. In thought their destination was pragmatism. In literature it was, and for closely related reasons, realism."[9] No wonder the more traditional segment of British society felt uneasy when faced with the new literature.[10]

Yet England itself was undergoing basic changes which would produce opposition to "official" Britain and more sympathy with the democratic emphases of American life and literature. In fact, Gohdes believes that the most important factor in the increased contact between Britain and America after 1870 was ". . . the fact that life in England came to be more and more like life in the United States with the spread of middle-class capitalism and the rise to power of the common man. . . ."[11] Thus economic and national conditions in Britain created support for the ideas and aspirations of American fiction. Generally speaking, this support appears to have come, as Gohdes has asserted, from "extreme liberals or radicals in politics or Scotchmen by birth, sometimes both."[12] Therefore, one would not expect the literary opposition to Howells to be monolithic, nor was it. And, lest one forget, some critics did manage to free themselves to a considerable degree from both national and class bias.

That Howells had not alienated the British critics to any great degree becomes very clear if one concentrates upon the reception of his novels during this period and not merely upon the articles answering his theoretical claims. Despite Cady's assertion that Howells' reputation in England began to decline in 1880 with the publication of *The Undiscovered Country*,[13] the evidence in the reviews indicates a steady increase in Howells' reputation through the 1880s with the high point being reached, probably, in 1885 with the publication of *The Rise of Silas Lapham*.

A Modern Instance, the first really significant novel of this decade, was not, it is true, unanimously acclaimed, but it certainly received more praise than opprobrium. E. A. Purcell, in the *Academy*,[14] dismissed it as "a depressing, dreary book with all its ability and good intentions", but the *British Quarterly Review*[15] hailed it as "a profound study of jealousy" and proclaimed Marcia Gaylord worthy of comparison with Hester Prynne and Elsie Venner.

Oddly enough, Howell's next novel, *A Woman's Reason*, was more universally popular, with only the *Saturday Review* and the *Graphic* expressing dissent.[16] Even here, however, the *Saturday Review*'s concern was that Howells was abandoning realism for melodrama which was unsuitable to his talent. The *Westminster Review*[17] revealed no reservations and declared Howells

"beyond question one of the most charming romance writers in the English language, on either side of the Atlantic . . . ." The *Spectator*[18] added the observation that this new work, which it considered Howells' best, would "increase the well-deserved popularity . . . he already enjoys in England."

Even this high praise, however, was to pale before the enthusiasm with which *The Rise of Silas Lapham* was received. On its publication, the critics hailed this novel as outstanding.[19] While there was some confusion exhibited on the meaning of the central theme,[20] all the reviewers were impressed by the powerful characterization. G. Barnet Smith in the *Academy*,[21] acclaimed Howells as "one of the best living writers of American fiction." The *Literary World*[22] declared Howells to be the Dickens and Thackeray of America, and the *Dublin Review*[23] maintained that "this latest work of Mr. Howells seems to us to have the most solid grasp of human nature, the firmest touch in delineating and discriminating character" of all modern American romances. But the *Pall Mall Budget*[24] surpassed all these encomiums, not only by calling this a great novel by a great artist, but also by launching an attack, very similar to Howells' own, against the "philistine English people . . . brought up on beef, beer, and Dickens." Howells was too exquisite for the dulled palates of the English, who were still backward enough, so the critic asserted, to prefer the "grown-up variants on the pirates and cannibals of the *Boy's Own Journal* . . . ." The *Saturday Review*,[25] although not so wildly enthusiastic, published an important review in which the critic made one of the earliest attempts[26] to distinguish between the talents of Howells and of James. Howells' strength, the reviewer felt, lay in his convinced Americanism, which gave depth to his characters, while James, more cosmopolitan than Howells, presented an externalized picture of Americans. In addition, Howells had avoided James's photographic technique while steadily improving himself as an artist "until at last he attained the mastery of narrative which we see in *The Rise of Silas Lapham*."

The publication of *Indian Summer* in the following year cemented Howells' reputation with the English reviewers. George Saintsbury, in the *Academy*,[27] commented that "when Mr. Howells, instead of endeavouring to show what a bad novelist Dickens was, is endeavouring to show . . . what a good one he is himself, he is generally worthy of attention". Other critics hailed him as "first among living novelists"[28] and as "an Anglo-Saxon Tourguenieff",[29] and even the lordly *Athenaeum*[30] proclaimed Howells and James a match for any other Anglo-Saxon authors with the exception of George Meredith.[31]

Howells' literary stock took a sharp dip with the publication of his next two novels, *The Minister's Charge* and *April Hopes*,[32] but rallied quickly with the appearance of one of his better novels,[33] *Annie Kilburn*, in 1889. The *Spectator*[34] in particular was impressed by the novel and praised Howells for his constant "deepening and widening of human interest". Especially powerful, in the reviewer's estimation, was Howells' ability "in a few sentences to present . . . the sordid narrowness, the lack of fine human quality, and withal the wholesome humanness of common life in such a town as Hatboro". This was, the critic believed, Howells' finest work, "a masterpiece of veracious art".

Certainly the appearance of *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, in the first year of the new decade, did nothing to injure the high esteem in which Howells was held. The few complaints were centred around some rather tedious passages, with special emphasis on the opening pages of the novel. As the critic in the *Athenaeum*[35] summed it up, "in the process of reading the book one is constantly weighing its brilliancy against its tediousness." Other critics, even when reiterating opposition to realism *per se*, admitted the power of this new work,[36] although William Sharp[37] qualified his praise of the novel by repeating J. M. Robertson's strictures on Howells' philosophical weaknesses.[38] The *Spectator*,[39] on the other hand, saw in the novel a continuation of the trend already evinced in *Annie Kilburn* and *The Rise of Silas Lapham*: a fusion of Howells' analytical ability with a larger view of society. In *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, the reviewer declared, Howells "opens up a vein of deeper seriousness than he has ever before reached . . . there are passages in *A Hazard of New Fortunes* which . . . entitle him to be ranked among men of genius."

Howells' next venture was in the realm of the symbolic psychological novel, and again he had a good press. In fact, William Sharp[40] was evidently freed from his doubts and qualifications and declared *A Shadow of a Dream* to be "as perfect of its kind as anything in latter-day fiction." Sharp confessed that he had earlier attacked Howells for his parochialism, but now was forced to admit that this "foremost living American novelist grows upon one more and more." Both Sharp and the critic in the *Spectator*[41] agreed that the novel marked a new departure in Howells' work, with the *Spectator* going on to the shrewd observation that "Essential tragedy underlies its carefully poised and adjusted refinements; while the author's reticent art, that seems scarcely to stir the ripples of extreme civilization, subtly suggests the pain and conflict of human life, perhaps most grievous when they are compressed by the conventions of polished manners."

Thus it seems fair to say from the evidence of individual reviews that

at the beginning of the 1890s Howells' reputation in England was solidly established despite his forays into the critical field. While many reviewers refused to accept his more extreme claims for realism, they nevertheless considered him a leading man of letters and acclaimed his most important novels. Howells, however, soon put his reputation to the test by publishing *Criticism and Fiction*, a thin volume which reiterated some of his sharpest attacks upon British life and letters.

The irate reaction to *Criticism and Fiction* highlights both the offended national pride and the class bias of some of the reviewers. "This kind of thing . . . should be reserved . . . for the Fourth of July", exploded one writer,[42] while another asserted that Howells was like a country bumpkin who had mistaken the village pump for an architectural masterpiece.[43] The critic in the *Saturday Review*[44] and Andrew Lang[45] both took Howells to task for his plebeian education. Howells, said the former, was a perfect example of the "modern craze for liberty, education and such things; the apotheosis of the Liberal board-school boy", and that he evidently, like all liberals, appeared to consider every opponent of his theories an aristocrat in disguise. Lang, on his part, solemnly assured his readers that Howells was too enveloped by the "noisy blatant today . . . what is new is only the unessential . . . the rest is as old as the sun."

Yet, even in the face of great provocation on Howells' part, not all reviewers reacted so violently as the ones just mentioned. James Aschcroft Noble in the *Academy*,[46] although obviously in sympathy with Howells' opponents, called for more reason and less passion in the discussion since Howells was a capable and sincere man whose judgments, even when wrong-headed, must be treated with respect. The critics in the *Spectator* and the *Athenaeum*[48] merely disregarded the obvious Anglophobia and pronounced much of the work full of good sense. Quiller-Couch chastised Howells for the tone of the work, complaining that it was "quite possible to dislike Englishmen and English books without talking of 'poor islanders' with fog-and-soot clogged lungs doting in forgetfulness of the English manners and grovelling in ignorance of the Continental masters". Admittedly, Quiller-Couch agreed, Englishmen were stick-in-the-muds; but, turning the tables on Howells, where, he asked, were the American novels dealing with toil, or poverty? Not only was the new realism rather pale, but the claim to being more cosmopolitan than the English faded when one recognized, Quiller-Couch asserted, that the only universal spirit produced by America thus far had been Whitman.[49] William Archer, a strong supporter of America and Howells,[50] also admitted surprise at Howells'

tone of polemical irritation. Archer intelligently dismissed much of the worst of this as writing done under the heat of controversy, but deplored it, nevertheless, as unworthy of a man of Howells' talents. Archer deeply sympathized with Howells' ideas although he believed that Howells' weakness was his inability to properly appreciate the old masters.[51] *The Author*[52] and the *Pall Mall Budget*[53] joined the chorus of sympathy with Howells' ideas while disagreeing with the violence of some of the declarations. The former considered *Criticism and Fiction* "as good a treatise on the Art of Fiction as has ever appeared. . . . Beneath the parochial view there is wisdom and there is guidance". The critic in the *Pall Mall Budget* understood why Howells, who had suffered from "prejudiced, incompetent and insolent criticism", should be somewhat irrational in places, and declared that the main argument of the book put Howells squarely in the main intellectual currents of the day. What was needed now, however, the critic urged, was a transcending of Howells and James just as they transcended Dickens and Thackeray. Here, unlike Quiller-Couch's suggested areas for realistic investigation, the reviewer championed a more scientific analysis of love, guilty or innocent. The novel, in other words, must overcome the moral censorship that Howells would like to bind on it and proceed further into what is the "most important problem of life."

Even so brief a summary of the reviews of *Criticism and Fiction* may verify the assertion that the opposition to Howells was far from monolithic, and it certainly shows that not all the critics were thrown off their critical balance by injured conservatism and nationalism.

The question which now presents itself is whether the violence of the exchange over *Criticism and Fiction* was reflected in the evaluation of Howells' novels of the 1890s. There appears to be no evidence of any shift in the pattern of reviewing. The *Saturday Review* remained hostile while the *Athenaeum* moved from disappointment to enthusiasm as taste dictated. William Sharp remained an enthusiastic reader, and the general consensus of the critics was in Howells' favor.

Of the five novels published between 1892 and 1897,[54] *The Landlord at Lion's Head* was the most highly praised, and rightly so. All the others, however, received their fair share of acclaim even when Howells ventured into the dangerous area of social and utopian commentary. Sharp, for example, called *A Traveller from Altruria* a "remarkable book"[55] and proclaimed Howells, in another review,[56] "America's foremost realist". The continued popularity of Howells is attested to, in a rather left-handed way, by the *Athenaeum*,[57] which protested the danger of Americanisms in a writer so popular

in England. The *Literary World*[58] affirmed the high opinion of the English reviewers for Howells when its reviewers asserted that Howells "stands in the very front rank of American writers of the day". One could draw on further statements to verify the claim that Howells' popularity in England had not deteriorated in the 1890s, but perhaps the comments of the English on his major novel of the period, *The Landlord at Lion's Head*,[59] will suffice to illustrate the esteem with which his work was regarded.

The reviewer in the *Spectator* sighed with relief when he contrasted Howells' novel with "Mrs. Atherton's lurid pictures of the unbridled individualism of the 'new race' of Americans. . . ." Particularly admirable to the critic was Howells' subtlety of analysis, his characterization, and his delicate humour, all of which combine to give us a picture of the ordinary, sane life of America. The *Athenaeum* was delighted with the novel which was, so the critic thought, "a capital piece of workmanship". Despite some reservations, the reviewer declared that "the fairest judgment that can be passed on the book is indicated by saying that one can read it almost to the end with pleasure". No qualifications bothered the reviewer in the *Literary World*, who pronounced the novel close to perfection "in all the important particulars."

Thus, there is not only no evidence of Howells' reputation suffering from the bitterness caused by *Criticism and Fiction*, but, on the contrary, the English critics continued to esteem him through the 1890s.

What conclusions, then, can be drawn from the examination of British periodicals about the struggle over realism and Howells' literary reputation? First of all, it seems indisputable that Howells' reputation reached its zenith in the last two decades of the nineteenth century and specifically with the publication of *The Rise of Silas Lapham* in 1885.[60] This novel, as has been shown, received almost unanimous praise from the critics, and the *Pall Mall Budget* declared it "A Great American Novel". Howells maintained his popularity during the 1890s and even through the first two decades of the twentieth century. The *Nation*,[61] for instance, was amazed in 1916 at the vigour and freshness of Howells' writing in *The Leatherwood God*. The *Spectator* went so far as to assert that "for strength and suggestiveness [*The Leatherwood God*] will rank with the best that he had ever done."[62] On his death in 1920 the *Times Literary Supplement*,[63] although refusing him a place in the front rank of novelists, declared that "Howells was the first and most distinctively American novelist that has yet appeared", and the *New Statesman and Nation*[64] deplored the fact that since David Douglas had ceased publishing Howells' novels "the most prolific and the most versatile writer of America

during the generation just passed has never had a regular publisher in this country."

While it is obvious that Howells' critical articles and the publication of *Criticism and Fiction* aroused considerable opposition and virulent response, this opposition was far from total and obviously did not damage his literary reputation. The periodicals which were most angered by Howells' ideas were of a conservative political and social hue, and the more liberal magazines, despite some doubts about realism, tended to find praise for Howells' work.[65] Of more importance is the fact that the really serious critics and periodicals did treat Howells' work sympathetically and intelligently. The bitterest reviews of Howells were those of *Criticism and Fiction* when the injured national pride of the reviewers led them to extravagant statements. Yet even here the more sagacious critics attempted to separate Howells' propagandist utterances from the body of his intelligent thought, and expressions of agreement were not entirely absent. It appears, therefore, that Howells' literary reputation was little modified by his strongly expressed critical opinions.[66] As the *Athenaeum* recognized in 1903,[67] Howells' position on both sides of the Atlantic was unassailable, despite the many bitter and sarcastic sallies that had been exchanged between Howells and the British critics. The opinion expressed by William Sharp in his review of *The Quality of Mercy*[68] that Howells was the "foremost living American novelist" is indicative of the high place Howells held in the eyes of the more important literary judges. In 1916 both the *Times Literary Supplement*[69] and the *Nation* praised Howells as the outstanding intellectual figure in America, and it was the *Nation*, as earlier noted,[70] which claimed that Howells' fiction of the last years of the nineteenth century was the high-water mark of American writing.

NOTES

1. *Century*, XXV, pp. 25-29 (November, 1882).
2. See discussion in Edwin H. Cady, *The Road to Realism: The Early Years, 1837-1885, of William Dean Howells* (Syracuse, 1956), pp. 218-221.
3. *Criticism and Fiction* (New York, 1891).
4. Both Professors Murray and Cargill are convinced that Howells' *Century* article damaged James's reputation in England because it offended English conservatism and nationalism. See Donald M. Murray, "Henry James and the English Reviewers, 1882-1890", *American Literature*, XXIV, pp. 1-20 (March, 1952); Oscar Cargill, "Henry James's 'Moral Policeman': William Dean Howells", *American Literature*, XXIX, pp. 371-398 (Jan., 1958).

5. See Cady, *The Road to Realism*, pp. 194-198, for a brief discussion of Howells' reputation in England.
6. Edwin H. Cady, *The Realist at War: The Mature Years, 1885-1920, of William Dean Howells* (Syracuse, 1958), pp. 28-55.
7. Anon., "American Literature in England", *Blackwood's Magazine*, CXXXIII, 136-161 (January, 1883); *Quarterly Review*, XLV, 201-209; 212-217 (Jan., 1883); Arthur Tilley, "The New School of Fiction", *National Review*, I, 257-268 (April, 1883); Anon., "The New School of American Fiction", *Temple Bar Magazine*, LXX, 383-389 (March, 1884).
8. There is a tendency to overlook articles of the same period which praised Howells' fiction. For examples see Henry Norman, "Theories and Practice of Modern Fiction", *Fortnightly Review*, XL, 870-886 (July-Dec., 1883); Anon., "American Fiction", *London Quarterly Review*, LXI, 186-187 (Oct., 1883-Jan., 1884; *Macmillan's Magazine*, L, 250-260 (August, 1884). For sympathetic, if somewhat critical views, see Lady Verney, "The Americans Painted by Themselves", *Contemporary Review*, XLVI, 543-556 (Oct., 1884) and, especially, J. M. Robertson, "Mr. Howells' Novels", *Westminster Review*, CXXII, 347-474 (October, 1884). Nor can Karl Hillebrand, "About Old and New Novels", *Contemporary Review*, XLV, 388-403 (March, 1884), despite his strictures on realism, be considered unsympathetic to Howells as a novelist.
9. Cady, *The Road to Realism*, p. 149.
10. As Holbrook Jackson has commented, "many good people of the time, looking backward at the large geniality and splendid sanity of Charles Dickens, the high moral purpose of George Eliot, and the fine and unimpeachable respectability of Thackeray, had grave forebodings for their own times and serious doubts as to the wisdom of the successors of the accepted masters." See Holbrook Jackson, *The Eighteen Nineties* (New York, 1927), p. 217. In America the same phenomenon is seen in Hamilton Wright Mabie's declaration that "it is certainly a mental or moral illness which makes such themes attractive to men of real talent . . . modern realism . . . is, in a word, practical atheism applied to art." *Andover Review*, IV, 417-429 (Nov., 1885). See Cady, *The Road to Realism*, pp. 241-243, for an illuminating discussion of this article.
11. Clarence Gohdes, *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* (New York, 1944), p. 6.
12. Gohdes, p. 132.
13. Cady, *The Road to Realism*, p. 198.
14. XXII, 273 (Oct. 14, 1882). Other unfavourable reviews were in *The Pall Mall Budget*, XXIX, 14 (Nov. 17, 1882) and the *Quarterly Review*, CLV, 217-220 (Jan., 1883).
15. LXXVII, 226 (Jan.-April, 1883). Generally favourable reviews can be found in *Blackwood's*, CXXXIII, 136-161 (Jan., 1883); *Saturday Review*, LIV, 548-549 (Oct. 21, 1882); *Spectator*, LV, 1658-1659 (Dec. 23, 1882); *Westminster Review*, CXIX, 285 (Jan., 1883).
16. *Graphic*, XXVIII, 602 (Dec. 15, 1883); *Saturday Review*, LVI, 604-605 (Nov. 10, 1883).

17. CXXI, 273 (Jan., 1884).
18. LVII, 415-416 (March 29, 1884). Other favourable reviews are in *Academy*, XXIV, 327 (Nov. 17, 1883); *Athenaeum*, LXXXII, 597-598 (Nov. 10, 1883); *Literary World*, XXVIII, 321-323 (Nov. 16, 1883); *Pall Mall Budget*, XXXI, 21 (Dec. 28, 1883).
19. *Athenaeum*, LXXXVI, 334 (Sept. 12, 1885) is more restrained in its appreciation.
20. See particularly the *Westminster Review*, CXXV, 303 (January, 1886).
21. XXVIII, 182 (Sept. 19, 1885).
22. XXXII, 262-263 (Sept. 18, 1885).
23. XCVIII, 418-419 (April, 1886).
24. XXXIII, 28-29 (Sept. 17, 1885).
25. LX, 517-518.
26. The first such differentiation appears to have been Stevenson's. See Robert Louis Stevenson, "A Humble Remonstrance", *Longman's*, V, 139-147 (Dec., 1884).
27. XXIX, 233-234 (April 3, 1886).
28. *Literary World*, XXXIII, 387-388 (April 23, 1886).
29. *Pall Mall Budget*, XXIV, 29 (March 25, 1886).
30. *Athenaeum*, LXXXVII, 453-454 (April 3, 1886). Other favourable reviews are *Saturday Review*, LXI, 481 (April 3, 1886); *Westminster Review*, CXXVI, 295 (July, 1886). The *Dublin Review*, XCIX, 166-167 (July, 1886), was somewhat disappointed in this novel.
31. *Saturday Review*, LXIII, 198 (Feb. 5, 1887) and the *Athenaeum*, LXXXVIII, 822 (Dec. 18, 1886) attacked this novel, but the *Pall Mall Budget*, XXXV, 301-31 (May 26, 1887) and the *Westminster Review*, CXXVIII, 262 (May, 1887) were favourably impressed.
32. *Murray's Magazine*, II, 864 (July-Dec., 1887) and the *Westminster Review*, CXXIX, 124 (Jan., 1888) had kind things to say about this work, but the *Saturday Review*, LXIV, 794 (Dec. 10, 1887); the *Academy*, XXXII, 350 (Nov. 26, 1887); and the *Athenaeum*, XC, 671-672 (Nov. 19, 1887) either found it totally dull or generally unsatisfactory.
33. Cady includes this novel in his list of Howells' ten best works. See *The Realist at War*, p. 269.
34. LXII, 371-372 (March 16, 1889). The *Athenaeum*, XCII, 847 (Dec. 22, 1888), and the *Saturday Review*, LXVII, 103 (Jan. 26, 1889) were both critically opposed to the novel, but other favourable reviews were published in the *Academy*, XXXV, 6 (Jan. 5, 1889); *Literary World*, XXXVIII, 556-557 (Nov. 28, 1888); and the *National Observer*, I, 77-78 (Dec. 8, 1888).
35. XCIV, 889-890 (Dec. 28, 1889). *The Literary World*, XL, 486-488 (Dec. 13, 1889) and the *Saturday Review*, LXVIII, 684 (Dec. 14, 1889) were more inclined to find the novel's tediousness outweighing its brilliance.
36. *Westminster Review*, CXXXIV, 89-90 (July, 1890).
37. *Academy*, XXXVII, 41-42 (Jan. 18, 1890).
38. *Westminster Review*, CXXII, 347-374 (October, 1884).

39. LXIV, 342-343 (March 8, 1890).
40. *Academy*, XXXVIII, 27-28 (July 12, 1890).
41. LXV, 213-215 (August 16, 1890). Other favourable reviews can be found in the *Literary World*, XL, 600-607 (June 27, 1890) and the *Athenaeum*, XCV, 828 (June 28, 1890). Unfavourable comments were published in the *Pall Mall Budget*, 798 (June 19, 1890) and the *Saturday Review*, LXX (July 5, 1890).
42. *Literary World*, XLIV, 108-109 (August 14, 1891).
43. *National Observer*, VI, 408-410 (Sept. 5, 1891).
44. LXXII, 114-115 (July 25, 1891).
45. "The New Fiction", *Illustrated London News*, CVII, 141 (August 3, 1895).
46. XL, 209 (Sept. 12, 1891).
47. LXVII, 294-296 (August 29, 1891). The general tone of the review is, however, rather critical of Howells' ideas on fiction.
48. XCVIII, 223 (August 15, 1891).
49. A. T. Quiller-Couch, "A Literary Causerie", *Speaker*, IV, 143-144 (August, 1891).
50. See William Archer, *America Today* (N.Y., 1899), for an example of Archer's pro-Americanism. On page 210 he calls Howells "a master craftsman."
51. William Archer, "The Novelist as Critic", *Illustrated London News*, XCIX, 175 (August 8, 1891).
52. II, 274-275 (Feb. 1, 1892). See less favourable comment in the same periodical, II, 122 (Sept. 1, 1891).
53. XXXIX, 1340 (August 20, 1891).
54. *An Imperative Duty* (1892). For reviews see *Dublin Review*, CX, 464 (April, 1892); *National Observer*, VII, 176-177 (Jan. 2, 1892); *Literary World*, XLIV, 554 (Dec. 25, 1891); *Athenaeum*, XCIX, 210-211 (Feb. 13, 1892); *Westminster Review*, CXXXVII, 224 (Feb., 1892). *The Quality of Mercy* (1892). For reviews see *National Observer*, XVII, 439 (March 12, 1892); *Saturday Review*, LXXIII, 307 (March 12, 1892); *Athenaeum*, XCIX, 338-339 (March 12, 1892); *Novel Review*, 225 (Feb.-Dec., 1892); *Literary World*, XLV, 195 (Feb. 26, 1892); *Westminster Review*, CXXXVII, 464 (April, 1892); *Academy*, XLI, 419-420 (April 30, 1892). *The World of Chance* (1893). For reviews see *Saturday Review*, LXXV, 408 (April 15, 1893); *Westminster Review*, CXXXIX, 544 (May, 1893); *Academy*, XLIII, 434-435 (May 20, 1893); *Athenaeum*, CI, 502 (April 22, 1893); *Literary World*, XLVII, 458 (May 19, 1893). *A Traveller from Altruria* (1894). For reviews see *Athenaeum*, CIV, 29 (July 7, 1894); *Saturday Review*, LXXVIII, 129 (August 4, 1894); *Academy*, XLVI, 147-148 (Sept. 1, 1894); *Literary World*, L, 19-20 (July 13, 1894); *Spectator*, LXXIV, 475 (April 6, 1895). *The Landlord at Lion's Head* (1897). For reviews see *Spectator*, LXXVIII, 597 (April 24, 1897); *Athenaeum*, CIX, 678 (May 22, 1897); *Literary World*, LV, 407 (April 20, 1897); *Sketch*, XVIII, 453 (July 7, 1897). These reviews are all roughly arranged from unfavourable to favourable after each novel.
55. *Academy*, XLVI, 147-148 (Sept. 1, 1894).
56. *Academy*, XLI, 419 (April 30, 1892).

57. CIV, 29 (July 7, 1894).
58. LIV, 301-302 (Oct. 16, 1896). Review of *Impressions and Experiences.*
59. See footnote 52 for reviews discussed.
60. Professor Cady declares (*The Road to Realism*, pp. 195 and 198) that Howells' English reputation began to decline with *The Undiscovered Country* (1880), but then states on p. 217 that Howells' popularity was at its height in 1882. He also quotes Gohdes' figures (p. 218) showing that between 1880 and 1900 Howells had forty-five editions or issues of his books published in England. In addition the evidence from the reviews discussed above indicates that Howells' reputation with the "literary public" was at its zenith in the last two decades of the century and particularly in the 1880s. It is difficult, therefore, to discover what evidence Professor Cady has for the assertion that the British began to reject Howells when he started producing his "realistic fiction."
61. *Nation*, XX, 424-426 (Dec. 16, 1916).
62. *Spectator,* CXVIII, 209 (Feb. 17, 1917). This is in essential agreement with Professor Cady's estimation of the novel: *"The Leatherwood God* is Howells' great unknown novel" (*The Realist at War,* p. 269).
63. II (May 12, 1920).
64. S. K. Ratcliffe, "William Dean Howells", *New Statesman and Nation,* XV, 195-196 (May 22, 1920).
65. Certain pieces of evidence tend to verify Gohdes' statement that support for American fiction appears to have come from "extreme liberals or radicals in politics or Scotchmen by birth, sometimes both." William Sharp, William Archer, and J. M. Robertson, all of them Scots, gave varying degrees of support to Howells. Robertson, an important member of the Rationalist Press Association and a free-thinker, quibbled over the lack of *more* realism. The *Westminster Review,* a Benthamite publication, gave Howells, if not realism, a consistently good press. More work needs to be done relating the political and social position of the periodicals to their aesthetic views.
66. If the evidence presented proves, as I believe it does, that Howells' reputation as reflected in the English periodicals grew in strength through the last decades of the nineteenth century, it seems unlikely that Howells' controversy with the English critics would be a primary factor affecting James's English reputation. Certainly there is a strong element of nationalism and conservatism in the reaction of British reviewers to the "American school" of fiction, and the identification with Howells may have hurt James with the "Establishment" forces. In addition, Howells undoubtedly appealed to the more radical, democratic elements in British society, hardly the source from which James could expect support. Nevertheless, a probable partial explanation for James's "poor" reputation is that his fiction was too subtle for the "amateur" palate of most British reviewers, either conservative or radical.
67. CXXI, 393-394 (March 28, 1903).
68. See footnote 54.
69. 585 (Dec. 7, 1916).
70. XX, 424-426 (Dec. 16, 1916).