

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

The American Critical Archives is a series of reference books that provide representative selections of contemporary reviews of the main works of major American authors. Specifically, each volume contains both full reviews and excerpts from reviews that appeared in newspapers and weekly and monthly periodicals, generally within a few months of the publication of the work concerned. There is an introductory historical overview by the volume editor, as well as checklists of additional reviews located but not quoted. *Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews* presents the most comprehensive gathering of newspaper and magazine reviews of James's work ever assembled. Other volumes in the American Critical Archives series concentrate on reviews from American publications, but because of the importance of James's British connection, this book also generously samples reviews from British newspapers and other periodicals. The focus here is on the novels, but reviews of James's most important travel narratives are included as well. The volume ends with reviews of *The American Scene*, James's impressionistic depiction of his relationship with his birthplace. This collection also reprints many rarely seen notices written by the most important female reviewers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Each chapter ends with a checklist of additional reviews not presented here. The Introduction surveys the major themes of the reviews and shows how they influenced James personally and in his work.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

AMERICAN CRITICAL ARCHIVES 7
Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

The American Critical Archives

GENERAL EDITOR: M. Thomas Inge, Randolph-Macon College

1. *Emerson and Thoreau: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Joel Myerson
2. *Edith Wharton: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by James W. Tuttleton, Kristin O. Lauer, and Margaret P. Murray
3. *Ellen Glasgow: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Dorothy M. Scura
4. *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by John L. Idol, Jr., and Buford Jones
5. *William Faulkner: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by M. Thomas Inge
6. *Herman Melville: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Brian Higgins and Hershel Parker
7. *Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Kevin J. Hayes
8. *John Steinbeck: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Joseph R. McElrath, Jr., Jesse S. Crisler, and Susan Shillinglaw
9. *Walt Whitman: The Contemporary Reviews*, edited by Kenneth M. Price

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Henry James

The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by

Kevin J. Hayes

University of Central Oklahoma



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
 Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
 UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521453868

© Cambridge University Press 1996

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1996

First paperback edition 2010

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Henry James: the contemporary reviews / edited by Kevin J. Hayes.

p. cm.—(American critical archives; 7)

Includes index.

ISBN 0-521-45386-0

1. James, Henry, 1843-1961—Criticism and interpretation.

I. Hayes, Kevin J. II. Series.

PS2124.H463 1995

813'.4-dc20

95-8077

CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-45386-8 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-15540-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

For Hershel Parker

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Contents

Series Editor's Preface	<i>page</i> ix
Introduction	xi
<i>Roderick Hudson</i> (1875)	1
<i>The American</i> (1877)	19
<i>The Europeans</i> (1878)	47
<i>Daisy Miller</i> (1878)	65
<i>Confidence</i> (1879)	79
<i>Washington Square</i> (1880)	99
<i>The Portrait of a Lady</i> (1881)	119
<i>The Bostonians</i> (1886)	151
<i>The Princess Casamassima</i> (1886)	173
<i>The Reverberator</i> (1888)	197
<i>The Aspern Papers</i> (1888)	209
<i>The Tragic Muse</i> (1890)	219
<i>The Other House</i> (1896)	243
<i>The Spoils of Poynton</i> (1897)	261
<i>What Maisie Knew</i> (1897)	281
<i>The Two Magics</i> (including "The Turn of the Screw") (1898)	299
<i>The Awkward Age</i> (1899)	315
<i>The Sacred Fount</i> (1901)	335
<i>The Wings of the Dove</i> (1902)	359
<i>The Ambassadors</i> (1903)	387
<i>The Golden Bowl</i> (1904)	411
<i>The American Scene</i> (1907)	433
Index	471

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Series Editor's Preface

The American Critical Archives series documents a part of a writer's career that is usually difficult to examine, that is, the immediate response to each work as it was made public by reviewers in contemporary newspapers and journals. Although it would not be feasible to reprint every review, each volume in the series reprints a selection of reviews designed to provide the reader with a proportionate sense of the critical response, whether it was positive, negative, or mixed. Checklists of other known reviews are also included to complete the documentary record and allow access for those who wish to do further reading and research.

The editor of each volume has provided an introduction that surveys the career of the author in the context of the contemporary critical response. Ideally, the introduction will inform the reader in brief of what is to be learned by a reading of the full volume. The reader then can go as deeply as necessary in terms of the kind of information desired—be it about a single work, a period in the author's life, or the author's entire career. The intent is to provide quick and easy access to the material for students, scholars, librarians, and general readers.

When completed, the American Critical Archives should constitute a comprehensive history of critical practice in America, and in some cases Great Britain, as the writers' careers were in progress. The volumes open a window on the patterns and forces that have shaped the history of American writing and the reputations of the writers. These are primary documents in the literary and cultural life of the nation.

M. THOMAS INGE

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Introduction

After *Roderick Hudson* was published in the United States, Henry James eagerly anticipated reviews of the work, his first separately published, book-length work of fiction. He wrote his brother, father, and mother, asking them to send any notices from local newspapers and magazines, and he also wrote William Dean Howells, asking about another *Roderick Hudson* review.¹ Seldom again would James express such interest in the opinions of his reviewers. Over the course of his career, his attitude toward contemporary critics shifted from enthusiasm to disgust. James's surviving letters to family, friends, and publishers reveal an emerging disdain toward the critics that ultimately approached intolerance. By the 1890s, James, according to the letters, had begun taking pains to avoid reading reviews. With a few exceptions, he came to see his reviewers as thick-witted bumlbers with little sensitivity to the English language and little understanding about what made a good book.

Responding to his brother's curiosity about the American reception of *Roderick Hudson*, William James wrote: "Roderick Hudson seems to be a very common theme of conversation, to be in fact a great success, though I can give you no saying about which is memorable for its matter or its source. Every one praises the end, including myself."² William James exaggerated, but *Roderick Hudson* reviews were mainly positive. Several readers, however, did not mask their uneasiness. Sometimes, the book's characters were unsympathetic, and other times they seemed unrealistic. The author's tone appeared somewhat heartless. Excessive details sometimes weighed the story down. Despite these occasional negative comments, nearly all the reviewers recognized James as a writer of power. Overall, *Roderick Hudson* indicated his tremendous potential and seemed to foreshadow a brilliant career. Because the critics recognized James's superior writing ability, however, they would subsequently hold him to higher standards than those applied to other novelists of his time. The contemporary response to Henry James illustrates the clash between a writer's artistic ideals and critics' unrealistic expectations.

The minor criticisms leveled at *Roderick Hudson* became more pronounced in reviews of *The American* and *The Europeans*. James's manner was becoming increasingly cold-blooded; his characters, even more unsympathetic. Both

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

books were censured for their endings. The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* reviewer, for example, commented that while reading *The Europeans*, “there was a vague suspicion all the way through that it wasn’t going to end in anything in particular, as it proves at last.”³ In *The American*, the New York *Tribune* complained, the “action simply stops, leaving matters very much as they were before.” Christopher Newman had been likeable enough through much of the book, but he lost the reader’s sympathy by the end. His final lack of forcefulness and perseverance seemed incongruous with his early activities as a go-getting, self-made American. Through much of the book, the *Scribner’s* reviewer found Christopher Newman believable, engaging, and manly, but by the end, “the successive steps of the story grow more and more disheartening, and we finally close the volume, conscious victims of misplaced confidence.” The New York *Times* went as far as to suggest an alternate ending: “It would have been better for Mr. James’s literary fame to have blown the convent up with nitroglycerine, and had Newman carry off Mme. de Cintré . . . than to have allowed him to end his love affair in what is vulgarly termed a fizzle.”

The book’s title was part of the problem. Setting up Newman as *the American* did not sit well with the nationalistic American critics. Contemporary English readers, free from the jingoism of their American counterparts, responded somewhat differently. George Saintsbury’s review indicates how the work was received in England. Saintsbury saw Newman as a “typical Yankee” and found “something exceedingly jarring” in the idea that Newman would revenge himself for personal slight by making use of a family secret. Saintsbury asked, “How could he think of doing such a thing?” whereas American critics asked, “How come he didn’t go through with it?”

Though more open-minded, the English reviewers were not always kind. After reading reviews of *The American*, *The Europeans*, and the English edition of *Roderick Hudson* (the publication of which had been delayed until 1879), James expressed skepticism about his contemporary readers in letters to his family. Sending a copy of the *Saturday Review* notice to his brother William, he wrote, “The shabbiness of its tone is such as really—n’est ce pas?—to make one think more meanly of human nature.”⁴ A review in the *Spectator*, James wrote his mother, “depressed me by its essential *unintelligence* and the extreme narrowness which lurks under its liberal pretensions.”⁵

Still, he was not without enthusiasts. W. E. Henley was his favorite English reviewer of the early novels. Reviewing *The Europeans* for the *Academy*, Henley found James an “exponent of the refined, eclectic realism of Turgéniéff” and found the book the “purest piece of realism ever done.” James made sure Henley promptly received copies of his next works. When *Daisy Miller* appeared, James wrote his publisher, “I enclose you a rather long list, as usual, of people to whom I should like ‘Daisy Miller’ sent. Will you kindly see that the copy for Henley (the 1st) goes *immediately*? He is an admirable reviewer to whom I promised an early one.”⁶

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

After its publication in 1878, *Daisy Miller* quickly became James's best-liked book up to that time. Although the character of Daisy Miller was not totally sympathetic, she was recognizable, reminding readers of many young American women traveling abroad. Some saw the work as a cautionary tale. Richard Grant White, for example, hoped the book would have "some corrective effect" but accurately prophesied, "the probability is that, on the contrary, Daisy Miller will become the accepted type and her name the *sobriquet* in European journalism of the American young woman of the period." American reviewers of *Daisy Miller* analyzed how James's title character measured up as a national type just as they had for Christopher Newman. English critics, on the other hand, saw the book as more than merely an illustration of national character and recognized other aspects of James's writing such as his narrative technique. The *Pall Mall Gazette* reviewer, for example, approved James's use of an internally focalized, third-person narrative: "We know no more about them [the characters] than the *dramatis personae* see, and in this way our curiosity is kept alive."

James was delighted with the English reception. He wrote his brother William from England, "I am very glad indeed that you were pleased with 'Daisy Miller,' who appears (*literally*) to have made a great hit here. 'Every one is talking about it' &c, & it has been much noticed in the papers. Its success has encouraged me as regards the faculty of appreciation of the English public; for the thing is sufficiently subtle, yet people appear to have comprehended it. It has given me a capital start here."⁷ James's words both convey his enthusiasm and suggest what he believed to be a writer's ultimate goal: to create a literary work that satisfies both creator and audience. Never again would James's artistic quest and his desire for public acceptance so happily coincide.

Reviews of James's fiction from *Confidence*, first published in late 1879, through *The Aspern Papers* in 1888 reflect the differences between his approach to fiction writing and his contemporary reader's understanding of the novel. The author, most readers believed, should reflect some sympathy in his characters, but James seemed devoid of sympathy. With his "mental microscope," to borrow a term the *Chicago Tribune* applied to describe the technique he used in *The Bostonians*, James scrutinized the thoughts and actions of his characters just as a biologist treated specimens. Scientific diction pervades the critical language applied to the works of James's middle period. *Washington Square*, the *New York Times* quipped, portrayed "a few marked specimens of the *genus Americanum*."⁸ Reviewing *Confidence*, the *New York Herald* stated that when James's narrators found "a young lady worthy of their interest they impale her as a naturalist might a butterfly and make a careful and scientific investigation of her nature." In his fine overview of James's readers, Henry Nash Smith noticed the many times reviewers used the graphic surgical term "vivisection" to describe James's penetrating analysis.⁹ The field of physics also provided appropriate metaphors. The *Critic* said that *The Princess Casamassima*

would be “endlessly delightful . . . to the lover of interpretations, of emotions analytically examined, of hairs radiantly split, of spectroscopic gratings capable of dividing a ray of light into 32,000 lines to the square inch, or of intellectual engines describing 150,000 sensations to the twenty pages.”

James sometimes claimed the right to enter the heads and hearts of his characters at will, and many readers found this authorial prerogative disturbing. Reviewing *The Bostonians*, Horace E. Scudder commented on James’s “habit of reporting the mind as well as the conversation of his baser characters in a sort of third personal evasion of elegance.” Julia Wedgwood, too, criticized the narrative point of view in *The Bostonians*: “To be told not only what his *dramatis personae* express but what they thought and kept to themselves, what they felt inclined to express and why they refrained . . . seems to us a violation of every conceivable rule of literary good breeding, and affects us in fiction with not less sense of fatigue and unfitness than such an experience would in life.” The most perceptive readers, however, accepted James’s minute delineation of thought and feeling and tried to understand his narrative strategies.

Some found that James made excessive demands on his readers. Rather than straightforwardly explain the action taking place, James more often seemed to force his readers to fill in important details. One reviewer had become accustomed to James’s endings by the early 1880s and saw *The Portrait of a Lady* as a kind of mathematical proof. He wrote, “when at last the demonstrator breaks off in the abrupt way which has startled all his readers, it is with the air of saying, ‘I have furnished all the points and shown you how to proceed. Find the answer for yourselves.’”¹⁰ While many resented the demands James made on his readers, others were pleased. Describing *Confidence*, the *Scribner’s* reviewer noticed: “We see, too, the influence that their emotion exerts on their conduct, but not the real emotion itself. For all that, the reader who can supply the missing links and rewrite the love passages for himself, can only admire the whole outgrowth of the conditions.” Sometimes this complicity between author and reader became uncomfortable for the reader. Robert Bridges remarked that in *The Aspern Papers*,

the reader is entrapped into a keen interest in the hunt for the love-letters of the poet *Aspern*. When the indelicacy and even cruelty of the whole plot are suddenly flashed upon you, you feel something of the shame and humility which at last overtook the literary ghoul. You are to a degree *particeps criminis*, and understand the weak point, in human nature which has led to so many unpardonable literary sins.¹¹

By the late 1880s, James had created a large enough body of work that reviewers had a fair idea of the “Jamesian” novel.¹² Concerning *The Aspern Papers*, the *Saturday Review* commented, “Though readers who have followed his [James’s] past career will know what awaits them at the end of the story, there is still an interest in watching the passes of the swords.” In other words,

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

the reviewer is saying, simply accept the fact that although James's endings would remain disappointing and unresolved, his telling of the tale would nevertheless be worth reading. When George Bernard Shaw was reviewing books for the *Pall Mall Gazette* during the late nineteenth century, he apparently did not have the opportunity to review any of James's works, but on one occasion he did manage to mention James and characterize his way of ending a book. Complaining of an author who mixed both old and new writing styles and incongruously placed the new before the old, Shaw made an analogy with James's writing: "It is as if a publisher not quite abreast of his time had commissioned Mr. James to write a novel, and, finding the last chapter inconclusive and unsatisfactory, had called in Miss Braddon to marry the lovers, kill the villain, and wind up the business on the strictest principles of poetic justice."¹³ Shaw recognized that the Jamesian dénouement marked an advance over the typical romantic ending. Ambiguity and lack of resolution, Shaw's remark suggests, were infinitely preferable to cliché.

During the decade from *Confidence* to *The Aspern Papers*, James's attitude toward his reviewers changed drastically. Early in the period, he remained eager to know how his work was being received. After *Washington Square* appeared, for example, James, then in San Remo, wrote Frederick Macmillan, "Have there been any (noticeable) notices of my book? Perhaps you have sent two or three to Bolton St. I should be glad to see the few that appear in the important papers: for the others I don't care."¹⁴ Macmillan wrote back promising to send "anything of interest."¹⁵ On a trip home to America after the publication of *The Portrait of a Lady*, James was pleased to find the critics responding positively. He again wrote Macmillan, "Also my book is selling—largely, for one of mine. I hope it is doing something of the kind *chez vous*. I have seen a good many English notices, & appear to myself to have got off on the whole very well. Look, if you can put your hand on it, at a Review in the *Tribune* for Dec. 25th—very glowing, & well-written." Although James did not admit it to his publisher, the *Tribune* review had been written by his good friend John Hay.¹⁶ With the appearance of *The Bostonians*, James's attitude soured. "I even confess," he later recalled, "that since the *Bostonians* I find myself holding the 'critical world' at large in a singular contempt. I go so far as to think that the literary sense is a distinctly waning quality."¹⁷

After the critics got hold of *The Princess Casamassima*, James abandoned hope about his reviewers. Those who disliked the book heartlessly said so. Still, he was not without sympathizers. William Dean Howells had written a "rousing eulogy" on the work,¹⁸ and Edmund Gosse wrote to console James for the scathing *Athenaeum* review. James responded to Gosse, "Yes, the notice in the *Athenaeum* of my 'Princess' is singularly discreditable. But this sort of thing is a very old story to me—I have nothing more to learn about it . . . though it disillusionizes one for art & letters."¹⁹ Another sympathizer wrote mentioning the negative review in *Punch*. James responded, "You exaggerate the impor-

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

tance of that contemptible little notice in *Punch*, of the *Princess*: these things are not of my ken or my care. This sounds sublime—but really the idiocy and ill nature of the journals of my time have made me so. Don't speak of them.”²⁰ In 1890, James wrote his publisher, reversing his instructions of nearly ten years before, “Kindly instruct that no ‘notice’ of any kind be sent me.”²¹

James's attitude about the reviewers is poignantly reflected in a letter to his brother written after finishing *The Tragic Muse* but before it was published:

I hope you will have received promptly a copy of *The Tragic Muse*, though I am afraid I sent my list to the publishers a little late. I don't in the least know, however, when the book is supposed to come out. I have no opinion or feeling about it now—though I took long & patient & careful trouble (which no creature will recognise) with it at the time: too much, no doubt; for my mind is now a muddled, wearied blank on the subject. I have shed and ejected it; it's over & dead—& my feeling as to what may become of it is reduced to the sordid hope it will make a little money—which it won't.²²

James was wrong about how critics would respond to *The Tragic Muse*. It actually received the most praiseful reviews of any James work since *Daisy Miller*. The *Christian Union* reviewer found a “gain in freshness of feeling and vigor of treatment. . . . The impression that one receives is that the story is a *tour de force* of a very accomplished and brilliant man.” The *New York Times* also enthusiastically approved the work. Unlike the typical James story, the story was full of movement and the ending was good: “Mr. James's former work appears to have been a schooling for this latest book, which takes its place, for the present at least, as a masterpiece.” And the *Manchester Guardian* found *The Tragic Muse* a “brilliant rendering of the kaleidoscopic effects which play on the surface of society life.”

For much of the last decade of the nineteenth century, James devoted his creative energies to play writing. He did publish collections of short fiction during the early 1890s, but these received little critical notice. During the autumn of 1896, James published *The Other House*, a work originally written as a play and his first novel since *The Tragic Muse* more than six years before. Prior to its publication, James wrote to his publisher Frederick Macmillan to reiterate his earlier instructions: “Kindly, when *The Other House* is published, neglect, as far as I am concerned, the reviews. I mean, please *don't* forward them.”²³ It is important to understand that although James tried to avoid reading the reviews, often he could not help but read them. A letter he wrote to his brother a month and a half later suggests that, despite the instructions to Macmillan, Henry James had learned of the critical response to *The Other House*. Most reviewers liked the book, but James was hardly pleased. He knew that *The Other House* was a slight work compared to some of his earlier efforts that the reviewers had disliked. He wrote his brother, “*The Other House* . . . by the way, shows symptoms of being the most successful thing I have put forth

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

for a long time. If *that's* what the idiots want, I can give them their bellyfull.”²⁴ In light of this letter to his brother, Henry James's letter to Macmillan seems to convey a deliberate pose. For his publisher, James fashioned himself as a literary artist who cared little for what the public thought about his work. For his brother, however, James freely admitted that he was both aware of the reviews and disturbed by their superficiality.

During the six-year hiatus in which James published no novels, an important new scientific discovery had been made—Wilhelm Röntgen had discovered X rays. Literary critics suddenly had the ideal scientific metaphor with which to describe James's technique. Commenting on *The Spoils of Poynton*, the novel that appeared next after *The Other House*, the *Chicago Tribune* reviewer stated, “Like the up-to-date doctor who makes his patients swallow an electric light bulb and turns the X rays on them to boot, Mr. James illumines the whole interior of his characters and calmly dissects their thoughts while you wait.” Similarly, the narrator of *The Sacred Fount* was characterized by one reviewer as a “Röntgen-ray-eyed guest,” and another called him “an X-ray-eyed narrator.”²⁵

Although critics had a new metaphor to describe James's fiction after the mid-1890s, the X ray comments were, after all, merely an extension of the “mental microscope” and “vivisection” metaphors applied to the fiction of James's middle period. What made these later reviews different from the earlier ones was the amount of respect critics began to give James. The *New York Times* closed its review of *The Spoils of Poynton* with the following:

It is sad to think that not one novel reader in ten thousand, probably, will be able to comprehend his [James's] and Mrs. Gereth's and Fleda Vetch's views of life, art, and conduct, leaving sympathy out of the question. But the appreciation of the one in ten thousand is worth working for, and the knowledge Mr. James must have that his delight in the book's subtlety and refinement, the grave, thoughtful piquancy which is its substitute for humor, will be keen while it lasts, is, perhaps, a sufficient reward. And counting all the tens of thousands of novel readers in the English speaking world, one from each of the tens of thousands will make up a company that is worth while. So that we need not grieve for Henry James.

James's next novel, *What Maisie Knew*, elicited similar comments from the *Pall Mall Gazette* reviewer, who adapted Milton's words to describe James's readers as an “audience fit, though few.”

The Two Magics, published a year after *What Maisie Knew*, contained “The Turn of the Screw” and “The Covering End.” Most reviews concentrated on the first tale. Nothing James had written before had prepared the critics for “The Turn of the Screw.” To be sure, they found his characteristic subtlety, but unlike in earlier works, they found that the subtlety in “The Turn of the Screw” enhanced rather than obscured the story. The *Athenaeum* reviewer called the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

use of subtlety in “The Turn of the Screw” “triumphant” and remarked that James “only adds to the horror of his conception by occasionally withholding the actual facts and just indicating them without unnecessarily ample details.” The *Illustrated London News* was similarly impressed: “He has rarely written anything so subtle, so delicate in workmanship, so intense in feeling, so entirely artistic.” The Manchester *Guardian* reviewer also liked James’s use of subtlety. He “presents his details with a fine economy, and their accumulation and elaboration prepare us for the intenser moments.”²⁶ The London *Daily News* stated that “The Turn of the Screw” showed James’s

subtlest characteristics, his supreme delicacy of touch, his surpassing mastery of the art of suggestion. . . . The story is a masterpiece of artistic execution. Mr. James has lavished upon it all the resources and subtleties of his art. . . . The workmanship throughout is exquisite in the precision of the touch, in the rendering of shades of spectral representation.²⁷

Reviewers of *The Two Magics* were thrilled by James’s departure from his usual subject matter, which one deprecatingly called “things of sublime inconsequence.” They were pleased that James had abandoned the petty insignificance of the sitting room and the parlor to grapple with the elemental forces of good and evil. After reading “The Turn of the Screw,” the *Athenaeum* reviewer had hopes that James would give his readers “more of the natural man, and less of the intricate criticism and of the excessive sense of the importance of his subject” that, the critic implied, had marred several of James’s previous works. The reviews of James’s other works often expressed anger that he seemingly wasted so many words and so much creative energy on trivial things. No one made that complaint about “The Turn of the Screw.”

According to many of his critics, James could hardly have followed up “The Turn of the Screw” with two less important books than *The Awkward Age* and *The Sacred Fount*. The New York *Tribune* review of *The Sacred Fount* begins:

When Mr. James published “The Turn of the Screw,” in the fall of 1898, he must have inspired in many a breast the wish that he would trust himself again in the train of speculation so powerfully exploited in that eerie narrative. It carried him, for the moment, away from the trivialities which have too often engrossed him, and enabled him to breathe the spiritual airs of creative imagination. In the following summer came “The Awkward Age,” an anti-climax, if ever there was one.

Reviewing *The Awkward Age*, the *Spectator* concluded, “On the whole, we never remember to have read a novel in which the disproportion between the ability employed and the worth or attractiveness of the characters was more glaring.”²⁸ Another English review of *The Awkward Age* was titled “Mr. Henry James Exasperates” and stated that “James has refined refinement, subtilized subtlety, and suggested suggestion to bewilderment.”

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Reviews of *The Sacred Fount* were much the same as those of *The Awkward Age*. The *Chicago Tribune* stated, "It justifies to the full every adverse criticism ever passed upon his work by those who do not like his methods." More than one reviewer explicitly called the work a parody of James himself, and several others suggested much the same thing. *Current Literature* said that "James has out-Jamesed himself," and the London *Daily Chronicle* contrasted James's "later manner" with his "more charming earlier style." With every book, the reviewer suggested, "his manner, so to say, gets later and yet more late." James tried to stay above the reviewers, but he could not avoid reading the notices altogether. He wrote a correspondent who had sent him a clipping, "Many thanks about the 'Notice.' I have seen but one—the one in the *Times*, but I shan't trouble you for any—as it is my eccentric practice to see as few as possible. No 'press-cuttings' agency ever had access to me. This is the fruit of a long life."²⁹

The Wings of the Dove, *The Ambassadors*, and *The Golden Bowl* brought admirers or, perhaps more accurately, confirmed the admiration of many long-time James enthusiasts—despite the fact that, as Montgomery Schulyer claimed, James had become a "harder taskmaster than ever."³⁰ To be sure, the intricate syntax of these late works made them less approachable than the early works, but critics found something else they had not found within the earlier fictions. James, it seems, had finally learned how to express sympathy with his characters. The *Times Literary Supplement* suggested that James had written nothing to compare with *The Wings of the Dove*, except possibly *The Tragic Muse* and *Roderick Hudson*, but "in neither of these works do we find the same element of grave and penetrating tenderness."³¹ None of the reviewers had found tenderness in James's early works. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, which had greatly disliked *The Awkward Age*, called *The Ambassadors* James's "finest novel." Similarly, Edward Garnett called the work the "finest and subtlest piece in the long gallery of his many achievements."³² The *Athenaeum* review of *The Golden Bowl* expressed a unique sentiment: The reviewer wished the book were longer!

The Golden Bowl was James's last published novel, but he had one masterwork left in him. *The American Scene*, a work Ezra Pound would later call the "triumph of the author's long practice,"³³ described James's impressions of America upon his return after an absence of nearly a quarter century. In the book, James had characterized himself as the "restless analyst," and his reviewers found the phrase a fitting epithet. Several American readers disliked the book, but most English critics were awed by it. Much like the novels, *The American Scene* illustrated James's late manner. Edmund Gosse remarked,

This strange and eloquent book, divided by such a chasm from all ordinary impressions of travel made by the competent and intelligent stranger, is highly typical of Mr. James's later manner of writing. It is produced in that

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
 Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

curious mode of his, by which an infinity of minute touches, each in itself apparently unemphatic, are so massed and arranged that out of them arises, when the reader least expects it, perhaps—a picture which absolutely controls the imagination.

Gosse called the book the “most durable surface-portraiture of an unparalleled condition of society which our generation is likely to see.”

After reading the *Daily Mail* review, James wrote his friend Gosse, “I have just come up to town, & I gave myself this morning very promptly to the beatific perusal of your beautiful notice of *The American Scene* in the D.M. It has given me extraordinary pleasure—more, I can emphatically say, than any Appreciation of any book of mine has ever given me. Therefore my eyes really fill with tears as I very devoutly thank you.”³⁴ James’s heartfelt response to Gosse reflects a considerably different stance than had earlier letters such as those to Macmillan. James may have told others that he had no desire to read his reviews, but, these thankful remarks make clear, he never stopped wanting to be read, appreciated, and understood.

The present study represents the most thorough gathering of James’s reviews ever assembled, but it would not have been possible without the pioneering research into James’s contemporary reception begun fifty years earlier. The study of the critical response to Henry James started with Richard Nicholas Foley’s Catholic University dissertation, *Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866 to 1916* (1944), and Donald McLeish Murray’s New York University dissertation, “The Critical Reception of Henry James in English Periodicals, 1875–1916” (1950), part of which appeared as “Henry James and the English Reviewers, 1882–1890” in *American Literature* (1952). Subsequent studies have treated the reception of individual works, such as Richard Dankleff’s University of Chicago dissertation, “The Composition, Revisions, Reception, and Critical Reputation of Henry James’ *The Spoils of Poynton*” (1959), and Rosalie Hewitt’s “Henry James’s *The American Scene*: Its Genesis and Its Reception, 1905–1977,” *Henry James Review* (1980). Perhaps the best short treatment of James’s contemporary readers is Henry Nash Smith’s “Henry James II: The Problem of an Audience,” in *Democracy and the Novel: Popular Resistance to Classic American Writers* (1978). Linda J. Taylor’s *Henry James, 1866–1916: A Reference Guide* (1982) provides an excellent list of James’s reviews in American newspapers and magazines but, curiously, lists almost no English reviews. Still, I am immensely grateful for Taylor’s work. It helped me locate many American reviews of James’s books that would otherwise have escaped my attention, and it was especially helpful for compiling the checklists of additional reviews that close each section of this book. For items concerning James in American newspapers and other periodicals that appeared during his lifetime other than book reviews, readers should consult Taylor.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
 Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Contemporary notices of James's works have been reprinted in many different places. Casebooks and critical editions of several important works—*The American*, “Daisy Miller,” *The Portrait of a Lady*, “The Turn of the Screw,” and *The Wings of the Dove*—reprint reviews. Other collections of critical essays, such as James Gargano's two-volume *Critical Essays on Henry James* (1987) and Roger Gard's *Henry James: The Critical Heritage* (1968), reprint others. The checklists of additional reviews that end each section of the present book are cross-referenced to other reprints of James's contemporary notices to allow readers to access easily those reviews that space constraints prevented me from including here.

Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century critics had the habit of quoting lengthily from works they reviewed. In this edition, I have abbreviated overlong quotations to the first and last sentences from the quoted passage and replaced with ellipses the intervening text. After each abbreviated quotation, I have bracketed references to the page numbers on which the quotation appears. For works from *Roderick Hudson* (1875) to *The Tragic Muse* (1890), I conveniently cite page numbers from the Library of America editions: *Henry James: Novels 1871–1880*, ed. William T. Stafford (1983); *Henry James: Novels 1881–1886*, ed. William T. Stafford (1985); and *Henry James: Novels 1886–1890*, ed. Daniel Mark Fogel (1989). For those works published after 1890, I cite page numbers from the original editions.

Many people deserve credit for making this work possible. My fascination with Henry James began in graduate school during J. A. Leo Lemay's seminar “Complicity in American Literature.” An essay I wrote for Professor Lemay's course eventually became the basis for “‘The Turn of the Screw’ and the Aesthetics of Response,” a paper that helped to shape the present work and which I presented separately at the 1993 American Literary Realism conference in Cabo San Lucas. I also thank M. Thomas Inge for establishing this series and for his work on this book as series editor. Further, I thank the newspaper and microfilm librarians at the University of Central Oklahoma, the University of Delaware, the University of Illinois, Indiana University, the Library of Congress, the University of Michigan, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Virginia. I am especially grateful to Doyleene Manning and the Interlibrary Loan Department at the Max Chambers Library, University of Central Oklahoma. Of course, I thank Richard and Carole Hayes for their encouragement and support from the beginning. Finally, I am grateful to Hershel Parker, who first taught me the techniques for, and the value of, finding reviews. To him this book is dedicated.

Notes

- 1 Henry James to William James, 3 December 1875; *The Correspondence of William James*, ed. Ignas K. Skrupskelis and Elizabeth M. Berkeley (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia,

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by Kevin J. Hayes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

- 1992–), 1:244–45. Henry James to Henry James, Sr., 20 December 1875; Henry James to Mrs. Henry James, Sr., 24 January 1876; Henry James to William Dean Howells, 3 February 1876; *Henry James Letters*, ed. Leon Edel (Cambridge, Mass. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974–84), 2:12–23.
- 2 William James to Henry James, 12 December 1875, *The Correspondence of William James*, 1:247.
 - 3 *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 7 December 1878, p. 2. Quotations from reviews reprinted in this volume will not be separately documented.
 - 4 Henry James to William James, 1 May 1878, *The Correspondence of William James*, 1:302.
 - 5 Henry James to Mrs. Henry James, Sr., 6 July 1879, *Henry James Letters*, 2:250.
 - 6 Henry James to Frederick Macmillan, 17? February 1879, *The Correspondence of Henry James and the House of Macmillan, 1877–1914*, ed. Rayburn S. Moore (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), p. 30. Four months later, James wrote Macmillan again, asking him to send copies of the English edition of *Roderick Hudson* to Henley and to Matthew Arnold; *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 33.
 - 7 Henry James to William James, 23 July 1878, *Correspondence of William James*, 1:305–6.
 - 8 *New York Times*, 28 November 1880, p. 10.
 - 9 *Democracy and the Novel: Popular Resistance to Classic American Writers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 146.
 - 10 *Lippincott's Magazine* 29 (February 1882), 213–15; reprinted in this volume.
 - 11 For my notions of complicity in American literature, I am indebted to my teacher J. A. Leo Lemay.
 - 12 My use of the word “Jamesian” here is not an anachronism. The earliest use of the adjective “Jamesian” that I have located occurs in the *Detroit Free Press* review of *The Princess Casamassima* in 1886.
 - 13 “A Novel by Mr. Julian Hawthorne,” review of Julian Hawthorne, *Love—or a Name, Pall Mall Gazette*, 30 December 1885; reprinted in Brian Tyson, *Bernard Shaw's Book Reviews Originally Published in the Pall Mall Gazette from 1885 to 1888* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), p. 76.
 - 14 James to Macmillan, 27 February 1881, *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 61.
 - 15 Macmillan to James, 4 March 1881, *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 62.
 - 16 James to Macmillan, 27 December 1881, *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 67. See also George Monteiro, *Henry James and John Hay: The Record of a Friendship* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1965).
 - 17 James to William Dean Howells, 2 January 1888, *Henry James Letters*, 3:210.
 - 18 On 10 March 1887, William James wrote Henry James, “Howells told me the other night that he had written a rousing eulogy of your *Princess* for the next Harper, and he hadn't a fault to find with it. Rev. John Brooks, a good man, interested in Socialism was here this morning and called it ‘a superb book.’” *Correspondence of William James*, 2:59. James W. Gargano, *Critical Essays on Henry James: The Early Novels* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1987), pp. 64–65, reprints the *Harper's* review of *The Princess Casamassima* without attributing it to Howells.
 - 19 James to Edmund Gosse, 8 November 1886, *Selected Letters of Henry James to Edmund Gosse 1882–1915: A Literary Friendship*, ed. Rayburn S. Moore (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), p. 44.
 - 20 James to Francis Boott, 26 November 1886, *Henry James Letters*, 3:139.
 - 21 James to Frederick Macmillan, 29 May 1890, *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 162.
 - 22 Henry James to William James, 16 May 1890, *Correspondence of William James*, 2:135.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-45386-8 - Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews
Edited by Kevin J. Hayes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

- 23 James to Messrs Macmillan & Co. [New York], 17 September 1896, *Correspondence of Henry James and . . . Macmillan*, p. 184.
- 24 Henry James to William James, 30 October 1896, *Correspondence of William James*, 2:416.
- 25 *Academy* 1503 (23 February 1901), 165–66; “Mr. Henry James’ New Novel,” *Current Literature* 30 (April 1901), 493; both are reprinted in this volume.
- 26 *Manchester Guardian*, 11 October 1898, p. 4.
- 27 Quoted in “Book Reviews Reviewed,” *Academy* no. 1391 (31 December 1898), 561.
- 28 *Spectator* 3697 (6 May 1899), 647; reprinted in Roger Gard, ed., *Henry James: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), p. 282.
- 29 James to James B. Pinker, 18 September 1902, *Henry James Letters*, 4:242.
- 30 *New York Times Saturday Review of Books and Art* 7 (4 October 1902), 658.
- 31 *Times Literary Supplement* 34 (5 September 1902), 263. Reprinted in Gard, *Henry James: The Critical Heritage*, pp. 319–21; J. Donald Crowley and Richard A. Hicks, eds., *The Wings of the Dove: Norton Critical Edition* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978), pp. 481–83.
- 32 Arthur Sherbo, in “Still More on James,” *Henry James Review* 12 (1991), 110–12, first located Garnett’s review but carelessly said it appeared in the *Spectator*. Garnett’s review, reprinted in the present volume, appeared in *Speaker: The Liberal Review* new series 9 (14 November 1903), 146–47.
- 33 *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, ed. T. S. Eliot (New York: New Directions, 1935), p. 327.
- 34 James to Edmund Gosse, 2 February 1907, *Selected Letters of Henry James to Edmund Gosse*, pp. 225–26.