

1977

Howells, Marriage, and Swedenborg: The Influence of Swedenborg's Teachings on Howells' Portrayal of Marriage in His Novels

Nancy Danner Marlow

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [English](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Marlow, Nancy Danner, "Howells, Marriage, and Swedenborg: The Influence of Swedenborg's Teachings on Howells' Portrayal of Marriage in His Novels" (1977). *Masters Theses*. 3334.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3334>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

July 20, 1977

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

pdm

HOWELLS, MARRIAGE, AND SWEDENBORG:

THE INFLUENCE OF SWEDENBORG'S TEACHINGS
(TITLE)

ON HOWELLS' PORTRAYAL OF MARRIAGE

IN HIS NOVELS

BY

NANCY DANNER MARLOW

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts in English

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1977

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

7/22/77

DATE

ADVISEE

7/22/77

DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

HOWELLS, MARRIAGE, AND SWEDENBORG:
THE INFLUENCE OF SWEDENBORG'S TEACHINGS
ON HOWELLS' PORTRAYAL OF MARRIAGE
IN HIS NOVELS

BY

NANCY DANNER MARLOW

B. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1969

ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English at the Graduate School
of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS
1977

Over one-half of Howells' novels are concerned with marriage and courtship. Like many other aspects of his thinking, Howells' ideas of marriage were influenced by the teachings of Emmanuel Swedenborg, an eighteenth century Swedish scientist and theologian. The bulk of Swedenborg's teachings regarding marriage are found in his The Delights of Wisdom Concerning Conjugal Love, published in 1768. Howells showed the influence of Swedenborgianism on the marriages in his novels in three major areas: the actual marriages in his novels, matters relating to marriage, and marital failures.

An important element in Swedenborgianism is the belief in marriages in heaven. Although Howells had his personal doubts, regarding this, passages from A Foregone Conclusion, The Shadow of a Dream, and Their Wedding Journey voice the possibility that Swedenborg's concept could be true. Howells presented many marriages in his novels which met Swedenborg's criteria for truly conjugal relationships. Some of these marriages were the Marches, the Colvilles in Indian Summer, the Laphams, and the Pinneys in The Quality of Mercy. Marriages in Howells' novels seem to be conjugal if the partners do not seek selfish sexual gratification, if the partners fulfill their respective conjugal duties, and if the partners realize that marriage will change their lives.

Matters having a close relation to and a great effect upon conjugal relationships are love of infants, betrothals, second marriages, and appearances of conjugal love. Although children play minor roles in most of his novels, in Indian Summer and A Modern

Instance, children were used by Howells to reflect the actions of adults. Betrothals were the first steps for couples entering conjugal relationships. During this time the couple should seek the advice of parents and should refrain from sexual activity. In novels such as The Minister's Charge and The Rise of Silas Lapham where sexual activity was suggested, the marriages did not occur. Of the few repeated marriages in Howells' novels, the marriage of Colville and Lina Bowen seems to be the most influenced by Swedenborgianism. In some cases couples who appeared to share conjugal love actually did not; such marriages were the Redfields in The Leatherstocking and the Northwicks in The Quality of Mercy.

Of the causes of marital failure cited by Swedenborg, Howells used three extensively: religion, differences in social status, and differences in age. The deterioration of the Hubbards' marriage in A Modern Instance parallels the religious deterioration in New England. The marriage in A Chance Acquaintance does not occur because Arbuton thinks Kitty is beneath him socially. Colville and Imogene Graham do not marry in Indian Summer because of the disparity in their ages.

The most important conclusion made by Howells about marriage is that love is not enough. Nonetheless, a marriage cannot exist without love. In a conjugal relationship partners accept each other realistically. April Hopes relates the courtship of a couple whose marriage is destined to fail because the partners cannot accept each other as they are. Marriage is real in Howells' novels; it is not the end of a romance, but the beginning of a life together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CONJUGIAL LOVE	5
Marriages in Heaven	5
Aspects of Conjugal Love	8
Causes of Marital Failures	14
MARRIED LOVE IN HOWELLS' NOVELS	16
Marriages in Heaven	16
Howells' Conjugal Loves and Marriages	20
ASPECTS OF CONJUGIAL MARRIAGES IN HOWELLS' NOVELS	26
Chastity and Sex in Conjugal Marriages	26
Duties in Conjugal Love	38
Change of States of Life	46
MATTERS RELATED TO CONJUGIAL LOVE	51
Love of Infants	51
Betrothals	52
Iterated Marriages	56
Appearances of Conjugal Love	61
COLDNESS, SEPARATION, AND DIVORCE	63
Religion	63
Mind and Manners	66
Inequality of State and Condition of Age	70
LOVE AND MARRIAGE	75

INTRODUCTION

Marriage was important to William Dean Howells. In an article published in Harper's Magazine just a year and a half before his death, Howells said of marriage:

The greatest and most dramatic shrinkage of consciousness is, of course, that which follows from the cooling of the passions, and is something quite physical. Love at its best means marriage, and is altogether the most beautiful thing in life. It is never self-consciously ridiculous, though often ridiculous enough to the witness. Its perversion is the ugliest thing in life and the shamefulest, but for a day, for an hour of its bliss, one would give all one's other years; yet it does not escape the imperfection which mars everything. The best of existence, the home and the children, proceed from it; without it there can be no death, and the rending of the dearest ties and the anguish of grief come from love, too; the grave as well as the home awaits it.¹

Howells' own marriage was a very good one; he often regarded his wife as his "other and better self." When she agreed with him he felt confident.² His wife was Elinor Meade, an intelligent and talented woman from an "idiosyncratic Vermont family."³ She was a great help in his work, allowing him a greater insight into his feminine characters. Like the Marches in Their Wedding Journey, Howells and Elinor had difficulties in becoming married. Howells had asked Elinor to meet him in Liverpool, England, where they could marry; from

¹W. D. Howells, "Eighty Years and After," Harper's Magazine 140 (December 1919):22.

²Edwin Harrison Cady, The Road to Realism, 2 vols. (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1958), 2:64.

³William M. Gibson, "William D. Howells," in Six American Novelists of the Nineteenth Century, An Introduction, ed. Richard Foster (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), p. 159.

there they would make their wedding journey through Paris to their new home in Venice. However, Liverpool required a residency of a week for marriage, so they went to London where Howells thought they could be married at the American legation. Here they were turned away by the official secretary. Finally, they were married in Paris. Their difficulties became a family joke which evidenced their very successful marriage.¹

Like many other aspects of his thinking, Howells' ideas of marriage were influenced by the teachings of Emanuel Swedenborg, an eighteenth-century Swedish mystic. Born Emmanuel Swedberg, January 29, 1688, in Stockholm to Sara Behm and Jasper Swedberg, a regimental chaplain, he assumed the name of Swedenborg when he was ennobled in 1719. Swedenborg left his scientific work to devote his life to interpreting the scriptures as a result of a religious revelation in April of 1745.² During his lifetime, Swedenborg was a well-known scientist, an influential businessman, and a religious writer. The "spiritual truths" Swedenborg experienced during his religious revelations were the subjects of his religious writings.³

Swedenborg had no established followers during his lifetime in Sweden; however, the Church of the New Jerusalem, founded on his teachings, was established in England and spread to America. The first American Swedenborgian society was founded in 1789 in Baltimore. The New Church (as it was called to differentiate itself from all previous Christian

¹Cady, The Road to Realism, 1:98-99.

²Inge Jonsson, Emmanuel Swedenborg, 1688-1772, trans. Catherine Djurklou (New York: Twayne Publishing, 1971), p. 17.

³John T. Frederick, The Darkened Sky: Nineteenth-Century American Novelists and Religion (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1969), p. 177.

churches) never became a large society. A century after the first society was founded in America there were only seven thousand New Church members in America. It had its strongest hold in the Midwest, especially in Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio, where Howells' father, William Cooper Howells, was a convert.¹

Frederick pictures Howells' early religious training as Swedenborgian:

At Hamilton, where William Dean spent his boyhood, and again at Jefferson, the village of his adolescent years, there were no local societies of the New Church; and though the children were permitted to attend the services of other churches, including the Roman Catholic, the Howells family had no part in regular public religious observances. In their place, on Sunday evenings the father read to the family passages from the writings of Swedenborg, doubtless with comment and interpretation, while an engraved portrait of Swedenborg, in a mahogany frame, looked on from a prominent place in the room. It is clear that a rather firm and explicit grounding in Swedenborgian doctrine was part of the preparation for life which William Cooper Howells sought for his children.²

Howells did not actively support the Swedenborgian theology, but the ethics of Swedenborgianism were important in his life.³ Three elements of Swedenborgian ethics having a major influence in Howells' life and writings are (1) freedom of will, (2) the constant penetration of spiritual beings in our natural lives, and (3) the sacredness and permanence of marriage.⁴ Swedenborg's concept of marriage as shown in his The Delights of Wisdom Concerning Conjugal⁵ Love and its influence

¹Frederick, The Darkened Sky, p. 178.

²Ibid., p. 181.

³Daniel Aaron, "William Dean Howells: The Gentleman from Altruria" in *Men of Good Hope* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 145.

⁴Frederick, The Darkened Sky, pp. 177-178.

⁵"Conjugal" rather than "conjugal" was used by the translator because Swedenborg used the Latin "conjugiale" not "conjugale." The former term better expressed pure and celestial affection (from translator's notes to Conjugal Love, p. 1). "Conjugal" will be used in this paper.

on Howells' portrayal of marriage in his novels is the subject of this paper.

Conjugal Love was published in 1768. This was the first of Swedenborg's theological works to which he attached his name. In this, as in his other works, Swedenborg believed he was commissioned by God to relate to people the true knowledge of Christ. The book discussed at length the nature of married love and Swedenborg's reasons for believing, or in his case knowing, it was continued in heaven.¹

Swedenborg believed that marriage, not celibacy, was the means through which people could grow spiritually and attain their highest good. He also taught that marriage was eternal. Sexual relations were not inherently evil; the evil came from infidelity or from abuse of sexual relations in marriage. Swedenborgianism was the basis for Howells' portrayal of marriage in his novels.²

¹George Trobridge, Emmanuel Swedenborg: His Life, Teachings, and Influence (New York: The New-Church Press, Inc., 1918), pp. 94, 100-01, 140.

²Frederick, The Darkened Sky, p. 179.

CONJUGIAL LOVE

Conjugal Love is set up into chapters, each of which contains a set of theories, "proven" by Swedenborg during his heavenly visitations. Since Swedenborg was not only a theologian, but also a scientist, he presented his discourse in a scientific manner. Swedenborg stated that although most men needed sensory evidence to believe his theories, only those whose spirits were opened to God could commune with the angels of heaven to receive this evidence. Swedenborg's spirit was open to the Lord; therefore, he was the evidence of his theories during his visitations. In each chapter he stated his propositions and followed them with his proofs--the memorable relations of his heavenly visitations.

True conjugal love, according to Swedenborg, is spiritual, rational, and natural at once, appealing to the soul, mind, and body alike. It is heavenly and pure so long as man avoids those things which can pervert it. Conjugal Love covers three major areas--marriages in heaven, aspects of conjugal love, and causes of marital failures.

Marriages in Heaven

In the first chapter Swedenborg set forth his propositions that confirmed the occurrence of marriages in heaven. This is probably the most controversial and seemingly most unChristian aspect of Swedenborg's teachings regarding marriage for even the Bible states that there are no marriages in heaven. Howells had difficulty with this theory

because of his personal doubts regarding life after death.

Swedenborg based his theory of heavenly marriages on the following scripture:

And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;

And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.

And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.¹

The female was created from the male; however, male and female are different both outwardly and inwardly. Within men and women is a tendency to become one person; this tendency is conjugal love. Without it male and female are merely half-people. Because the femaleness and maleness are a part of men and women both physically and spiritually, conjugal love is a part of the natural (physical) and the spiritual in people. Therefore the qualities of maleness and femaleness and of conjugal love exist after death since they are a part of the spiritual in people.

If at this point Swedenborg's readers were doubtful, Swedenborg stated his most conclusive proof of the existence of marriages in heaven. He saw them during his visits to heaven. According to him, "This position having been confirmed by reason, and at the same time by experience, stands in need of no further demonstration."²

In the final proposition of this chapter Swedenborg redefined the scriptural references to marriages in heaven. According to

¹Genesis 2:21-23.

²Emmanuel Swedenborg, The Delights of Wisdom Concerning Conjugal Love, trans. from the Latin (Philadelphia: Francis and Robert Bailey, 1796), ed. Dr. Clifford K. Shipton, Early American Imprints, 1639-1800 (Worcester, Massachusetts: American Antiquarian Society), p. 76

Swedenborg, when Jesus taught that men rise after death and that in heaven they neither marry nor are married, He was referring to spiritual nuptials, which is the conjunction between man and God. Since this must occur on earth, there is no need for it to reoccur in heaven. To celebrate nuptials, then, is to join with the Lord; to enter into nuptials is to be received into heaven by the Lord.¹

In the following chapter Swedenborg continued his discussion of marriages in heaven by showing the state of married partners after death. If both partners are dead, they come together and live as they did during life. This is the external state, the first of the two states entered into by men and women after death. When they enter the second, or the internal state, they learn each other's true feelings and whether conjugal love between them exists. If a man has had several wives, he lives with each externally, but he can accept only one internally. True conjugal love can exist between only one man and one woman. If a woman has had several husbands, she presents herself to only one. Women have an interior perception of love and know their spouses well, but men do not.

If both partners' inclinations agree, they will continue to live a conjugal life. If not, they will dissolve their marriage. Separations occur after death because marriages made on earth are seldom a result of an internal perception of love. If there is a separation, each is given a suitable partner. In heaven a married couple constitutes one angel. The relationship between conjugal partners in heaven is similar to those on earth but more delightful and blessed. They do not produce children, but their offspring are love and wisdom.

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 66-76.

Marriage after death exists only in heaven. Those condemned to hell are natural rather than spiritual, and natural marriages can never be conjugal.¹

Aspects of Conjugal Love

Swedenborg devoted much of Conjugal Love to defining and discussing conjugal love and marriage. Although there are infinite varieties of conjugal love, there are basic principles which must exist in true conjugal love.

Few people know what conjugal love is because it is so rare. It originates in the marriage of good, which is grounded in the female, and truth, which is grounded in the male, and it corresponds with the marriage of Christ and the Church. Because of its origin and correspondence, conjugal love is celestial, spiritual, holy, pure, clean, and above every other love. Conjugal love is the foundation of spiritual love and natural love. Only Christians can experience conjugal love, and it is the basis for all joys and delights.²

In a more detailed discussion, Swedenborg wrote about the marriages of good and truth and of Christ and the Church in the following two chapters. From the marriage of good and truth comes the love of the sex, which is natural. In conjugal love this love of the sex is chaste. In the "Memorable Relation" following this chapter Swedenborg made two additional comments concerning conjugal love. First, according to Genesis 2:24, conjugal love was inspired at the

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 84-91.

²Ibid., pp. 98-103.

creation.

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother,
and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one
flesh.

Second, Matthew 19:4-6 instructs that conjugal love is a basic part
of Christianity.

And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that
he which made them at the beginning made them male and female,
And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother,
and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one
flesh?

Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What there-
fore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.¹

In the corresponding marriage of Christ and the Church, the
offsprings are truth, from which come understanding, perception, and
thought, and good, from which come love, charity, and affection. Man
as husband does not correspond with Christ nor does the wife correspond
with the Church because husband and wife together are the Church.
However, there is a correspondence between the marriage of Christ and
the Church and the marriages of men and women in these aspects:
conjugal love, insemination, prolificness, and the love of infants.²

Since Swedenborg claimed that conjugal love makes love of the
sex chaste, he devoted a chapter to outlining the chaste and the non-
chaste principles. The chaste and non-chaste are only in marriage
and marriage-related things, and the chaste is only in monogamous marriages.
Chastity exists because of religion and only the Christian conjugal
principle is chaste. With those made spiritual by the Lord, conjugal
love and, therefore, its delights become more purified and chaste.

According to Swedenborg, the following cannot be chaste because
they are not a part of marriage: eunuchs; those who have not felt a

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 130-149.

²Ibid., pp. 153-154.

love of sex, such as infants, boys and girls, young men and virgins; those who do not regard adultery as evil and those who abstain from adultery for merely external reasons; those who believe marriages are unchaste. Because marriage is preferred to celibacy, those who are celibate cannot be chaste unless they wish to share the conjugal life and remain celibate only because of the lack of a conjugal partner.¹

The Lord's words, that they are no longer two, but one flesh, refer to the conjunction of souls and minds by marriage. As evident from Genesis 2:22-24 and Matthew 19:4-6, from creation man and woman have the inclination and faculty to become one. This union is achieved through conjugal love. Every person has a soul, a mind, and a body, with the soul the inmost principle, the mind, the middle, and the body, ultimate. Conjugal love conjoins the two souls and minds into one by joining the will of the wife with the understanding of the husband. The wife's inclination to unite with the husband is constant and continuous, but the husband's is not. This is because the woman is love and the man is merely the recipient of that love. The wife inspires conjunction into her husband; this conjunction begins with the marriage and continues to grow throughout eternity--but only with those who share true conjugal love.

So that this conjunction will occur the wife is given the knowledge of her husband's affections and the prudence to moderate them. However strong they are alone, male and female need the other to be complete. Male and female have different duties to perform in life, and neither can perform the duties of the other. Like husband and wife, those duties conjoin to become one house.

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, p. 174.

Those who experience conjugal love are aware of their oneness because true conjugal love is a union of souls and minds and an attempted union of bodies. The union of bodies is possible only through the heart.¹

Marriage changes the states of life for men and women. The state of life refers to the quality of life as it relates to understanding and will. This state of life continually changes, even after death. The changes differ between men and women because men and women are different. With conjugal partners the states of life change according to the conjunction of their minds. A woman becomes a wife without her husband's knowledge just as Eve was created while Adam slept. Without her husband's awareness the wife conjoins her will with his inner will so that their wills and likewise their selves become one.

Children born of conjugal marriages learn the conjugal principles from their parents. Sons have a tendency toward wisdom, and daughters toward loving the teachings of wisdom. Children's souls come from the father's wisdom and are encompassed by the mother's love.²

In outlining the causes of love, friendship, and favors in marriage, Swedenborg explained that marriages are weakened if there is no spiritual union. Almost all things in the natural world are capable of being joined externally. In the spiritual world things are joined internally and externally if there is a union between the internal and external affections. Although marriages are usually contracted because of external affections, these affections must be influenced by

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 193-208.

²Ibid., pp. 216-229.

the internal. Since the bonds of marriage should continue until the death of one of the partners, the external affections can resemble the internal in cases where there are no internal affections. From this comes the apparent love, friendship, or favor in marriage. These appearances are conjugal because they serve several useful and necessary purposes: (1) amendment and accommodation; (2) preservation of order in domestic affairs; (3) unanimity in the care and education of children; (4) peace in the house; (5) reputation of the house; (6) security in the acquired families of marriage; (7) avoidance of disgrace; (8) fostering reconciliation; and (9) fostering a friendship resembling conjugal love if the man ceases to be able to function as a husband.¹

Standards regarding betrothals and nuptials are also included in Conjugal Love. The selection of partners belongs to the man because it is indecent for a woman to speak of love. However, women have the right to select from their suitors. Before she consents, a woman should consult with her parents or those whom she regards as such and then deliberate with herself. After she gives her consent, they should pledge themselves to each other; consent must be established by a solemn betrothal, which prepares each for conjugal love. The betrothal conjoins the minds so that the spiritual marriage precedes the marriage of the bodies. However, this is the case only with those who think chastely of marriage. During the time of betrothal there should be no sexual union. When the betrothal is completed, the nuptials should take place. The conjugal covenant is to be ratified before witnesses and consecrated by a priest before the nuptials are celebrated

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 287-289.

with festivity. With the nuptials a full marriage, one of mind and body, is made.¹

An iterated marriage is one following the death of a prior marriage partner. "Iterated" is a word coined by the translator meaning to do a thing again. If the prior marriage was not truly conjugal, then the surviving partner may again marry. Those who have experienced true conjugal love do not enter iterated marriages except for reasons separate from conjugal love. There are four states which may call for remarriage: (1) provision of a new mother for children; (2) the desire to have more children; (3) the need for someone to run a large house and its servants; and (4) the distraction from a man's domestic duties. These, of course, are a widower's reasons for remarrying. According to Swedenborg, a widow is always desirous of remarriage since she is incapable of providing for herself.²

Because the main reason for conjugal love is procreation, conjugal love and the love of infants are interiorly conjoined. There are two universal spheres proceeding from the Lord to preserve the universe. One is the sphere of procreation, and the other is the sphere of protecting those procreated. These spheres become one with the sphere of conjugal love and with the sphere of the love of infants. The love of infants is protection and support of those who cannot protect and support themselves. This sphere affects both evil and good and causes everyone to love, protect, and support their children. It affects the female primarily and the male through the female.

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 307-320.

²Ibid., pp. 329-335.

The love of infants and children differs with spiritual conjugal partners from what it is with natural partners. With spiritual partners it is interior and with natural partners it is exterior. The love of infants prevails both with partners who love each other and with those who do not. The love of infants remains after death, especially with women. Infants are educated after their death under the Lord's auspices by such women and grow as they would in the world. Their innocence becomes the innocence of wisdom, and they become angels.¹

Causes of Marital Failures

After considering the various aspects of conjugal love, Swedenborg then turned to its opposite--nonconjugal love and the problems it causes in marriage. These problems are coldness, separation, and divorce. Coldness, or the lack of love, is the separation of souls and minds which leads to indifference, discord, contempt, disdain, and aversion. This coldness can eventually lead to separation of beds, bedrooms, and houses. There are internal, external, and accidental causes of coldness. The internal causes come from religion. Among the external causes of coldness are differences in mind and manners from heredity and education and the inequality of state and condition in age, dignity, and wealth.

There are also some accidental causes of coldness: (1) the feeling that enjoyment is common because it is continually allowed; (2) cohabitation with a conjugal partner seems forced because it is grounded in law; (3) affirmation on the part of the wife and a discourse on her part concerning love ; and (4) the man's thought of his wife

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 385-387.

if she is willing and her thought of him if he is not. If one partner is cold mentally to the other his actions will reflect that coldness.¹

Although Swedenborg's treatise of conjugal love seems to be outmoded in this day of women's liberation and of redefining male and female roles, he is very persuasive. I can easily see how William Dean Howells, who lived during American Victorianism, was influenced by Swedenborg when I, who consider myself liberated, also came under his influence. However, Howells brought Swedenborg's ideas concerning marriage down to earth by tempering them with his realism.

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, pp. 257-270.

MARRIED LOVE IN HOWELLS' NOVELS

Howells presented marriage according to Swedenborg in two ways. First, he presented Swedenborg's concept of marriage in heaven--mainly through the conversations of his characters. Second, he showed conjugal marriages and contrasted these relationships with those which were obviously less than conjugal.

Marriages in Heaven

Swedenborg's concept of marriage after death was probably the most difficult for Howells (as it is for others) to accept. Howells had trouble accepting marriage after death because he doubted whether there was life after death. There were two major phases in the process of Howells' loss of faith. First, he discovered that he could no longer believe in Swedenborgianism or in any other doctrine as such. This occurred during his early twenties and is expressed in his poem "Lost Beliefs."

One after one they left us;
The sweet birds out of our breasts
Went flying away in the morning:
Will they come again to their nests?

Will they come again at nightfall,
With God's breath in their song?
Noon is fierce with the heats of summer,
And summer days are long!

Oh, my Life! with thy upward liftings,
Thy downward-striking roots,
Ripening out of thy tender blossoms
But hard and bitter fruits,--

In thy boughs there is no shelter
 For my birds to seek again!
 Ah! the desolate nest is broken
 And torn with storms and rain!¹

Second, he lost confidence in his personal immortality. This occurred during the late 1880's or early 1900's.²

Elinor Howells died on May 6, 1910. On June 8, 1910, Howells wrote to William James: "I wish I could believe in a meeting with her, but she believed in none and how can I?" On June 9, 1910, he wrote to his brother Joseph: "I do not know whether I believe that we shall meet again."³ After his wife's death, Howells experienced an uncertain return to the hope of immortality.⁴ Whatever his personal beliefs were, marriage in Howells' novels reflects his early training in Swedenborgianism, and this includes the concept of marriage for eternity.

In A Foregone Conclusion Don Ippolito, speaking to Ferris about his love for Florida Vervain, asks, "Can there be any higher thing in heaven or on earth than love for such a woman?" Ferris's answer, "Yes; both in heaven and on earth,"⁵ illustrates that Swedenborgianism had taught Howells that marriage is for eternity. However, Swedenborg did not believe that such eternal unions were always begun on earth. All too often those earthly marriages were too plain and for this life only.⁶

¹Howells, "Lost Beliefs," The Atlantic Monthly 5 (April 1860):486.

²Frederick, The Darkened Sky, pp. 182-183.

³Mildred Howells, ed., Life in Letters of William Dean Howells, 2 vols. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1928), 2:285.

⁴Frederick, The Darkened Sky, pp. 220-221.

⁵Howells, A Foregone Conclusion (Boston: Houghton, Osgood and Company, 1879), p. 193.

⁶Edward Wagenknecht, William Dean Howells: The Friendly Eye (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 165.

In The Shadow of A Dream Mrs. Faulkner speaks of marriage and refers directly to Swedenborg:

Marriage is for this world. We are told that by Christ himself, and we know it instinctively. Death does dissolve it inexorably; and although I believe, as Swedenborg says in one of his strange books, that one man and one woman shall live together to all eternity in a union that will make them one personality, still I believe that, as he says that union may or may not begin on earth, and that it will be formed hereafter without regard to earthly ties.¹

Again Howells' Swedenborgianism is evident, when he repeats Swedenborg's theory that most eternal marriages do not begin on earth. In fact Swedenborg believed most couples married on earth were not married to their true conjugal partners. With time and space not defined in heaven as they are on earth, finding one's true conjugal partner would be almost impossible on earth. A conjugal partner could have been dead for centuries or not even born yet; those who happen to live within the same time may live on opposite sides of the world.

The Shaker belief that marriages were earthly and the Swedenborgian belief that marriages were both earthly and heavenly were a source of conflict in Howells' mind and in some of his novels. In The Undiscovered Country Ford discussed his pending union with Egeria with the Shaker Elihu: "You talk of your angelic life! Can you dream of anything nearer the bliss of heaven than union with such tenderness and mercy as hers?" Elihu's reply defines the Shakers' position:

We say nothing against marriage in its place. A true marriage is the best thing in the earthly order. But it is of the earthly order. The Angels neither marry nor are given in marriage. We seek to be perfect, as we are divinely bidden. If you choose to be less than perfect--²

¹Howells, The Shadow of a Dream (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), pp. 89-90.

²Howells, The Undiscovered Country (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1880), p. 352.

However, Ford and Swedenborg have the last word: "There can be no higher choice than love like hers."¹

In The Day of Their Wedding the minister gives the Shakers, Althea and Lorenzo, an undiluted and positive lecture on Swedenborgianism.² Early in their conversation the minister said, "We even go so far as to say that matches are made in heaven. I must confess that some of them don't seem to bear out the theory."³ Later in the same conversation the minister broaches the subject of eternal mating more seriously:

In a certain sense, marriage is both the death and the resurrection. If you will think about it, you will see that it is the very symbol of eternity in human life. All other human relations dissolve and end, but that endures imperishably. The family continually perishes through marriage, which creates it. Children are born to a wedded pair, and there is a family; they grow up and marry, and the family which they constituted ceases to be, as the family which their children shall constitute will cease to be. But the marriage of the father and mother remains to all eternity. If there is no giving of marriage beyond this life it is not in condemnation of marriage but in recognition of the fact that it is from everlasting as well as to everlasting, like all things eternal The husband and the wife lay down their separate lives, and take up a joint life, which, if they are truly married, shall be theirs forever. There is no marrying after death, but heaven is imaged in every true marriage on Earth; for heaven is nothing but the joy of self-giving, and marriage is the supreme self-giving But marriage is properly the death of the individual, and in its resurrection you will rise not as man and woman, but as one pair, in the unity of immortal love.⁴

As the preceding passage shows, Howells was able to effect a compromise between his early teachings of Swedenborgianism and his doubts regarding immortality. In a very beautiful way he had the

¹Howells, The Undiscovered Country, p. 353.

²Frederick, The Darkened Sky, pp. 211-212.

³Howells, The Day of Their Wedding (New York: Harper Brothers, 1896), p. 82.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 85-87.

minister explain that marriage as a union of love is eternal whether or not any particular marriage is. Perhaps Howells' early training in Swedenborgianism was so deeply ingrained that even the greatest personal doubts could not dislodge it.

Finally Howells refers to the eternity of marriage in Their Wedding Journey:

They were about to enter the village, and he could not make any open acknowledgement of her tenderness; but her silken mantle (or whatever) slipped from her shoulder, and he embracingly replaced it, flattering himself that he had delicately seized this chance of an unavowed caress and not knowing (oh, such is the blindness of our sex!) that the opportunity had been yet more subtly afforded him, with the art which women never disuse in this world, and which I hope they will not forget in the next.¹

Though Howells could not openly believe in marriage (or life) after death, he certainly hoped for both. It is possible this hope existed because his own marriage was happy--perhaps even conjugal.

Howells' Conjugal Loves and Marriages

In Howells' novels the happy marriages are those in which the participants view their relationships realistically, not romantically. There is a placidity and contentment that goes beyond love. The emphasis is on marriage rather than on love, an emphasis clearly influenced by Swedenborg's writings. Howells' happy marriages are those containing many of Swedenborg's principles of conjugal love.

The foremost of Howells' conjugal marriages is that of Basil and Isabel March. According to one critic, the Marches are Howells' idea of the normal male and female of our species.² Basil was once a

¹Howells, Their Wedding Journey (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894), p. 213.

²Delmar Gross Cooke, William Dean Howells: A Critical Study (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922), p. 156.

romantic poet and sentimental journalist; Isabel had been an idealistic girl with no one to whom she could attach her ideals. They developed a realistic attitude toward life because their romantic feelings were directed toward each other and thus fulfilled.¹

Early in their marriage Basil and Isabel were so absorbed in the wonder of their marriage they were compared to Adam and Eve; however, their Eden was the real world, not a paradise.

So the old marvel was wondered over anew, till it filled the world in which there was room for nothing but the strangeness that they should have loved each other so long and not made it known, that they should ever have uttered it, and that, being uttered, it should be so much more and better than ever could have been dreamed. The broken engagement was a fable of disaster that only made their present fortune more prosperous. The city ceased about them, and they walked on up the street, the first man and first woman in the garden of the new-made earth. As they were both very conscious people, they recognized in themselves some sense of this, and presently drolled it away, in the opulence of a time when every moment brought some beautiful dream, and the soul could be prodigal of its bliss.²

Although the Marches were not young at the time of their marriage, they regarded themselves as young, because their love was a type of rebirth.³

"I used to think I was (superannuated) before we were married," answered Isabel simply; "but now," she added triumphantly, "I'm rescued from all that. I shall never be old again, dearest; never, as long as you--love!"⁴

At the conclusion of Their Wedding Journey the Marches have a new understanding of each other and are ready to begin their life together.⁵

¹David L. Frazier, "Their Wedding Journey: Howells' Fictional Craft," New England Quarterly 42 (September 1969):323-349.

²Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 41.

³Frazier, "Howells' Fictional Craft," p. 344.

⁴Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 213.

⁵Frazier, "Howells' Fictional Craft," p. 348.

Their holiday was over, to be sure, but their bliss had but begun; they had entered upon that long life of holidays which is happy marriage.¹

The new-found youth of the Marches suggests that they were reborn through their love for each other. At the end of Their Wedding Journey Basil and Isabel's life together is just beginning. They are ready to begin this life with a new understanding of each other.² It is this understanding which is so basic to a good marriage and which conjugal couples in other novels share.

Colville and Lina Bowen in Indian Summer are another such couple. According to Marion Cumpanio, "Thus the wisdom of age and the innocence of youth have been bridged in this ideal marriage." Colville became aware of his love for Mrs. Bowen through his talks with Mr. Waters, the elderly New England minister, and Mrs. Bowen decided to marry Colville because her young daughter Effie cared for him. Colville and Mrs. Bowen were caught between the old and the young.³ Like the Marches' marriage, the marriage of the Colvilles is firmly grounded in realism. If such conjugal couples do not live "happily ever after," they do achieve a type of contentment, which is probably even better than perpetual happiness. It is unlikely that ordinary people can endure happiness every day. According to Howells, love is for the young. Life drives people to marriage and to contentment, armed neutrality, or a beautiful friendship.⁴ The Colvilles, like most

¹Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 359.

²Frazier, "Howells' Fictional Craft," pp. 344-348.

³Marion W. Cumpanio. "Howells' Bridge: A Study of the Artistry of Indian Summer," Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):363-382.

⁴Cady, The Road to Realism, 2:125.

couples, achieved a combination of the three.

In the levities which the most undeserving husbands permit themselves with the severest of wives, there were times after their marriage when Colville accused Lina of never really intending to drive him away, but of meaning, after a disciplinary ordeal, to marry him in reward of his tested self-sacrifice and obedience. He said that if the appearance of Effie was not a coup de theatre contrived beforehand, it was an accident of no consequence whatever; that if she had not come in at that moment, her mother would have found some other pretext for detaining him. This is a point which I would not presume to decide. I only know that they were married early in June before the syndic of Florence, who tied a tricolor sash round his ample waist for the purpose, and never looked more paternal or venerable than when giving the sanction of the Italian state to their union. It is not, of course, to be supposed that Mrs. Colville was contented with the civil rite, though Colville may have thought it quite sufficient. The religious ceremony took place in the English chapel, the assistant clergyman officiating in the absence of the incumbent, who had already gone out of town.¹

Silas and Persis Lapham in *The Rise and Fall of Silas Lapham* were another of Howells' conjugal couples. One of Swedenborg's requirements for a conjugal marriage was that the partners share similar stations in life. However, since most women were superior to most men, it was permissible and often desirable for the woman to be superior. Persis was her husband's superior; with her goodness as support, Silas was able to "rise" during his financial failure.

Lapham was proud of his wife, and when he married her it had been a rise in life for him. For a while he stood in awe of his good fortune, but this could not last, and he simply remained supremely satisfied with it Their marriage was hallowed by an early sorrow; they lost their boy, and it was years before they could look each other in the face and speak of him²

The marriage of Walter Libby and Grace Breen in Dr. Breen's Practice was another of Howells' marriages destined to become conjugal.

¹Howells, Indian Summer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 279-280.

²Howells, The Rise of Silas Lapham (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1937), pp. 48-49.

Although Howells himself was reluctant to admit whether the Libbys were happy, it is obvious from the following quote that they were satisfied with their marriage: "They go their way in life, and are probably not disturbed by any misgivings concerning them."¹ It is just this satisfaction or quiet happiness that exemplifies all of Howells' conjugal couples.

Many other characters, both major and minor, in Howells' novels are partners in conjugal marriages. As couples can show their feelings for each other in a glance, Howells shows the essential of these marriages in a paragraph or even in a sentence:

They (the Pinneys) found out, as soon as they were engaged, and that sort of social splendor which young people wear to each other's eyes had passed, that they were both rather simple and harmless folks, and they began to value each other as being good. This tendency only grew upon them with the greater intimacy of marriage. The chief reason for thinking that they were good was that they loved each other so much; she knew that he was good because he loved her; and he believed that he must have a great deal of good in him, if such a girl loved him so much. They thought it a virtue to exist solely for one another as they did; their mutual devotion seemed to them a form of unselfishness.²

In April Hopes there are several conjugal marriages, which serve as a contrast to the future relationship of Dan Maverick and Alice Pasmer. They are destined not to know the quiet happiness of the Stricklands or the Brinkleys.

They all laughed, and the professor looked proud of the wit at his expense; the American husband is so, and the public attitude of the American husband and wife toward each other is apt to be amiably satirical; their relation seems never to

¹Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1969), p. 271

²Howells, The Quality of Mercy (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1891), pp. 125-126.

have lost its novelty, or to lack droll and surprising contrasts for them.¹

The preceding are several of the many conjugal marriages in Howells' novels. Those enjoying the conjugal relationships come from varied socio-economic backgrounds. They can be members of society, the nouveau-riche, middle class, or lower class. They can also be major or minor characters. These conjugal couples realize that marriage is more than romantic love; it is a conjugal relationship of two complementary people whose personalities develop and engulf each other. Perhaps Isabel March's thoughts are shared by the others who are part of a conjugal relationship:

Marriage was not the poetic dream of perfect union that a girl imagines it; she herself had found that out. It was a state of trial, of probation; it was an ordeal, not an ecstasy. If she and Basil had broken each other's hearts and parted, would not the fragments of their lives have been on a much finer, much higher plane? Had not the commonplace, every-day experiences of marriage vulgarized them both? To be sure, there were the children; but if they had never had the children, she would never have missed them; and if Basil had, for example, died just before they were married--She started from this wicked reverie, and ran towards her husband, whose broad, honest back, with no visible neck or shirt-collar was turned towards her, as he stood, with his head thrown up, studying a timetable on the wall; she passed her arm convulsively through his, and pulled him away.²

¹Howells, April Hopes (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974), p. 27.

²Howells, Their Wedding Journey, pp. 396-397.

ASPECTS OF CONJUGIAL MARRIAGES IN HOWELLS' NOVELS

What makes such marriages conjugal? What are the differences between the marriages that succeed and those that fail? Perhaps more important is the question: what are the differences between Basil and Isabel March and Bartley and Marcia Hubbard?

Swedenborg in Conjugal Love set forth the basic precepts for conjugal marriages. These precepts covered such aspects of marriage as chastity, duties of men and women within a marriage, and the changes effected by marriage in the lives of those involved. The answers to the above questions can be found in Howells' application of Swedenborgian principles in his novels.

Chastity and Sex in Conjugal Marriages

According to Swedenborg, within conjugal love sex is chaste. Of course, this is so only in monogamous Christian marriages. Although Howells has been labeled a Victorian and a prude by many modern readers, sex, albeit not explicit, is present in many of his novels. Since Howells was a Victorian as were his characters, the so-called repression of sex in his novels is natural. Sexuality is "repressed by Howells' characters as well as by his pen. Howells does not face the sexual act but every Victorian display resulting from it."¹

There were three sources for sexual repression during Howells' time. First, Christianity taught that bodily desires had to be suppressed

¹George Arms, "Howells' New York Novel: Comedy and Belief," New England Quarterly 21 (September 1948):324.

to obtain a spiritual life. Second, romantic chivalry regarded the woman as a delicate, pure being who had to be protected from the coarser male. Third, Darwinism taught that man rose above the animals by denying the bestiality of sex. In addition to these three aspects of his milieu, Howells had the principles of Swedenborgianism at work within his mind. Swedenborg regarded promiscuity and selfish sensuality as direct routes to hell. Conjugal partners want their loved ones to reach sexual joy and fulfillment without concern for their own gratification. This attitude toward sex is the route to heaven.¹

Unfortunately, Swedenborg stressed heavily the disgust of lustful sex, a fact which added to the repression of Howells' expression of sexuality in his novels. It bothered him that he was susceptible to bawdry humor.²

According to Howells, America did not have the sexual problems of Europe. Because wholesome conditions prevailed in America, the honest American novelist could not write about unwholesome aspects of sex. What Howells wrote, then, was representative of his world.³ Even though he was bound by his time and his principles, Howells was able to deal with many aspects of sex, especially sexual neuroses in his novels.

One problem Howells faced in his novels was the question: how can sexual intercourse occur with pure women. Howells' answer to this problem was to regard sex implicitly and symbolically. His pure women

¹Cady, The Road to Realism, 2:122-123.

²Ibid., p. 123.

³Cooke, William Dean Howells, pp. 74-75.

were not completely pure; they were marred in some outward way.¹ Lydia (The Lady of the Aroostook) had allowed herself to be loved by a drunkard, thus causing her to move to California after her marriage. Rhoda (An Imperative Duty) is a mulatto who marries a white man; she and her husband moved to Italy. In The Rise of Silas Lapham Penelope, who is from an unpresentable family, marries Tom Corey, and they move to Mexico where she would have "the charm of something strange and foreign."² In all these cases the marriages are allowed to occur because the couples will not be living in that part of America with which Howells was familiar.

Europe (especially Rome and Florence) represented for Howells and his readers the place where girls learned about sex. European living no longer polished young girls but tarnished them.³ Howells regarded upper-class European society as immoral sexually. The Lady of the Aroostook shows how an innocent American girl became aware of the sinful and decadent Venetian society. In all three of his Italian novels he presents young American girls who are in conflict with Italian society and morals.⁴ Mrs. Pasmer in April Hopes was aware that living in Europe no longer had the social status it once did.

During the fifteen years which they had spent chiefly abroad, she had observed the gradual decay of that distinction which formerly attended returning sojourners from Europe. She had

¹William Wasserstrom, "William Dean Howells: The Indelible Stain," New England Quarterly 32 (December 1959):486.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 488-489.

³*Ibid.*, p. 489.

⁴Olov W. Fryckstedt, In Quest of America: A Study of Howells' Early Development as a Novelist (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 42, 156-158, 145.

seen them cease gradually from the romantic reverence which once clothed them, and decline through gathering indifference into something like slight and compassion, as people who had not been able to make their place or hold their own at home; and she had taught herself so well how to pocket the superiority natural to the Europeanized American before arriving at consciousness of this disesteem, that she paid a ready tribute to people who had always staid at home.¹

Because Swedenborgian theology linked unchaste sex with what is natural or bestial in man, Howells used sex to differentiate the stations in life of his characters. If the characters were of a lower socio-economic level, sex was stressed in the love scenes. One example of this is Marcia and Bartley's first kiss in A Modern Instance:

At the door he bent down his head and kissed her. "Good night, dear--friend."
"Good night," she panted; and after the door had closed upon him, she stooped and kissed the knob on which his hand had rested.²

Although Howells repressed references to overt sex in his novels, he did express sex symbolically. Marcia's kissing the doorknob is a symbol of sexual activity.³

The many sexual undertones present in A Modern Instance forbode the failure of Bartley and Marcia's marriage. That their feelings for each other are largely a result of physical attraction is evidenced by the lengthy description of Marcia's beauty followed by a detailed description of Bartley's physical attributes.

The action brought her figure in relief, and revealed the outline of her bust and shoulders, while the lamp flooded with light the face she turned to him, and again averted for a moment, as if startled at some noise behind her. She thus showed a smooth, low forehead, lips and cheeks deeply red, a softly rounded

¹Howells, April Hopes, p. 49.

²Howells, A Modern Instance (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1881), p. 16.

³Everett Carter, Howells and the Age of Realism (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1954), pp. 151-152.

chin touched with a faint dimple, and in turn a nose short and aquiline; her eyes were dark, and her dusky hair flowed crinkling above her fine black brows, and vanished down the curve of a lovely neck. There was a peculiar charm in the form of her upper lip: it was exquisitely arched, and at the corners it projected a little over the lower lip, so that when she smiled it gave a piquant sweetness to her mouth, with a certain demure innocence that qualified the Roman pride of her profile. For the rest, her beauty was of the kind that coming years would only ripen and enrich; at thirty she would be even handsomer than at twenty, and be all the more southern in her type for the paling of that northern color in her cheeks. The young man who looked up at her from the doorstep had a yellow mustache, shadowing either side of his lip with a broad sweep, like a bird's wing; his chin, deep-cut below his mouth, failed to come strenuously forward; his cheeks were filled to an oval contour, and his face had otherwise the regularity common to Americans; his eyes, a clouded gray, heavy-lidded and long-lashed, were his most striking feature, and he gave her beauty a deliberate look from them as he lightly stamped the snow from his feet, and pulled the seal-skin gloves from his long hands.¹

Such detailed descriptions of characters' physical beauty with the emphasis on sexuality are rare with Howells. The detail is present in A Modern Instance because sexual attraction not the chaste sexuality of conjugal love is the foundation of the Hubbards' marriage.

Unchaste sexuality is also apparent in Marcia's relationship with her father. One critic defines this as a sexual neurosis termed by Carl Jung as an Electra complex.² This critic cites several other incidents within the novel which indicate Marcia's infatuation with her father and her consequent rejection of her mother. Immediately after her passionate first kiss with Bartley, Marcia turns and sees her father:

As she turned, she started to see her father coming down the stairs with a candle in his hand

The old man descended the remaining steps, but turned at the parlor door, and looked again at his daughter with a glance that arrested her with her foot on the lowest stair.

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 6-7.

²Kermit Vanderbilt, "Marcia Gaylord's Electra Complex: A Footnote to Sex in Howells," American Literature 34 (1962):366.

"Marcia," he asked grimly, "are you engaged to Bartley Hubbard?"

The blood flashed up from her heart into her face like fire, and then, as suddenly fell back again, and left her white. She let her head drop and turn, till her eyes were wholly averted from him, and she did not speak. He closed the door behind him, and she went upstairs to her own room; in her shame, she seemed to herself to crawl thither, with her father's glance burning upon her.¹

Marcia's strong sexual desires had been kept under control until this time because these desires were for her father; however, now she has transferred them to Bartley and feels guilty for releasing them. After the birth of her child, Marcia's first thoughts are of her father, and she wants the child named after him. She feels little grief at the death of her mother and refuses to return home during her mother's illness.²

Perhaps the most obvious contrast between the levels of characters was that made between the Marches and the group of country young people in Their Wedding Journey.

This content was heightened, no doubt, by a just sense of their contrast to the group of people nearest them,--a young man of the second or third quality and two young girls. The eldest of these was carrying on a vivacious flirtation with the young man, who was apparently an acquaintance of brief standing; the other was scarcely more than a child, and sat somewhat abashed at the sparkle of the colloquy The encounter was visibly that kind of adventure which both would treasure up for future celebration to their different friends; and it had a brilliancy and interest which they could not even now consent to keep to themselves. They talked to each other and at all the company within hearing, and exchanged curt speeches which had for them all the sensation of repartee.³

Howells' placing of the Marches' relationship upon a higher plane is evident from an unpublished letter regarding the illustrations

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 16-17.

²Vanderbilt, "Electra Complex," pp. 367-370.

³Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 41.

for Their Wedding Journey. In a letter dated October 30, 1871, Howells had objected to one of the drawings by Hoppin. Hoppin had replied: "The scene where Isabel is represented in the sleeping car is not a successful one--I must try again: although I can't quite agree with you that she is treated with discourtesy--Any woman with her dress off--& in the thumping & bumping of a sleeping car would lose a little of her 'tone' about day-light I know--." However, Hoppin did not include this illustration of Isabel in the final engravings. In the published edition Basil stands alone in the aisle beside his berth trying to put on his boots.¹

Howells showed sexual neurotics repeatedly in his novels, especially in relation to the problems of a changing world.² Many of his "villains" are those who fail to adhere to the normal in sexuality. Such characters as Bartley Hubbard, Angus Beaton, and Bittridge fail to follow the strict sexual conventions of Howells' society. Others of Howells' characters are merely sexually confused rather than overtly despicable. Some of these are Don Ippolito (A Foregone Conclusion), Staniford (The Lady of the Aroostook), Owen Elmore (A Fearful Responsibility), Marcia Gaylord, the Lapham sisters, Colville, Christine Dryfoos (A Hazard of New Fortunes), Faulkner (The Shadow of a Dream), and Westover (The Landlord at Lion's Head).³

However, Cady accused Howells of being a sexual neurotic himself. Howells' "neurotic cowardice" kept sex out of his novels.

¹Arthur A. Adrian, "Augustus Hoppin to William Dean Howells," New England Quarterly 24 (March 1951):85-86.

²Vanderbilt, The Achievement of William Dean Howells (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 48.

³Arthur Boardman, "Howellsian Sex," Studies in the Novel (North Texas University) 2:56-58.

Because he found sex abhorrent as a subject matter, Howells could not become a complete realist and a social critic.¹ Perhaps Kolb tempers Cady's accusation with his statement that although Howells did not deal with the lowest levels of sexuality, he made it possible for other writers to do so.² Howells concerned himself with the signs of sexual behavior within his time span.³

One thing Howells saw as the cause of sexual neuroticism and sexual guilt was religious fanaticism. In The Leatherwood God Joseph Dylks is a confidence man who uses religious fanaticism to seduce young women. His sexual attraction causes women both to idolize him and to become infatuated with him. He had married and deserted Nancy; later, believing him to be dead, she remarried. Dylks returned to Leatherwood and proclaimed himself God incarnate. While encouraging the infatuation of Nancy's niece Jane, Dylks at the same time tried to convince Nancy to join him:

Everywhere the people are waiting for a sign, just as they've always been, and we would come with a sign--plenty of signs: the perfect Godhead, male and female, for the greatest sign of all. Why, I wonder there's a Christian woman living with the slur that the idea of just one male God throws on women! Don't you know that the Egyptians and the Greeks and the Romans, and everybody but the Hebrews, had a married God, and that the Godhead was husband and wife?⁴

Swedenborgianism influenced Howells to condemn all aspects of selfish sex as unchaste, especially Dylks' attempt to use religion for his

¹Cady, "The Neuroticism of William Dean Howells," PMLA 61 (1946):237-238.

²Harold H. Kolb, Jr., The Illusion of Life: American Realism as a Literary Form (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969), p. 46.

³Carter, Age of Realism, pp. 151-152.

⁴Howells, The Leatherwood God (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970), p. 99.

own sexual gratification.

A surprising aspect of Swedenborg's views regarding chastity and sex is his attitude toward celibacy. Those who were celibate were not chaste unless they were celibate only because they could not find a conjugal partner. Swedenborg himself was a member of this group.

In A Foregone Conclusion Don Ippolito's celibacy symbolizes the romantic attitude toward marriage. Florida cannot marry Don Ippolito because marriage and romanticism are as irreconcilable as marriage and celibacy. Instead Florida marries Ferris and accepts the realities of marriage.¹ Howells had the idea for this novel as early as 1866 when he wrote in an editorial for the New York Times that the decay of Italian society was caused, at least in part, by the celibacy of the priesthood. He further argued that marriages of priests would be natural and positive.²

According to Wagenknecht, Howells' Shaker stories most clearly show how he regarded marriage. In both The Day of Their Wedding and A Parting and a Meeting Howells is noncommittal regarding the conflict between Swedenborg and the Shakers. In the first novel Althea and Lorenzo leave the Shaker community to be married, but return to the Family without consummating their marriage. In the second novel both the woman who chose marriage and the man who chose the angelic life of the Shakers were disappointed. Wagenknecht concludes:

But in his account of the real Shaker at Shirley who obviously suggested this story Howells opts for love: "But perhaps in an affair like that, a girl's heart had supreme claims. Perhaps there are some things that one ought not to

¹Charles L. Campbell, "Realism and the Romance of Real Life Multiple Fictional Worlds in Howells' Novels," Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):294.

²Gibson, "William D. Howells," p. 168.

do even with the hope of winning heaven." What champion of "all for love and the world well lost" ever went further than that? In another passage Howells says: "The sum of Shaker ascetism is this: they neither marry nor give in marriage; but this is a good deal."¹

Wagenknecht seems to be as noncommittal regarding the Shakers as he accuses Howells of being. After presenting the case for Howells' preference of love and marriage to celibacy, he seems to contradict himself by saying that Howells agreed with Elihu's conviction that marriage was of "the earthly order."² Howells' choice had to be marriage because he allows Ford the last word in that discussion. Obviously marriage to the right person is a "higher choice" than celibacy.

Another conversation between Ford and Elihu sheds more light on the necessity for celibacy among the Shakers. Elihu explains that celibacy is most necessary for communism:

"But we require great sacrifices," rejoined the Shaker gravely. "We put husband and wife asunder; we bid the young renounce the dream of youth; we say to the young man, Forego; to the young girl, Forget. We exact celibacy, the supreme self-offering to a higher life. Even if we did not consider celibacy essential to the angelic life, we should feel it to be essential to communism. We must exact it, as the one inviolable condition."³

According to one critic, the Shakers' denial of marriage and sex does not fit in with all their good and natural teachings. Egeria chooses love and marriage because it is the right choice for her; Ford's marriage rescues him from his cynicism.⁴ Howells' original manuscript of The Undiscovered Country included a statement

¹Wagenknecht, The Friendly Eye, p. 167.

²Ibid., p. 167.

³Howells, The Undiscovered Country, p. 347.

⁴Vanderbilt, "The Undiscovered Country: Howells' Version of the American Pastoral," American Quarterly 17 (Winter 1965):654.

by Egeria which was later deleted. It was her main objection to Shaker life: "Why don't they get married and live together naturally?"¹

In The Day of Their Wedding Althea tells the minister the basis for the Shakers' belief in celibacy:

And Jesus answering said unto them, the children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die anymore; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.²

The minister's answer is pure Swedenborgianism straight from Conjugal Love:

"Is that the passage they ground their doctrine on? You know those are Luke's words, and Luke had his facts at second-hand. The other gospels do not report the words of Jesus so, but even if Luke's report were the most accurate, as it's certainly the fullest, I should not take it literally. I have thought a good deal about that passage," said the minister, "for I have to do a good deal of marrying and giving in marriage, and I read in it a deeper meaning than the face of the words bear. In a certain sense, marriage is both the death and the resurrection . . . marriage is the giving up of self I suppose it is the dread of something like this in marriage that has created the celibate sects in all times and in all religions"³

It is important also to understand why Althea and Lorenzo chose to return to the Family without consummating the marriage. They believed their marriage to be wrong, not because marriage itself is wrong, but because they had married for the wrong reasons:

"From all that I can make out," she said, "they fell in love with each other for about the same things, or just about the same, as we got foolish about each other for. He thought she was handsome, and she thought he was handsome. Lorenzo,

¹Vanderbilt, Achievement, p. 37.

²Howells, The Day of Their Wedding, pp. 84-85.

³Ibid., pp. 85-87.

they fell in love with each other's looks!"¹

As Swedenborg contended, marriages made on earth are seldom a result of an internal perception of love. Those who do attain conjugal love grow into it. The Shakers were unable to do this because of their strong religious training.

Although branded a prude by many critics for his seeming reluctance to write about the lower aspects of life, Howells believed American fiction, like American life, was on a higher level than the fiction and life of Europe. In an article on Henry James published in Century in 1882, Howells said that American fiction should be guided by ideals that would raise it above a mere brutal description of sexual relations. Howells, although reserved himself toward writing about explicit sex, did not allow his reservations to keep him from admiring the works of authors such as Crane and Norris who were not adverse to writing about sordid subjects.²

In a letter dated February 16, 1909, to Robert Herrick, Howells discussed Herrick's book Together. Although he admired Herrick's literary talents, Howells was disturbed by Herrick's treatment of sexual episodes:

I can regard it as simply a picture of certain sides of American life, usually blinked, by an impartial observer whose sole business was to get them to the reader's knowledge; or I may regard it as in some sort a polemic for wider freedom in the sexual relations than the accepted ethics now grant If you have portrayed it as a thing that happens, and stand quite outside it morally, you are within your rights as an artist; but if you mean that it was a thing to have done without shame or without sin, you put yourself in a position which the criticism deriving from such ethics as the world knows may and must question.³

¹Howells, The Day of Their Wedding, p. 136.

²Fryckstedt, In Quest of America, pp. 206, 264.

³Mildred Howells, ed., Letters, 2:262.

By his treatment of sex in his novels, Howells showed the influence of Swedenborgianism over him. Sex in marriage was chaste, and marriage was more desirable than celibacy for attaining resurrection and salvation.

Duties in Conjugal Love

In a true conjugal relationship husband and wife have different but complementary duties. The wife's love for her husband is constant and intuitive while her husband is merely the recipient of her love. Women's intuition played an important role in Howells' novels. For example, in The World of Chance the marriage does not occur because the heroine intuitively realizes that her social views make it impossible for her to become a part of her would-be husband's chance world.¹ In The Lady of the Aroostook Staniford's attitude toward women was changed because Lydia knew intuitively of his need to be believed in. Baxter observes:

The young woman totally lacking in sensibility and worldly wisdom, qualities prized most highly by the Staniford of the earlier half of the novel, succeeds in converting him by a simple example of unerring moral instinct."²

Both Swedenborg and Howells placed women in unique positions--not on a pedestal and not at the feet of men. Both felt that women should be beside their men--equal but still maintaining their femaleness. Men and women are complementary; neither can be complete without the other. This was especially true in Howells' own marriage. Elinor, intelligent, talented, and witty, was an important yet subtle influence

¹Joseph H. Gardner, "Howells: The Realist as Dickensian," Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):330.

²Annette Kar Baxter, "Archetypes of American Innocence: Lydia Blood and Daisy Miller," in The American Experience, ed. Hennig Cohen (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), p. 153.

on Howells.¹ Although little is known about her, she helped her husband develop his insight into his feminine characters. When Elinor became an invalid after their daughter Winifred's death, Howells felt the gulf left by the loss of her inspiration. Their conjugal life's purpose was the inspiration of his imagination.²

Alexander Harvey found Howells' feminine characters to be extremely remarkable:

An arresting feature of the work of William Dean Howells is the fact that a writer who knows women so well should find them so good. It is even more remarkable that a novelist who finds women so good can make them so interesting.³

Howells' women, though different, have many similarities; they are passionate and strongly sexed. Each intuitively seeks out her right man and pursues him relentlessly.⁴

In a conjugal marriage the wife shares her husband's life and interests. In his novels Howells attempted to remove woman from her pedestal of the nineteenth century and to re-examine her status and her relationship with men.⁵ He wanted to present a modern marriage to replace the situation in which the wife's sweetness and patience always triumphs over her husband's less desirable traits.⁶

Howells expressed the mutual dependence of men and women in marriage in The Rise of Silas Lapham. The Laphams had developed

¹Gibson, "William D. Howells," p. 159.

²Cady, The Road to Realism, 2:99.

³Alexander Harvey, William Dean Howells: A Study of the Achievement of a Literary Artist (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1917), p. 55.

⁴Ibid., pp. 65-66.

⁵Kolb, The Illusion of Life, p. 46.

⁶Cady, The Road to Realism, 1:234.

the paint together, and Persis shared Silas' failures and successes.¹

Bartley read, "THE PERSIS BRAND," and then he looked at Lapham and smiled. "After her, of course," said Lapham. "Got it up and put the first of it on the market her last birthday. She was pleased."²

This same sharing was also evident in the marriage of Egeria and Ford in The Undiscovered Country.

One of those ignoble discoveries which chemists sometimes make in their more ambitious experiments has turned itself to profit almost without his agency, and chiefly at the suggestion of his wife, whose more practical sense perceived its general acceptability³

Egeria was responsible for Ford's financial success because she saw the general acceptability of his invention of a household gadget.

Although love can cause a woman to lose her reasoning abilities, marriage gives woman a real, but limited, practicality. Persis Lapham "kept up with her husband's business until it ceased to be of the retail nature with which women successfully grapple. Even Marcia Hubbard entered her husband's affairs "with the keen one-half intelligence which characterizes woman's participation in business."⁴

Howells used Basil and Isabel March to show the distinction between the duties of husband and wife.

March knew his wife to be a woman of good mind and in perfect sympathy with him, but he understood the limitations of

¹James W. Mathews, "The Heroines of Hawthorne and Howells," Tennessee Studies in Literature 7 (1962):37.

²Howells, The Rise of Silas Lapham, pp. 11-12.

³Howells, The Undiscovered Country, p. 416

⁴Edd Winfield Parks, "Howells and the Gentle Reader," South Atlantic Quarterly 50 (April 1951):244.

her perspective; and if he was not too wise, he was too experienced to intrude upon it any affairs of his till her own were reduced to the right order and proportion. It would have been folly to talk to her of Fulkerson's conjecturable uncandor while she was in doubt whether her cook would like the kitchen, or her two servants would consent to room together; and till it was decided what school Tom should go to, and whether Bella should have lessons at home or not, the relation which March was to bear with the Dryfooses, as owner and publisher, was not to be discussed with his wife.¹

Isabel, like Elinor Howells, was the "sociable, talkative wife of a potential writer, with an emerging taste for the 'poetry of the commonplace.' It was usually Isabel's sympathy and curiosity which involved the Marches in the affairs of other people, and her insight, or perversity, as the case might be, which extricated them."²

Swedenborg insisted that the desire to become part of a conjugal partnership was inherent in every man and woman. Because women are more aware of this inherent desire, they have the duty to make marriage attractive and appealing to men. To aid them in this duty, they are made aware of their husbands' affection for them. Although Kitty and Arbuton did not marry, Howells mentioned the inherentness of the conjugal desire in A Chance Acquaintance.

With such blissful pain as none but lovers know, Mr. Arbuton saw her break the egg upon the edge of the coffee-pot, and let it drop therein, and then, with a charming frenzy, stir it round and round. It was a picture of domestic suggestion, a subtle insinuation of home, the unconscious appeal of inherent housewifery to inherent husbandhood.³

One problem with some of Howells' women characters was their inability to find their true duties. The title characters of Dr. Breen's Practice and Annie Kilburn had a desire to fulfill some

¹Howells, A Hazard of New Fortunes (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), p. 100.

²Clara M. Kirk, "Reality and Actuality in the March Family Narratives of W. D. Howells," PMLA 74 (March 1959):142.

³Howells, A Chance Acquaintance (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1873), p. 223.

duty of which they were unsure. Each was unable to see that her true duty was as a conjugal partner.¹ Grace Breen's attitude toward marriage was probably influenced by her mother, who found marriage "tolerable only in its modified form of widowhood."² In a conversation with her mother Grace explains that she does not feel marriage is the ultimate achievement for her:

You see, mother, that the most advanced thinkers among those ladies are not so very different, after all, from you old-fashioned people. When they try to think of the greatest good fortune that can befall an ideal woman, it is to have her married. The only trouble is to find a man good enough; and if they can't find one, they're apt to invent one. They have strong imaginations.³

The man invented by the ladies for Grace was Dr. Mulbridge, compared by Miss Gleason to the masterful Rochester in Jane Eyre. However, Grace had no intentions of being mastered by Dr. Mulbridge. In her answer to his proposal, Grace announced her different conception of Mulbridge:

I think you are a tyrant, and that you want a slave, not a wife. You wish to be obeyed. You despise women. I don't mean their minds,--they're despicable enough, in most cases, as men's are,--but their nature.⁴

Eventually Grace marries Walter Libby whose proposal she had refused earlier in the novel.

They go their way in life, and are probably not disturbed by any misgivings concerning them. It is thought, on one hand, that he is a man of excellent head, and of a heart so generous that his deference to her in certain matters is part of the devoted flattery which would spoil any other woman, but that she consults his judgment in every action of her life,

¹Mathews, "The Heroines of Hawthorne and Howells," p. 40.

²Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice, p. 14.

³Ibid., p. 198.

⁴Ibid., p. 254.

and trusts his sense with the same completeness that she trusts his love. On the other hand, when it is felt that she ought to have done for the sake of woman what she could not do for herself, she is regarded as sacrificed in her marriage. If, it is feared, she is not infatuated with her husband, she is in a disgraceful subjection, without the hope of better or higher things. If she had children, they might be a compensation and refuge for her; in that case, to be sure, she must be cut off from her present resource in caring for the children of others; though the conditions under which she now exercises her skill certainly amount to begging the whole question of woman's fitness for the career she had chosen.

Both parties to this contention are, strange to say, ladies. If it has not been made clear from the events and characters of the foregoing history which opinion is right, I am unable to decide. It is well, perhaps, not to be too explicitly in the confidence of one's heroine. After her marriage perhaps it is not even decorous.¹

Although Howells declines to tell his readers whether the Libbys share a conjugal marriage, it is obvious that if their marriage is to be conjugal, it will be because they accept and fulfill their respective duties as conjugal partners.

In Annie Kilburn the title character, upon her return home after over a decade in Rome, had a desire to be useful:

But I have a longing; I feel that I must try to be of some use in the world--try to do some good--and in Hatboro' I think I shall know how.²

Annie decided that her usefulness lay in helping to form the Social Union, which would provide needed social activities for the poor working classes; however, the entertainment planned to fund the union would not be open to the "lower classes" it was eventually to benefit. Finally, Annie found her true use in the world by allowing the Social Union to be formed by the shopworkers themselves, as advised by Dr. Morrell:

¹Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice, pp. 271-272.

²Howells, Annie Kilburn (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1919), p. 4.

We people of leisure, or comparative leisure, have really nothing in common with you people who work for a living; and as we really can't be friends with you, we won't patronise you. We won't advise you, and we won't help you; but here's the money. If you fail, you fail; and if you succeed, you won't succeed by our aid and comfort.¹

Annie's place then was by the side of Dr. Morrell in a true Swedenborgian marriage. She was unhappy as a "social worker" because she was not fulfilling her conjugal duty.

In Mrs. Farrell the title character is determined to prove that she can achieve equality with men in direct competition with them. Because she disregards woman's traditional role, her femininity is wasted. She asks, "Why is it that there isn't some common ground for men and women to meet on, and be helpful to each other? Must they always be either lovers or enemies?"² However, she uses her sex whenever she feels it is safe to gain some advantage over men. She does not want a man to love her; she wishes him to subjugate himself to her.³

Although man and woman are equal in Swedenborgianism and in Howells' novels, woman could achieve this equality only by being a woman--not by competing as a man. This was evident in Reverend Sewell's comment about Mrs. Barker:

She was worth seeing as a survival of the superficial fermentation of the period of our social history when it was believed that women could be like men if they chose, and ought to be if they ever meant to show their natural superiority.⁴

¹Howells, Annie Kilburn, p. 325.

²Howells, Mrs. Farrell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1921), p. 96.

³Mathews, "The Heroines of Hawthorne and Howells," p. 40.

⁴Howells, The Minister's Charge: or The Apprenticeship of Lemuel Barker (Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1887), p. 242.

Change of States of Life

Marriage changes its participants. The virgin becomes a woman and a wife, and the youth becomes a man and a husband. However, the change is much more than a mere change of name and status. In Their Wedding Journey Basil and Isabel often contemplated how their marriage had changed their lives. Basil had once been the writer of romantic poetry and sentimental journals; Isabel had had high ideals with no one to whom these ideals could be attached. In their marriage they could direct their romantic feelings toward each other and, therefore, assume a realistic attitude toward life.¹

Not only does marriage change the lives of its participants, but also changes their personalities, especially those of the wives. According to Reverend Waters in Indian Summer, the wife becomes the woman her husband causes her to be:

"You never can know what sort of nature a young girl has. Her nature depends so much upon that of the man whose fate she shares."

"The woman is what the man makes her? That is convenient for the woman, and relieves her of all responsibility."

"The man is what the woman makes him, too, but not so much so. The man was cast into a deep sleep, you know--"

"And the woman was what he dreamed her. I wish she were!"

"In most cases she is," said Mr. Waters.

They did not pursue the matter. The truth that floated in the old minister's words pleased Colville by its vagueness, and flattered the man in him by its implication of the man's superiority. He wanted to say that if Mrs. Bowen were what the late Mr. Bowen had dreamed her, then the late Mr. Bowen, when cast into his deep sleep, must have had Lina Ridgely in his eye. But this seemed to be personalizing the fantasy unwarrantably, and pushing it too far. For like reason he forbore to say that if Mr. Waters' theory were correct, it would be better to begin with someone whom nobody else had dreamed before; then you could be sure at least of not having a wife to somebody else's mind rather than your own.²

¹Frazier, "Howells' Fictional Craft," p. 331.

²Howells, Indian Summer, p. 90.

The influence of Swedenborgianism upon Howells is very evident in the preceding passage. Reverend Waters is very much like Swedenborg. He is an unmarried man who is in the position of an authority on marriage; however, like Swedenborg he is not a bachelor by choice. He regards himself as a widower since his fiancée died before they could be married. In his discussion of the changes caused by marriage in Conjugal Love Swedenborg referred to the same Biblical reference as Reverend Waters. Swedenborg wrote that woman was formed into man's wife "on the part of the wife by secret means, and that this is meant by the woman's being created whilst the man slept."¹ One great difference lies in Colville's misunderstanding. He assumed that man was superior because he did the dreaming. However, Swedenborg relegated this superiority to the woman; she was able to become the wife her husband dreamed because she had intuitive knowledge of her husband's dream. Therefore, the late Mr. Bowen did not dream of Lina Ridgely, as Colville assumed, but Lina Ridgely became the wife of whom Mr. Bowen dreamed.

The reference to the creation of woman while Adam slept is repeated in Dr. Breen's Practice in a comment by George Maynard:

There was Adam, you know. He didn't pull the apple; but he fell off into that sleep, and woke up with one of his ribs dislocated, and that's what really commenced the trouble. If it hadn't been for Adam, there wouldn't have been any woman you know; and you couldn't blame her for what happened after she got going.²

A husband cannot blame his wife for her feminine foibles; after all, she is created out of his dreams.

¹Swedenborg, Conjugal Love, p. 217.

²Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice, pp. 210-211.

In Dr. Breen's Practice it is surprising to note that the character who relates most of the Swedenborgianisms regarding the changes caused by marriage is Louise Maynard, who seems to be both shallow and simple-minded. Although Louise had been contemplating divorcing her husband, she decided against it because she realized that their marriage had changed them so that they could no longer resume their lives as they were before their marriage.

It would have been easy enough to get a divorce, and George wouldn't have opposed it; but I looked at it in this way: that the divorce wouldn't have put us back where we were, anyway, as I had supposed it would. We had broken into each other's lives, and we couldn't get out again, with all the divorces under the sun. That's the worst of getting married: you break into each other's lives.¹

At another point Louise is surprised that Grace with her "high purposes" in life is marrying Walter Libby and tells her so:

"Well, I always told Walter Libby I should get him a wife, but you were the last person I should have thought of. What's going to become of all your high purposes? You can't do anything with them when you're married! But you won't have any occasion for them, that's one comfort."

"It's not my idea of marriage that any high purpose will be lost in it."

"Oh, it isn't anybody's, before they get married. I had such high purposes I couldn't rest."²

Grace, too realized the changes caused by marriage. She also realized the unique characteristics and duties shared by wives:

Marriage must change people so that unless they live to each other, their lives will be maimed and useless. It ought to be so much easier to forgive any wrong your husband does you than to punish it; for that perpetuates the wrong, and forgiveness ends it, and it's the only thing that can end a wrong. I am sure that your husband will be ready to do or say anything you wish; but if he shouldn't, Louise, you will receive him forgivingly,

¹Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice, p. 265.

²Ibid., p. 264.

and make the advance? It's a woman's right to make the advances in forgiving.¹

Perhaps one reason for the failure of the Hubbards' marriage in A Modern Instance is their inability (especially Marcia's) to change their lives in marriage. According to Wasserstrom, Marcia Gaylord never learned how to be a wife. Her father had trained her to be a dutiful child, but this did not allow her to be a woman and a wife. A dutiful daughter will probably become an irritable wife. She also brings into the marriage a jealous rival in the person of her father.² The marriage of Bartley and Marcia was not inherently bad; under different conditions it might have succeeded. Bartley would have accepted an occasionally quarrelsome marriage if Marcia had made a greater effort to make his life pleasant. However, Marcia was unable to change her girlish ideas of courtship and ideal love to adjust to real life and marriage. When Marcia finally realized that Bartley did not measure up to the husband of her dreams, she tried to force that dream upon him.³ Marcia did not use that inner knowledge available to women to know what kind of wife her husband wanted and needed.

Howells allowed Silas Lapham to utter his thoughts on wives who were unwilling to grow up when Silas spoke admiringly of his wife Persis to Bartley Hubbard:

"I tell you she was a woman!"
Bartley laughed. "That's the sort most of us marry."

¹Howells, Dr. Breen's Practice, p. 176.

²William Wasserstrom, Heiress of All Ages: Sex and Sentiment in the Genteel Tradition (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959), pp. 86-87.

³George N. Bennett, William Dean Howells: The Development of a Novelist (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959), pp. 118-119.

"No we don't," said Lapham. "Most of us marry silly little girls grown up to look like women."¹

The preceding discussion shows several ways in which conjugal marriages differ from those that are not conjugal. However, Swedenborg did not limit his discourse on conjugal love to a discussion of marriage; he realized that aspects closely related to marriage play an important role in the formation of conjugal relationships. Like Swedenborg, Howells realized that more than marriage is involved in a conjugal relationship.

¹Howells, The Rise of Silas Lapham, p. 12.

MATTERS RELATED TO CONJUGIAL LOVE

Although not directly connected with conjugal love, matters such as love of infants, betrothals, iterated marriages, and the appearance of conjugal love are involved in a conjugal relationship. Both Swedenborg and Howells included these matters in their writings.

Love of Infants

According to Swedenborg, the main purpose of conjugal love was procreation; therefore, the love of infants and conjugal love are closely related. The love of infants is a powerful love, present in both conjugal and nonconjugal marriages, and prevailing after death. Although most of Howells' fictional marriages, whether conjugal or not, produced children, children did not play an important part in Howells' novels. Only those "children" old enough to be considered adults had important roles in his novels. Two exceptions are Effie Bowen and Flavia Hubbard.

Although Effie's birth is not the procreation of Colville and Mrs. Bowen's conjugal marriage, Effie is a key figure in uniting her mother and stepfather. Colville himself attributed their marriage to Effie's timely appearance.¹

The Hubbards' child plays a key role in A Modern Instance. For awhile her birth drew her parents closer together. Bartley was proud of his daughter, and both took pleasure in showing her off:

¹Howells, Indian Summer, p. 279.

In these days they took their fill of the delight of young fatherhood and motherhood.

It was rather Bartley's ideal, as it is that of most young American fathers, to go out with his wife and baby in that way; he liked to have his friends see him; and he went out every afternoon he could spare.¹

However, Marcia began to ignore the child more and more on the train to Indiana as her final confrontation with Bartley approached.

Olivia went away with the little girl and put her to bed on the sofa in their state-room, and Marcia suffered them to go alone; it was only by fits and starts that she had cared for the child or even noticed it.²

The deterioration of Bartley's and Marcia's parental feelings for Flavia paralleled the deterioration of their marriage until, with the end of the marriage, the parental feeling virtually ended.

Even though the love of infants and procreation do not play central roles in Howells' novels, both are almost always present in the background because they were so much a part of Howells' own life. The Howells' household was "unashamedly child-infatuated." The death of their daughter, Winifred, left Elinor Howells an invalid.³ Howells' Altruria novels showed a utopian world by enlarging his ideas of what an ideal family should be.⁴

Betrothals

According to Swedenborg, the betrothal is very important to a conjugal marriage; it is the union of the minds and prepares for the spiritual and physical unions. Two of Swedenborg's standards of

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 267, 277.

²Ibid., pp. 486-487.

³Cady, The Road to Realism, 1:138, 2:99.

⁴Alma J. Payne, "The Family in the Utopia of William Dean Howells," Georgia Review 25 (Summer 1961):229.

betrothals were regarded by Howells as important enough to play major roles in his novels.

First, a young girl should seek the advice of her family or some other trusted older person before becoming betrothed. Howells believed that it was ridiculous for society to allow young people whose judgment was too immature to be trusted in all other matters to choose their marriage partners.¹ In April Hopes Howells allowed Mrs. Brinkley to speak for him (and for Swedenborg) regarding this:

Just think of two children, one of twenty and the other of twenty-three, proposing to decide their life-long destiny in such a vital matter! Should we trust their judgment in regard to the smallest business affair? Of course not. They're babes in arms, morally and mentally speaking. People haven't the data for being wisely in love till they've reached the age when they haven't the least wish to be so. Oh, I suppose I thought that I was a grown woman too when I was twenty; I can look back and see that I did; and what's more preposterous still, I thought Mr. Brinkley was a man at twenty-four. But we were no more fit to accept or reject each other at that infantile period-- Nobody should be allowed to marry before fifty. Then if people married it would be because they knew they loved each other.²

The parents' advice should be sought in a betrothal because marriage involves more than the bride and groom alone. It involves both their families.³ According to Mrs. Meredith in An Imperative Duty, "the family on each side counts almost as much as the couple in a marriage."⁴ In The Quality of Mercy Matt Hilary realized that his marriage to Suzette would involve more than just the two of them:

He understood why his love for Suzette Northwick must be grievous to his father and mother; how embarrassing, how

¹Wagenknecht, The Friendly Eye, p. 167.

²Howells, April Hopes, pp. 128-129.

³Wagenknecht, The Friendly Eye, p. 167.

⁴Howells, An Imperative Duty (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), p. 44.

disappointing, how really in some sort disastrous; and yet he felt that if there was anything more sacred than another in the world for him, it was that love. He must be true to it at whatever cost, and in every event, and he must begin by being perfectly frank with those whom it would afflict, and confessing to himself all its difficulties and drawbacks.¹

A conversation between Dan Mavering and his mother in April Hopes illustrates most clearly Howells' conviction regarding the involvement of the family in a betrothal:

"It seems to be so very much more of a family affair than I used to think it was."

"You thought it just concerned you and her?" said his mother with arch sympathy.

"Well, yes."

"Poor fellow! She knew better than that, you may be sure. At any rate, her mother did."

"What Mrs. Pasmer doesn't know isn't probably worth knowing," said Dan, with an amused sense of her omniscience.

"I thought so," sighed his mother, smiling too. "And now you begin to find out that it concerns the families in all their branches on both sides."

"Oh, if it stopped at the families and their ramifications! But it seems to take in society and the general public."

"So it does--more than you can realize. You can't get married to yourself alone, as you young people think; and if you don't marry happily, you sin against the peace and comfort of the whole community."²

As Mrs. Mavering says, a couple's marriage affects the entire community. The Pinneys in A Quality of Mercy were aware of this:

They had risked a great deal in getting married on Pinney's small salary, but apparently their courage had been rewarded, and they were not finally without the sense that their happiness had been achieved somehow in the public interest.³

In the Altrurian romances marriage occurred as a result of careful planning. Couples wishing to marry had to wait a year, during which time they were questioned about their feelings for each other and instructed in their marital duties to each other and the

¹Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 364.

²Howells, April Hopes, p. 203.

³Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 126.

community. Also during this time they were separated every three months and sent to other areas in order to meet other young men and women. They were instructed that divorce, although allowed, was considered an offense against the community.¹

The second of Swedenborg's standards of betrothals which occupied an important place in Howells' novels was that the betrothed couple should not engage in sexual activities. Although difficult to prove, there is evidence to show that during Howells' time sexual intercourse was often represented by a kiss. In Room with a View, a 1908 novel by E. M. Forster, a situation involving a kiss is treated as a compromising one which aroused the jealous anger of the girl's fiance. Both James and Twain avoided mentioning the kiss in their works, and Howells' society expected marriage to follow (if it did not precede) a kiss.² However, this did not always happen. In Howells' thirty-four novels the pre-marital kiss is seldom followed by a marriage.³

Dan Maverling and Alice Pasmer are one of the few couples whose premarital kiss is followed by a marriage. However, there is little hope their marriage will be conjugal. Their unsuitability for each other is apparent in the repeated breaking of their engagement. The marriage of Bartley and Marcia Hubbard is also destined to failure as a result of their pre-marital kiss. In The Coast of Bohemia the drummer forces a kiss from the heroine, which prevents her marriage.

¹Payne, "The Family," p. 227.

²Carter, The Age of Realism, pp. 149-150.

³Kenneth E. Eble, "Howells' Kisses," American Quarterly 19 (Winter 1957):441.

Ellen in The Kentons is unable to marry Breckon until she is free from the guilt caused by Bittridge stealing a kiss from her. Others who are prevented from marrying each other because of a pre-marital kiss are Don Ippolito and Florida in A Foregone Conclusion and Lemuel Barker and Statira in The Minster's Charge. In the three novels where real passion is evident, The Shadow of a Dream, Mrs. Farrell, and The Landlord at Lion's End, none of the couples involved marry.¹

In The Rise of Silas Lapham Irene's poking at the wood shavings while talking with Tom Corey is a symbol of sexual activity.

She found another shaving within reach of her parasol, and began poking that with it, and trying to follow it through its folds. Corey watched her a while.

"You seem to have a great passion for playing with shavings," he said. "Is it a new one?"

"New what?"

"Passion."

"I don't know," she said dropping her eyelids, and keeping on with her effort. She looked shyly aslant at him. "Perhaps you don't approve of playing with shavings?"

"Oh yes, I do. I admire it very much. But it seems rather difficult. I've a great ambition to put my foot on the shavings tail and hold it for you."²

In contrast there is no overt kiss between Penelope Lapham and Tom Corey, indicating that their relationship is of a higher caliber and could grow to be conjugal.³

Iterated Marriages

"Iterated," a word coined by the translators of Swedenborg's Conjugal Love, is derived from the Latin word itero, which means to do a thing again. According to Swedenborg, those whose first marriages were not conjugal could marry again with no difficulties.

¹Eble, "Howells' Kisses," pp. 443-445.

²Howells, The Rise of Silas Lapham, p. 161.

³Boardman, "Howellsian Sex," p. 56.

However, those who had known conjugal love could remarry only for reasons separate from conjugal love; these reasons involved a widower's need for a housekeeper and for a mother for his children. Of course, Swedenborg believed a widow should always remarry since she is unable to take care of herself.

Howells' novels are not often concerned with iterated marriages, although he does remarry a few widows. However, unlike Swedenborg, Howells did not seem to regard remarriage for widows as absolutely necessary. Mrs. Faulkner and Mrs. Breen, although experiencing very different marriages, were both able to take care of themselves. Mrs. Faulkner, who had known a conjugal marriage, realized that she could have married again.

We are very strangely made, Mr. March. It is twenty years since my husband died, and I have never once thought of marrying again; but I cannot honestly say that I would not have married if I had met anyone I loved. I know that such a thing was possible, though I did not know it then.¹

Like Mrs. Faulkner, Mrs. Breen did not remarry, but for different reasons. Because her marriage had not been conjugal, she enjoyed being a widow.

In The Landlord at the Lion's Head there is a reiterated marriage. However, Genevieve is divorced, not widowed, a situation about which Swedenborg had nothing to say since during his time (and even during Howells' time to some extent) divorce was not a common practice. Genevieve's marriage to Jeff Durgin is one in which a woman whose virtue has been reduced by divorce and a foreign breeding marries a bad American man.² Perhaps Genevieve remarried in search

¹Howells, The Shadow of a Dream, pp. 88-89.

²Wasserstrom, "The Indelible Stain," p. 489.

of conjugal love, although it is doubtful that she will find it in this marriage.

One of Howells' reiterated marriages could have been influenced by Swedenborg. That is the marriage of Colville and Mrs. Bowen in Indian Summer. Because little is known of her marriage to Bowen, we do not know whether it was conjugal. Swedenborg would probably say it was not since her marriage to Colville obviously was. Although Effie was a prominent instigator for the marriage of Colville and her mother, love seems to have been the major factor.

Although a few widows remarried, there were no remarriages of widowers. In fact widowers seem to be even more scarce than widows in Howells' novels. Two widowers, Dr. Boynton and Mr. Northwick, who did not remarry might have been saved from their disastrous ends if they had. Mr. Northwick in The Quality of Mercy may not have had a conjugal marriage but "he had been passively happy with her."¹ Mrs. Northwick was credited as the reason for her husband's fortunes:

None of his world knew that his fortunes had been founded upon the dowry she brought him, and upon the stay her belief in him had always been. She was a church-member, as such women usually are, but Northwick was really her religion; and as there is nothing that does so much to sanctify a deity as the blind devotion of its worshippers, Northwick was rendered at times worthy of her faith by the intensity of it.²

Perhaps a reiterated marriage with another loving and worshipful wife would have deterred Northwick from embezzling.

Dr. Boynton in The Undiscovered Country had also had a satisfying marriage, perhaps even a conjugal one. This is evident from his determination to make contact with his dead wife through

¹Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 7.

²Ibid., pp. 17-18.

spiritualism. A reiterated marriage for any of Swedenborg's acceptable reasons probably would have kept him away from the dangers of spiritualism.

Howells' novels seem to be relatively unaffected by Swedenborg's beliefs regarding reiterated marriages. There are few such marriages in his works and few of those that do occur are completely for the reasons allowed by Swedenborg. Only the marriage of Colville and Mrs. Bowen seems to have been influenced by Swedenborgianism, and even with Mrs. Bowen there is doubt as to which husband, if either, was her true conjugal partner.

In two of Howells' novels reiterated marriages were not allowed to occur. In both cases the prior marriage was obviously not a conjugal one. The first was in The Shadow of a Dream. Nevil and Hermia Faulkner's marriage was made impossible by Nevil's death. However, because there was a possibility that they loved each other while her husband was still living, Hermia saw Nevil's death as a judgment.

Our Nevil's death, violent and purely accidental as it was, seemed to us a most vague and inconclusive catastrophe, and no true solution to the problem. Yet our Hermia being what she was, and Nevil being Nevil, we saw that it was impossible Faulkner's dream should not have always had power upon them; and the time came when we could regard their death without regret.¹

The second was in A Modern Instance. Ben Halleck had left Boston because he realized he loved Marcia. When he returned and discovered that Bartley had deserted her, he wanted to ask her to divorce Bartley and marry him. Atherton attempted to divert him from this course with the following argument:

¹Howells, The Shadow of a Dream, p. 114.

"You might ask her, if she were a widow, to marry you; but how will you ask her, if she's still a wife, to get a divorce and then marry you? How will you suggest that to a woman whose constancy to her mistake has made her sacred to you?" Halleck seemed about to answer; but he only panted, dry-lipped and open-mouthed, and Atherton continued: "You would have to corrupt her soul first. I don't know what change you've made in yourself during these two years; you look like a desperate and defeated man, but you don't look like that. You don't look like one of those scoundrels who lure women from their duty, ruin homes, and destroy society, not in the old libertine fashion in which the seducer had at least the grace to risk his life, but safely, smoothly, under the shelter of our infamous laws. Have you really come back here to give your father's honest name, and the example of a man of your own blameless life, in support of conditions that tempt people to marry with a mental reservation, and that weaken every marriage bond with the guilty hope of escape whenever a fickle mind, or secret lust, or wicked will may dictate? . . .¹

At that time Halleck's answer to Atherton was positive and strong:

"You are very eloquent," said Halleck, "but I ask you to observe that these little abstractions don't interest me. I've a concrete purpose, and I can't contemplate the effect of other people's actions upon American civilization. When you ask me to believe that I oughtn't to try to rescue a woman from the misery to which a villain has left her, simply because some justice of the peace consecrated his power over her, I decline to be such a fool. I use my reason, and I see who it was that defiled and destroyed that marriage, and I know that she is as free in the sight of God as if he had never lived."²

However, once Marcia was legally free, Halleck was assailed with doubts as to the rightness of his plans. Once again he appealed to Atherton for advice, this time by letter.

These are the questions which I ask myself in my despair. She is free, now; but am I free? Am I not rather bound by the past to perpetual silence? There are times when I rebel against these tortures; when I feel a sanction for my love of her, an assurance from somewhere that it is right and good to love her but then I sink again, for if I ask whence this assurance comes-- I beseech you to tell me what you think. Has my offence been so great that nothing can atone for it? Must I sacrifice to this fear all my hopes of what I could be to her, and for her?³

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 450-451.

²Ibid., p. 451

³Ibid., p. 512.

Atherton, too, has doubts and shares them with his wife, Clara:

"Don't you see that his being in love with her when she was another man's wife is what he feels it to be,--an indelible stain?"

"She never knew it; and no one ever knew it but you. You said it was our deeds that judged us And now she is a widow, and any man may ask her to marry him."

"Any man but the one who loved her during her husband's life. That is, if he is such a man as Halleck. Of course it isn't a question of gross black and white, mere right and wrong; there are degrees, there are shades. There might be redemption for another sort of man in such a marriage, but for Halleck there could only be loss,--deterioration,--lapse from the ideal. I should think that he might suffer something of this even in her eyes--"¹

Obviously Atherton's negative feelings are due much to his low opinion of Marcia. However, he strongly felt that Ben Halleck would suffer with the guilt of having loved Marcia while she was married to another.

Appearances of Conjugal Love

Even a nonconjugal marriage could appear to be conjugal; although the internal feelings are not present, the external feelings are. According to Swedenborg, these appearances of conjugal love were in themselves conjugal because they served several necessary purposes, most of which involved keeping domestic peace and guarding the reputation of the family. Because marriage should be until death, external affections can resemble internal affections when there are no internal affections. One of the most obvious marriages in this category is that of the Northwicks. Mrs. Northwick loved her husband intently, and if his feelings for her were not of the same intensity, at least he gave the appearance of conjugal love.

In his sort he returned her love; he was not the kind of man whose affections are apt to wander, perhaps because

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 512.

they were few and easily kept together; perhaps because he was really principled against letting them go astray.¹

In The Leatherwood God the marriage of James Redfield to Jane Gillespie was compared to his breaking her. Their marriage is not conjugal because his masculinity had not been softened by her femininity.² However, they were satisfied with each other, and their marriage had the appearance of conjugal love. The Squire best described their marriage:

"Oh yes, they've got along," the Squire assented. "He's got along with her, and she's got along with the children-- plenty of them. I reckon she's what he wanted, and they're what she did."³

Perhaps many other marriages in Howells' novels merely give the appearance of conjugal love. Even those regarded as true conjugal love may be the appearance of conjugal love. After all, the purpose of the appearance of conjugal love is that others will not know that true conjugal love does not exist. However, the appearance of conjugal love can be present only when the partners' external affection for each other resembles the interior affection of conjugal love. Those marriages in which the partners are attracted by exterior affections but begin to hate each other interiorly were also discussed by Swedenborg. He termed these infernal marriages.

¹Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 18.

²Eble, "The Western Ideals of William Dean Howells," Western Humanities Review 11 (Autumn 1957):335.

³Howells, The Leatherwood God, p. 235.

COLDNESS, SEPARATION, AND DIVORCE

Swedenborg listed several causes--internal, external, and accidental--for coldness, separation, and divorce. Of these causes Howells used three extensively--differences in religion, differences in minds and manners, and inequality of state and condition of age.

Religion

One possible reason for the failure of the Hubbards' marriage in A Modern Instance is the religious confusion present in their lives.¹ This novel shows the decay of a marriage in a morally decaying civilization. Equity, the New England home of the Gaylords, had many churches, but the people had become so liberal in practicing their religion that they had lost sight of the real purpose of the church:

The habit of church-going was so strong and universal in Equity that even strangers stopping at the hotel found themselves the object of a sort of hospitable competition with the members of the different denominations, who took it for granted that they would wish to go somewhere, and only suffered them a choice between sects. There was no intolerance in their offer of pews, but merely a profound expectation, and one might continue to choose his place of worship Sabbath after Sabbath without offence. This was Bartley's custom, and it had worked to his favor rather than his disadvantage; for in the rather chaotic liberality into which religious sentiment had fallen in Equity, it was tacitly conceded that the editor of a paper devoted to the interests of the whole town ought not to be of fixed theological opinions.

Religion there had largely ceased to be a fact of spiritual experience, and the visible church flourished on condition of providing for the social needs of the community. It was practically held that the salvation of one's soul must not be

¹Vanderbilt, Achievement, p. 75.

made too depressing, or the young people would have nothing to do with it The church embraced and included the world In contrast with the relaxation and uncertainty of their doctrinal aim, the rude and bold infidelity of old Squire Gaylord had the greater affinity with the mood of the Puritanism they had outgrown.¹

Squire Gaylord was an atheist, and his wife gave up her religious beliefs for him, all the while blaming him for her loss. Therefore, their daughter Marcia was without any stabilizing religious training.²

It was doubtless in the disintegration of the finer qualities of her nature, that, as they grew older together, she threw more and more the burden of acute feeling upon her husband, to whose doctrine of life she had submitted, but had never been reconciled. Marriage is, with all its disparities, a much more equal thing than appears, and the meek little wife, who has all the advantage of public sympathy, knows her power over her oppressor, and at some tender spot in his affections or his nerves can inflict an anguish that will avenge her for years of coarser aggression. Thrown in upon herself in so vital a matter as her religion, Mrs. Gaylord had involuntarily come to live largely for herself, though her talk was always of her husband. She gave up for him, as she believed, her soul's salvation, but she held him to account for the uttermost farthing of the price It was not apathy that she had felt when their children died one after another, but an obscure and formless exultation that Mr. Gaylord would suffer enough for both.

Marcia was the youngest, and her mother left her training almost wholly to her father; she sometimes said that she never supposed the child would live. She did not actually urge this in excuse, but she had the appearance of doing so; and she held aloof from them both in their mutual relations, with mildly critical reserves. They spoiled each other, as father and daughter are apt to do when left to themselves

Her education proceeded fitfully. He would not let her be forced to household tasks that she disliked; and as a little girl she went to school chiefly because she would have been obliged to it if she had not chosen

What resulted was a great proficiency in the things that pleased her, and ignorance of the other things.³

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 26-28.

²Richard Foster, "The Contemporaneity of Howells," New England Quarterly 32 (March 1959):57.

³Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 101-103.

Bartley Hubbard, about whose family we know nothing, could be termed amoral in so far as he was concerned only with his actions which could be observed by society. If Bartley had had a more comfortable life, perhaps his marriage would not have ended in divorce. His life took the downhill course it did because he had no standards on which to pattern his life. Boston, instead of serving as the moral environment it was supposed to be, hastened the failure of the marriage and Bartley with its money-hungry journalism.

Bartley's growing obesity was a symbol of his growing immorality. Midway through the novel mention is made of Bartley's increasing girth:

He was unquestionably growing stout, and even Mrs. Halleck noticed that his blonde face was unpleasantly red that day. He was, of course, not intemperate He joked about the three fingers of fat on his ribs, and frankly guessed it was the beer that did it; at such times he said that perhaps he should have to cut down on his tivoli.¹

One critic suggests that Bartley's drinking and drunkenness are symbols for adulterous behavior.² Finally, in the court room trial Bartley had become so fat that his former friends and family did not recognize him at first; with his attempt to divorce Marcia in such an underhanded manner, he had reached the depths of his immorality.

It was not the fat on Bartley's ribs only that had increased: his broad cheeks stood out and hung down with it, and his chin descended by the three successive steps to his breast.³

Bartley's grotesque girth was an outward symbol of the grotesque girth of his immorality.

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 289.

²Leslie A. Fiedler, Love and Death in the American Novel (New York: Criterion Books, 1960), p. 259.

³Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 496.

Mind and Manners

Differences in mind and manners is not merely a matter of wealth; in fact wealth can have very little to do with it. Although Florida Vervain was wealthier than Ferris, there was no difference in their states of mind and manners.

It was fortunate for Ferris, since he could not work, that she had money; in exalted moments he had thought this a barrier to their marriage; yet he could not recall any one who had refused the hand of a beautiful girl because of the accident of her wealth, and in the end he silenced his scruples. It might be said that in many other ways he was not her equal; but one ought to reflect how very few men are worthy of their wives in any sense.¹

Wealth could be involved as in the case of Louise Hilary and Maxwell; however, the real difference was in their social standings, as Mrs. Hilary pointed out:

It isn't a question of his poverty; your father has money enough: it's a question of his social quality, and of all those little nothings that make up the whole of happiness in marriage. He would be different enough, being merely a man; but being a man born and reared in as different a world from yours as if it were another planet--I want you to think over all the girls you know--all the people you know--and see how many of them have married out of their own set, their own circle--we might almost say, their own family. There isn't one!²

Howells was very much aware of how differences in mind and manners could prevent a conjugal marriage. Two of his novels were completely devoted to this theme, and in a third it was very prominent. Kitty Ellison and Miles Arbuton in A Chance Acquaintance, Alice Pasmer and Dan Maverling in April Hopes, and Statira and Lemuel Barker in The Minister's Charge are all couples with very distinct differences in minds and manners.

¹Howells, A Foregone Conclusion, p. 260.

²Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 385.

A Chance Acquaintance shows the importance of finding the right spouse according to Swedenborg's ideal, with the man and woman complementary or the woman superior. The Arbuton/Ellison marriage could not have worked out because Miles could not accept Kitty as she was; he wanted to reshape her in a Boston society mold. Kitty wanted to marry Arbuton and almost did, if only for a European honeymoon.

Here, for the guilty space of a heat-lightning flash, Kitty wickedly entertained the thought of marrying Mr. Arbuton for the sake of a bridal trip to Europe, and bade love and the fitness of things and the incompatibility of Boston and Eriecreek traditions take care of themselves.¹

When Arbuton, in the presence of friends from Boston, snubbed Kitty, she knew this marriage would be impossible.

Why, of course, Fanny, I didn't care for knowing those people. What should I want to know them for? But what hurt me was that he should so postpone me to them, and ignore me before them, and leave me without a word, then, when I ought to have been everything in the world to him and first of all. I believe things came to me while I sat there, as they do to drowning people, all at once, and I saw the whole affair more distinctly than ever I did. We were too far apart in what we had been and what we believed in and respected, ever to grow really together. And if he gave me the highest position in the world, I should have only that. He never could like the people who had been good to me, and whom I loved so dearly, and he only could like me as far as he could estrange me from them. If he could coolly put me aside now, how would it be afterwards with the rest, and with me too? That's what flashed through me, and I don't believe that getting splendidly married is as good as being true to the love that came long before, and honestly living your own life out, without fear or trembling, whatever it is.²

Ironically, Kitty was the superior character, as Isabel March realized when they met in Their Wedding Journey: "'This Miss Ellison, why, I can tell you, I shouldn't be ashamed of her anywhere.' By anywhere Isabel meant Boston. . . ."³ Arbuton finally realized that Kitty, not

¹Howells, A Chance Acquaintance, p. 237.

²Ibid., pp. 263-264.

³Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 109.

himself, was the noble one. Their differences remained; however, their levels, at least in his realization had changed.

But here the whole fabric of Mr. Arbuton's defense toppled to the ground. He was a man of scrupulous truth, not accustomed to deceive himself or others. He had been ashamed of her, he could not deny, not to keep the love that was now dearer to him than life. He saw it with paralyzing clearness; and, as an inexorable fact that confounded quite as much as it dismayed him, he perceived that throughout that ignoble scene she had been the gentle person and he the vulgar one.¹

Unlike in A Chance Acquaintance, the marriage in April Hopes took place; however, the reader is well aware that the marriage is destined to fail. One of the main problems is the difference in the minds of Alice and Dan. This difference is referred to several times throughout the novel by different characters. Dan and Alice went through several misunderstandings and several times broke off their relationship. After one of these incidents, Boardman, Dan's friend, explained that he felt they would not make a good couple anyway:

Simply saying that I don't believe you two would ever understand each other. You haven't got the same point of view, and you couldn't make it go. Both out of a scrape.²

Mrs. Brinkley, who had friendly feelings toward Dan, was unable to regard Alice favorably. She, too, realized that their marriage would be a serious mistake. Dan needed a wife who would appreciate him for what he was, not one who would try to make him measure up to impossible ideals.

"I hope they won't [marry], then," said Mrs. Brinkley, "for they couldn't help being unhappy together, with their temperaments. There's one thing, Miss Cotton, that's more essential in marriage than Miss Pasmer's instantaneous honesty, and that's patience."

"Patience with wrong?" demanded Miss Cotton.

"Yes, even with wrong; but I meant patience with each other. Marriage is a perpetual pardon, concession, surrender; it's an everlasting giving up; that's the divine thing about it; and

¹Howells, A Chance Acquaintance, p. 260.

²Howells, April Hopes, p. 284.

that's just what Miss Pasmer could never conceive of, because she is self-righteous and conceited and unyielding. She would make him miserable."¹

Like Boardman and Mrs. Brinkley, the elder Maverick realized that the differences between his son and Alice would cause friction in their relationship, and he, too, was relieved when it seemed the marriage would not take place.

"Women give up a great deal when they marry," said the elder, "It's not strange that they exaggerate the sacrifice, and expect more in return than it's in the nature of men to give them. I should have been sorry to have you marry a woman of an exacting disposition."

"I'm afraid she was exacting," said Dan. "But she never asked more than was right."

"And it's difficult to do all that's right," suggested the elder.

"I'm sure you always have, father," said the son.

The father did not respond. "I wish you could remember your mother when she was well," he said. Presently he added, "I think it isn't best for a woman to be too much in love with her husband Women keep the romantic feeling longer than men; it dies out of us very soon--perhaps too soon No man can be all a woman wishes him to be," said his father. "It's better for the disappointment to come before it's too late You were to blame in the particular instance," his father answered. "But in general the fault was in her--or her temperament. As long as the romance lasted she might have deluded herself, and believed you were all she imagined you; but romance can't last, even with women. I don't like your faults, and I don't want you to excuse them to yourself. I don't like your chancing things, and leaving them to come out all right of themselves; but I've always tried to make you children see all your qualities in their true proportion and relation."²

Like many romantic novels, April Hopes ends with a marriage, but not the "happily-ever-after" variety. Alice and Dan's marriage is a product of Howells' realism and begins with a broken promise.

As they drove along, Alice held Dan's wrist in the cold clutch of her trembling little ungloved hand, on which her wedding-ring shone. "Oh, dearest! let us be good!" she said. "I will try my best. I will try not to be exacting and unreasonable, and I know I can. I won't even make any

¹Howells, April Hopes, p. 306.

²Ibid., pp. 309-310.

conditions, if you will always be frank and open with me, and tell me everything!"

He leaned over and kissed her behind the drawn curtains. "I will, Alice! I will indeed! I won't keep anything from you after this."

He resolved to tell her all about Julia Anderson at the right moment, when Alice was in the mood, and as soon as he thoroughly understood what he had really meant himself.

If he had been different she would not have asked him to be frank and open; if she had been different, he might have been frank and open. This was the beginning of their married life.¹

This broken promise has its origin in Swedenborgianism; Alice and Dan are too different in their minds and manners ever to achieve a conjugal relationship. Because of their differences, their marriage could lead to coldness, separation, and divorce.

In The Minister's Charge Lemuel Barker contemplated marriage with Statira, a young factory worker. As Reverend Sewell realized, Lemuel and Statira were from different stations in life; therefore, their marriage could never be conjugal.

"With a girl like that for his wife," pursued Sewell, "the conditions are all changed. He must cleave to her in mind as well as body, and he must seek the kind of life that will unite them more and more, not less and less. In fact, he was instinctively doing so when this accident happened. That's what marriage means."²

Luckily for both parties, "the marriage which eventually took place was not that of Lemuel with Statira."³

Inequality of State and Condition of Age

The third major cause of coldness, separation, and divorce was the difference in ages. In most instances Howells interpreted this to show the inadvisability of marriage between a young woman and

¹Howells, April Hopes, p. 354.

²Howells, The Minister's Charge, p. 446.

³Ibid., p. 463.

an older man. Howells made several comments on this situation through his characters. Pinney in The Quality of Mercy sympathized with Mrs. Wilmington's predicament. Mrs. Wilmington, although married to an older man, was waiting for him to die so that she could marry her husband's nephew. Pinney regarded the situation philosophically and cemented his relationship with Mrs. Wilmington by commenting that "if you were an old man and you married a young woman he guessed that was what you had got to expect."¹

In The Undiscovered Country Egeria and father, Dr. Boynton, are the topic of conversation by two Shakers, who seeing the father and daughter at the train station, mistake them for husband and wife:

"He seemed too old to be her husband."

"That often happens in the world."

"Yee," said Joseph; "but I never like to see a young wife with an old husband. "And there is something pleasing in a pretty young couple: they seem happy."²

The marriage of the Faulkners in The Shadow of a Dream was also a union of an old man with a young woman; therefore, it suffered the problems inherent with this type of mismatch. To Howells the worst of the problems besetting this type of union is that the wife could outgrow her husband. If a couple are equal in their development when she is young and he is old, she will probably outgrow him if she continues to develop and mature. Isabel March explained this phenomenon to her husband shortly after she met the Faulkners.

She went on to say, "Of course, I couldn't be with her for a quarter of an hour, and especially after I had seen what he was, without understanding her marriage. She's a great deal younger than he is; and she was earning her own living, poor thing, and perhaps supporting her family--"

¹Howells, The Quality of Mercy, p. 111

²Howells, The Undiscovered Country, p. 115.

"At any rate, she was poor, and they were poor; and she was dazzled by his offer, and might easily have supposed herself in love with him. And then--she outgrew him. With her taste and her sense, it could only be a question of time. I know she was writing inwardly through all his pretentious, ignorant talk about art and literature; but with her ideal of duty, she would rather die than let anybody see that she didn't think him the greatest and wisest of human creatures. They have no children; and that might be fatal to any woman that was less noble and heroic than she is. But she's simply made him her child, since his sickness, and devoted herself to him, and that's been their salvation. She won't let herself see any fault in him, or anything offensive or conceited or petty."¹

Obviously Howells was very much concerned about the equality of ages in a couple's marriage. Not only is this topic present in several novels as a minor topic, but it is the main subject of Indian Summer. In this novel Colville, who had been nursing a disappointment in love for many years, thought himself in love with Imogene Graham, who was much younger than he was. In fact Miss Graham was very close to the age of Jenny Milbury, at the time Jenny broke off her romance with Colville. Throughout the novel conversations among the central characters revolve around the problems of disparate ages in a marriage. Most of the Howellsian-Swedenborgian thoughts were uttered by Mr. Waters, the retired New England clergyman.

Like Howells and Swedenborg, Mr. Waters, though unmarried, believed strongly in the importance of marriage. He also believed in the importance of similar ages in marriage partners and explained his reasons for this belief to Colville:

Mr. Waters took no notice of what he had been saying. He resumed from another point. "But I should say that it would be unwise for a man of mature life to seek his happiness with one much younger than himself. I don't deny that there are cases in which the disparity of years counts for little or nothing, but, generally speaking, people ought to be as equally mated in age as possible. They ought to start with the

¹Howells, The Shadow of a Dream, p. 21.

same advantages of ignorance. A young girl can only live her life through a community of feeling, an equality of inexperience in the man she gives her heart to. If he is tired of things that still delight her, the chances of unhappiness are increased.¹

Colville himself finally realized the difficulties of age facing himself and Imogene if they should marry.

"I confess," he said, "that I feel the risks of the affair. It's not that I have any dread for my own part: I have lived my life, such as it is. But the child is full of fancies about me that can't be fulfilled. She dreams of restoring my youth somehow, of retrieving the past for me, of avenging me at her own cost for an unlucky love affair that I had here twenty years ago. It's pretty of her, but it's terribly pathetic--it's tragic. I know very well that I'm a middle-aged man, and that there's no more youth for me. I'm getting gray, and I'm getting fat. I wouldn't be young if I could; it's a bore. I suppose I could keep up an illusion of youthfulness for five or six years more; and then if I could be quietly chloroformed out of the way, perhaps it wouldn't have been so very bad."²

Finally within the security of their conjugal marriage, Colville and Lina hope for a marriage between Imogene and Mr. Morton. Mrs. Colville concludes, "But if it isn't Mr. Morton, it will be some one else--some young person."³

Equality in such aspects as religion, manners, and age was important to Howells in marriage as evidenced in his novels. In fact, these are probably more important than love in a marriage. A marriage based on Swedenborg's conjugal ideals but without love stood a much better chance for survival in Howells' opinion than a marriage based on love alone. In his novels he was interested in the theme of love without its romantic aspects.⁴ In April Hopes Howells warned against

¹Howells, Indian Summer, p. 128.

²Ibid., p. 219.

³Ibid., p. 280.

⁴Robert Falk, The Victorian Mode in American Fiction, 1865-1885 (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965), p. 52.

expecting too much from marriage.¹ A marriage does not necessarily signify that a couple will live and love "happily-ever-after." Marcia and Bartley are fine examples of that.

¹Falk, The Victorian Mode, p. 125.

LOVE AND MARRIAGE

Possibly one of the most important aspects of marriage considered by Howells in his novels was the role played by love. Although not the most essential factor, love was important in marriage. In The Minister's Charge Reverend Sewell lamented the tragedy of those who marry without love.

He had seen Lemuel and the young girl together a great deal, and a painful misgiving had grown up in his mind. It seemed to him that while he had seen no want of patience or kindness towards her in Lemuel, he had not seen the return of her fondness, which, silly as it was in some of its manifestations, he thought he should be glad of in him. Yet he was not sure. Garker was always so self-contained that he might very well feel more love for her than he showed; and, after all, Sewell rather weakly asked himself, was the love so absolutely necessary?

When he repeated this question in his wife's presence, she told him she was astonished at him.

"You know that it is vitaly necessary! It's all the more necessary, if he's so superior to her, as you say . . . I have always heard you say that marriage without love was not only sinful in itself but the beginning of sorrow."¹

In an earlier passage Reverend Sewell discussed the importance of betrothed couples knowing when love was no longer present in their relationship. It is far better for them to break their pledge than to marry without love.

". . . I should feel myself guilty if I did not do my utmost to prevent marriages between people when one or other wished to break their engagement, and had not the moral courage to do so. There is no more pernicious delusion than that one's word ought to be kept in such an affair after the heart has gone out of it, simply because it's been given . . . I am right about this, Lucy, and you know it. Half the miserable marriages in the world could be prevented, if there were only some frank and fearless adviser at hand to say to the foolish things that if they no longer fully and freely love each other they can commit no treason so deadly as being true to their word. "I wish," he

¹Howells, The Minister's Charge, p. 448.

now added, "that I could be the means of breaking off every marriage that the slightest element of doubt enters into beforehand. I should leave much less work for the divorce courts. The trouble comes from that crazy and mischievous principle of false self-sacrifice that I'm always crying out against. If a man has ceased to love the woman he has promised to marry--or vice versa--the best possible thing they can do, the only righteous thing, is not to marry.¹

Although important, love alone is not enough for a successful marriage. Howells made this clear in both April Hopes and A Modern Instance. In his introduction to April Hopes Kermit Vanderbilt quoted Howells:

I supposed that the social intent of the book--the teaching that love is not enough in love affairs, but that there must be a parity of ideal, training and disposition, in order to insure happiness--was only too obvious.²

Howells reiterated his feelings on the subject of love in a passage within the body of that novel:

It is the rule that Americans marry for love, and the very rare exception that they marry for anything else; and if our divorce courts are so busy in spite of this fact, it is perhaps because the Americans also unmarry for love, or perhaps because love is not sufficient in matters of the heart as has been represented in the literatures of people who have not been able to give it so fair a trial.³

Dan Maverick and Alice Pasmer loved each other very much, but their love was not enough to make up for their differences. Both expected their marriage to perform miracles. Instead they can only expect the same end as Marcia and Bartley.⁴ Their marriage is enmeshed with romantic illusions. They are doomed to an "eternal impasse" because

¹Howells, The Minister's Charge, pp. 309-310.

²Vanderbilt, Introduction to April Hopes by W. D. Howells, p. xxvi.

³Howells, April Hopes, pp. 48-49.

⁴Falk, The Victorian Mode, p. 126.

they are not aware of the illusive basis for their marriage.¹ Mrs. Brinkley, in her great common sense realized that Dan and Alice's love was not enough for their marriage to succeed. Indeed she repeated in several passages that love was not enough for marriage:

"Love isn't strong enough to save people from unhappiness through each other's faults. Do you suppose that so many married people are unhappy in each other because they don't love each other? No; it's because they do love each other that their faults are such a mutual torment. If they were indifferent, they wouldn't mind each other's faults. Perhaps that's the reason why there are so many American divorces; if they didn't care, like Europeans, who don't marry for love, they could stand it."

"Perhaps," she [Miss Cotton] said, "we shall have to go back to the idea that engagements and marriages are not intended to be regulated by the judgment, but by the affections."

"I don't know what's intended," said Mrs. Brinkley, "but I know what is. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the affections have it their own way, and I must say I don't think the judgment could make a greater mess of it. In fact," she continued, perhaps provoked to the excess by the deprecation she saw in Miss Cotton's eye, "I consider every broken engagement nowadays a blessing in disguise We are married too much. And as a natural consequence we are divorced too much. The whole case is in a nutshell: if there were no marriages, there would be no divorces, and that great abuse would be corrected, at any rate."

"Ah, Mrs. Brinkley," said one of the ladies, "it would be no use for you to preach broken engagements to any one who saw you and Mr. Brinkley together."

They fell upon her, one after another, and mocked her with the difference between her doctrine and practice; and they were all the more against her because they had been perhaps a little put down by her whimsical sayings.

"Yes," she admitted. "But we've been thirty years coming to the understanding that you admire so much; and do you think it was worth the time?"²

Like Alice and Dan, Bartley and Marcia at one time in their relationship loved each other--or at least they thought they did. However, their "love" was little more than physical attraction. A Modern Instance is a "vivid portrayal of the breakdown of a marriage

¹Campbell, "Realism and the Romance," pp. 298-299.

²Howells, April Hopes, pp. 79, 128-130, 132.

that had nothing but physical attraction as its cement."¹ Marcia's love for Bartley is basically passionate jealousy; Bartley's love for Marcia is his own self-love reflected by her. Howells wrote, "her adoration flattered his self-love to the same passionate intensity, and to something like the generous complexion of her worship."²

Bartley and Marcia managed to fool themselves into believing that their feelings were real love, and that their marriage would be successful. Bartley's love for Marcia was pride that such a beautiful girl was so fond of him. He believed that her love would make him a better person.

"I believe you could make me do anything; but you have always influenced me for good; your influence upon me has been ennobling and elevating."

She wished to refuse his praise; but her heart throbbed for bliss and pride in it; her voice dissolved on her lips. They sat in silence; and he took in his the hand that she let hang over the side of her chair. The lamp began to burn low, and she found words to say, "I had better get another," but she did not move.

"No, don't," he said; "I must be going, too. Look at the wick, there, Marcia; it scarcely reaches the oil. In a little while it will not reach it, and the flame will die out. That is the way the ambition to be good and great will die out of me, when my life no longer draws its inspiration from your influence."³

Marcia then regarded her love for Bartley as her duty to make him a better person. Since this was impossible, she perceived Bartley's character to be on a much higher plane than it was in actuality.

"Ah, Marcia!" he added, seriously, "Ben Halleck is the kind of man you ought to have married! Don't you suppose that I know I'm not good enough for you? I'm pretty good by fits and starts; but he would have been good right straight along. I should never have had to bring him home in a hack to you?"

¹Everett S. Carter, "The Palpitating Divan," English Journal 39 (May 1950):239.

²Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 62.

³Ibid., p. 15.

His generous admission had the just effect. "Hush, Bartley! Don't talk so! You know that you're better for me than the best man in the world, dear, and even if you were not, I should love you the best. Don't talk, please, that way of any one else, or it will make me hate you!"¹

Consequently, like Alice and Dan Maverling, Bartley and Marcia Hubbard were caught in a trap of their own making. Both Bartley and Marcia believed that her love for him would make him deserving of that love. However, Marcia's love was too jealous to lift Bartley's selfish character to a higher level. If either had been different, their marriage might have succeeded. Marcia, like many of Howells' women, expected too much of marriage. When her love failed to achieve her aims for it, she became frustrated.²

At the time of the Hubbards' marriage there is an implication that it will fail because something was missing.

The minister was an old man, and he seemed quite dazed at the suddenness of their demand for his services. But he gathered himself together, and contrived to make them man and wife, and to give them his marriage certificate.

"It seems as if there were something else," he said, absently, as he handed the paper to Bartley.³

Later in the novel Bartley informed Marcia during an argument that their marriage was not sacred because they had not posted their banns. According to him this was the "something else" to which the minister referred.

"There can't be anything sacred in our marriage unless we trust each other in everything."

"Well, I haven't done any of the mistrusting," said Bartley, with humorous lightness. "But isn't sacred rather a strong word to use in regard to our marriage anyway?"

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 318.

²Mathews, "The Heroines of Hawthorne and Howells," p. 39.

³Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 153.

"Why--why--what do you mean, Bartley? We were married by a minister."

"Well, yes, by what was left of one," said Bartley, "he couldn't seem to shake himself together sufficiently to ask for the proof that we had declared our intention to get married."

Marcia looked mystified. "Don't you remember his saying there was something else, and my suggesting to him that it was the fee? . . . We are married, right and tight enough; but I don't know that there's anything sacred about it."¹

According to Swedenborg, the betrothal period was an important one in establishing conjugal love. However, Howells is pointing out a much more serious missing element. The "something else" lacked by Bartley and Marcia is true conjugal love.

Those Howellsian characters whose marriages succeed are successful because they share conjugal love with their marriage partners. The difference between love and conjugal love is the difference between romance and realism. According to Charles Campbell, "the evolution from romantic to realist is accomplished by having the sentimental heroine enter the commonplace of marriage and demonstrating the qualified nature of her 'happily ever-after.'"²

In The Rise of Silas Lapham Howells speaks in his own voice about the necessity of conjugal love in marriage.

The silken texture of the marriage tie bears a daily strain of wrong and insult to which no other human relation can be subjected without lesion; and sometimes the strength that knits society together might appear to the eye of faltering faith the curse of those immediately bound by it. Two people by no means reckless of each other's rights and feelings, but even tender of them for the most part, may tear at each other's heartstrings with perfect impunity; though if they were any other two they would not speak or look at each other again after the outrages they exchange. It is certainly

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, p. 363.

²Campbell, "Realism and the Romance," p. 294.

a curious spectacle, and doubtless it ought to convince an observer of the divinity of the institution.¹

Conjugal love may not guarantee that a married couple will live happily ever-after, but it does increase the marriage's chances for an ever-after.

In A Foregone Conclusion Ferris realized that there is more to marriage than love for a beautiful and good woman, and said, "But if men had to marry because women were beautiful and good, there isn't one of us could live single a day."² The conjugal love shared by him and Florida allowed them in their marriage to ignore the mistakes they made before that marriage.

There is nothing that has really so strong a digestion as love, and this is very lucky, seeing what manifold experiences love has to swallow and assimilate; and when they got back to Venice, Ferris found that the customs of their joint life exorcised all the dark associations of the place. These simply formed a sombre background, against which their wedded happiness relieved itself.³

Perhaps the most important aspect of conjugal love is that it allows wives and husbands to accept each other realistically, faults and all. In A Modern Instance Atherton explained that necessity to his wife Clara.

They lived a very tranquil life, and Clara had no grief of her own unless it was that there seemed to be no great things she could do for him. One day when she whimsically complained of this, he said: I'm very glad of that. Let's try to be equal to the little sacrifices we must make for each other; they will be quite enough. Many a woman who would be ready to die for her husband makes him wretched because she won't live for him. Don't despise the day of small things.⁴

¹Howells, The Rise of Silas Lapham, p. 261.

²Howells, A Foregone Conclusion, p. 85.

³Ibid., p. 261.

⁴Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 468-469.

As anyone who has ever been married knows, the "poorer," "worse," and "sickness" do not destroy a marriage. The real culprits are as minor as sloppiness or different seasonings in the stew.

Another marriage blessed with conjugal love was that of Basil and Isabel March. Early in Their Wedding Journey Isabel briefly lamented Basil's appetite but quickly realized that his faults were not that important to her.

But Isabel would have only herself to blame if she had not perceived this trait of Basil's before marriage "But I took him with all his faults,--and was glad to get him," she added, ending her meditation with a little burst of candor; and she did not even think of Basil's appetite when he reappeared.¹

Like April Hopes, The Kentons featured a courting couple caught up with romanticism. However, unlike Alice and Dan, Ellen and Buckner were able to cope with life's reality. They realized both the need to be good people and their limitations to do so. "Above all, they are pledged to a responsible life in the world of reality, the world of the present."²

In his novels Howells presented many different marriages; however, most of them fell into two categories: the successful and the unsuccessful. The one factor which contributed the most to the success of a marriage was, not love, but conjugal love. Love is important to a marriage, and a marriage cannot be expected to survive without it.

"If the world doesn't like my open shame, let it look to its own secret shame,--the marriages made and maintained from interest, and ambition, and vanity, and folly. I will take

¹Howells, Their Wedding Journey, p. 18.

²Tom H. Towers, "The Only Life We've Got--Myth and Morality in The Kentons," Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):383, 393.

my chance with the men and women who have been honest enough to own their mistake, and to try to repair it, and I will preach by my life that marriage has no sanctity but what love gives it, and that when love ceases marriage ceases, before heaven. If the laws have come to recognize that, by whatever fiction, so much the better for the laws!" Halleck rose.¹

However, neither is love alone enough. Conjugal love is necessary for couples to face the reality of life. Love alone is sufficient for a romance, but marriage is real. It is the beginning of a life together, not the end of a romantic novel.

In 1892 Howells wrote to Charles Eliot Norton, "I doubt if I shall ever write another story in which mating and marrying play an important part. I am too old for it, and it does not interest me." However, half of his last twelve novels do concern marrying. In fact, over half of all his novels are centered around the theme of courtship and marriage.² Marriage was as real to Howells as life itself, and his ideas on marriage, as well as on life, were greatly influenced by Swedenborgianism.

¹Howells, A Modern Instance, pp. 451-452.

²Eble, "Howells' Kisses," p. 441.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Howells, William Dean. The Altrurian Romances. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.
- _____. Annie Kilburn. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1919.
- _____. April Hopes. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974.
- _____. A Chance Acquaintance. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1873.
- _____. The Day of Their Wedding. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1896.
- _____. Dr. Breen's Practice. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1969.
- _____. A Foregone Conclusion. Boston: Houghton, Osgood and Company, 1879.
- _____. A Hazard of New Fortunes. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- _____. An Imperative Duty. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- _____. Indian Summer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- _____. The Leatherwood God. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970.
- _____. The Minister's Charge: or The Apprenticeship of Lemuel Barker. Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1887.
- _____. Mrs. Farrell. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1921.
- _____. A Modern Instance. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1881.
- _____. The Quality of Mercy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1891.
- _____. The Rise of Silas Lapham. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1937.

- _____. The Shadow of a Dream. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- _____. Their Wedding Journey. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894.
- _____. The Undiscovered Country. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1880.
- Swedenborg, Emmanuel. The Delights of Wisdom Concerning Conjugal Love. Trans. from the Latin. Philadelphia: Francis and Robert Bailey, 1796. Edited by Dr. Clifford K. Shipton. Early American Imprints, 1639-1800. Worcester, Massachusetts: American Antiquarian Society.

Secondary Sources

- Aaron, Daniel. "William Dean Howells: The Gentleman from Altruria." In Men of Good Hope, pp. 172-207. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Adrian, Arthur A. "Augustus Hoppin to William Dean Howells." New England Quarterly 24 (March 1951): 84-89.
- Arms, George. "Howells' New York Novel: Comedy and Belief." New England Quarterly 21 (September 1948): 313-325.
- Baxter, Annette, Kar. "Archetypes of American Innocence: Lydia Blood and Daisy Miller." In The American Experience, pp. 148-156. Edited by Hennig Cohen. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Bennett, George N. William Dean Howells: The Development of a Novelist. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959.
- Boardman, Arthur. "Howellsian Sex." Studies in the Novel (North Texas University 2:52-60.
- Cady, Edwin Harrison. "The Neuroticism of William Dean Howells." PMLA 61 (1946): 229-238.
- _____. The Road to Realism. 2 vols. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1958.
- Campbell, Charles L. "Realism and the Romance of Real Life Multiple Fictional Worlds in Howells' Novels." Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):289-302.
- Carter, Everett. Howells and the Age of Realism. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1954.
- _____. "The Palpitating Divan." English Journal 39 (May 1950): 237-242.

- Cooke, Delmar Gross. William Dean Howells: A Critical Study. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922.
- Cumpiano, Marion W. "The Dark Side of Their Wedding Journey." American Literature 40 (January 1969):472-486.
- _____. "Howells' Bridge: A Study of the Artistry of Indian Summer." Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):363-382.
- Eble, Kenneth E. "Howells' Kisses." American Quarterly 19 (1957): 441-447.
- _____. "The Western Ideals of William Dean Howells." Western Humanities Review 11 (Autumn 1957):331-338.
- Falk, Robert. The Victorian Mode in American Fiction, 1865-1885. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. Love and Death in the American Novel. New York: Criterion Books, 1960.
- Foster, Richard. "The Contemporaneity of Howells." New England Quarterly 32 (March 1959):54-78.
- Frazier, David L. "Their Wedding Journey: Howells' Fictional Craft." New England Quarterly 42 (September 1969):323-349.
- Frederick, John T. The Darkened Sky: Nineteenth-Century American Novelists and Religion. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1969.
- Fryckstedt, Olov W. In Quest of America: A Study of Howells' Early Development as a Novelist. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Gardner, Joseph H. "Howells: The Realist as Dickensian." Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):323-343.
- Gibson, William M. "William D. Howells." In Six American Novelists of the Nineteenth Century, An Introduction, pp. 155-190. Edited by Richard Foster. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.
- Harvey, Alexander. William Dean Howells: A Study of the Achievement of a Literary Artist. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1917.
- Howells, Mildred, ed. Life in Letters of William Dean Howells. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1928.
- Jonsson, Inge. Emmanuel Swedenborg. Translated by Catherine Djurklou. New York: Twayne Publishing, 1971.
- Kirk, Clara M. "Reality and Actuality in the March Family Narratives of W. D. Howells." PMLA 74 (March 1959):137-152.
- Klinkowitz, Jerome. "Ethic and Aesthetic: the Basil and Isabel March Stories of William Dean Howells." Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):303-322.

- Kolb, Harold H., Jr. The Illusion of Life: American Realism as a Literary Form. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969.
- Mathews, James W. "The Heroines of Hawthorne and Howells." Tennessee Studies in Literature 7 (1962):37-46.
- Parks, Edd Winfield. "Howells and the Gentle Reader." South Atlantic Quarterly 50 (April 1951):239-247.
- Payne, Alma J. "The Family in the Utopia of William Dean Howells." Georgia Review 25 (Summer 1961):217-229.
- Towers, Tom H. "The Only Life We've Got: Myth and Morality in The Kentons." Modern Fiction Studies 16 (Autumn 1970):383-394.
- Vanderbilt, Kermit. The Achievement of William Dean Howells. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- _____. "Marcia Gaylord's Electra Complex: A Footnote to Sex in Howells." American Literature 34 (1962):365-374.
- _____. "The Undiscovered Country: Howells' Version of American Pastoral." American Quarterly 17 (Winter 1965):634-635.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. William Dean Howells: The Friendly Eye. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Wasserstrom, William. Heiress of all Ages: Sex and Sentiment in the Genteel Tradition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959.
- _____. "William Dean Howells: The Indelible Stain." New England Quarterly 32 (December 1959):486-495.
- Woodress, James and Stanley P. Anderson. "A Bibliography of Writing about William Dean Howells." American Literary Realism, Special Number (1969):1-139.