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WHAT'S IN A NAME?
RICHARDSON'S ROGER SOLMES AND
GALSWORTHY'S SOAMES FORSYTE

Linda Strahan

University of California, Riverside

Throughout Galsworthy's long and successful career as the quintessential English man of letters, his attitude toward the work of Richardson alternated between denigration and feigned indifference. Yet Richardson's Rogert Solmes serves as more than just a namesake for Galsworthy's Soames Forsyte; Soames Forsyte is the duplicate of Richardson's character in name, personality and attitude toward women. The flight of Clarissa foreshadows the flight of the fictional Irene—and the all-too-human Ada—because they are in essence running away from the same man. Thus, through an association provided by their homophonic nemeses, the character of Clarissa validates the unconventional behavior of Irene and pleads the Galsworthy's own case before a literate public. A discussion of literary and biographical factors influencing Galsworthy creates a context for an exploration of the similarities between Solmes and Soames which enriches both our reading of The Man of Property and our understanding of Galsworthy's relationship to his art.

Galsworthy was well aware of Clarissa. When discussing the English novel and its inclination to "self-indulgence," Galsworthy singled out the two works he believed most exemplify this disastrous trait: Ulysses and Clarissa.

The English novel, though on the whole perhaps more varied and rich than that of any other country, has—from Clarissa Marlowe down to Ulysses—been inclined to self-indulgence; it often goes to bed drunk.

Galsworthy's negative assessment of Richardson's greatest literary achievement would seem on the surface to eliminate Richardson as a role model for the later writer. Recently, however, literary criticism has acknowledged the relevance to inter-textual studies of one writer's disparagement of the achievement of another. Harold Bloom has argued that for the poet, denial of the power of his literary ancestor provides the necessary defense against his own fear of failure to measure up to his precursor: "The poet confronting his Great Original must find the fault that is not there."
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Galsworthy also denied Richardson’s power by failing to concede Richardson a place in the literary canon. In Galsworthy’s essays and addresses on various literary and social issues, many of which were gathered together by him and published under the title Candelabra because their purpose is to illuminate, he refers time and again to the great and familiar novelists who shaped the course of literary history. Richardson’s name is excluded from mention. In focused remarks about the two centuries of the English novel preceding his own, Galsworthy begins by “comparing Defoe, Fielding and Smollett with the Victorians” (p. 124). His plan, to shed light on the definition of sentimentality, glows as much from the figure left in the shadow as from those brought into the candlelight. Richardson’s shadow casts its image unrecognized over the mind and works of Galsworthy. Rita Goldberg points out in her book on Richardson and Diderot that Clarissa “is the sort of novel which filters through the roots of consciousness like a subterranean stream”5; the revolutionary work of Harold Bloom on literary influence6 has enabled critics to recognize that the old saw “a man is known as much by what he doesn’t say as what he does” applies to the writer as well as to his writing. Thus Galsworthy’s exclusion of Richardson’s name from his list of eighteenth century novelists may be even more significant than its mere inclusion would have been.

Critics, led perhaps by Galsworthy himself, place Galsworthy in a line which runs directly from Fielding to Thackeray to The Forsyte Saga.7 This position is valid only in so far as Richardson’s strong influence on Galsworthy in the early years began to fade, or perhaps be repressed, after The Man of Property. The relationship between Glasworthy and his precursor can be clarified by looking back at the origins of the novel in English. The English novel is commonly divided at the point of its inception in the eighteenth century into two distinct traditions. Fielding, whose Tom Jones is distinguished by its inclusion of neo-classical and epic elements, initiated one tradition. The other, more bourgeois, tradition, often referred to as formal realism commenced with the prose fictions of both Richardson and Defoe in spite of their obvious dissimilarities. In the ensuing history of the novel, the distinctions between these two traditions became blurred. Ian Watt asserts that this melding of the two types of fiction occurred as early as the same century in which they were born. His final chapter, “Realism and the later tradition: a note,” in The Rise of the Novel centers on a discussion of the reconciliation of the methods of
Richardson and Fielding in Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* and the works of Jane Austen.  

In light of the fusion Watt points out, I would suggest that in examining Galsworthy’s work the formal constructs are less significant than the authorial intent that occasioned their usage. Fielding proposes to present in his work a panoramic view of the whole of society, whereas Richardson conceives his task on a much smaller order (Watt, p. 251). The latter novelist’s concern is with a small group, a single household and those connected to it through kinship or commerce. The discrepancy in intent between the two writers results in two distinctly different kinds of novels. Fielding who privileges society and the social order emphasizes plot over character. Richardson, on the other hand, gives priority to the individual and concerns himself more strenuously with the development of character than of plot: *The Man of Property* is a bourgeois novel centered around the ramifications of the personality and desires of Soames Forsyte. Soames’ need for ownership becomes obsessive; it obliterates all compassion for the suffering of others. The increasing strength of his avidity determines the final outcome of the novel. Thus, despite Galsworthy’s disclaimers, a much closer family resemblance is recognizable between his novel and *Clarissa* than between it and *Tom Jones* or *Joseph Andrews*.

Only in retrospect, when taking all nine volumes of Galsworthy’s saga as a whole, does the influence of the Fielding tradition become evident. When Galsworthy expanded the simple plot of *The Man of Property* through the addition of the later works, a picture of the social structure in England in a specific period of time did begin to emerge. Richardson’s overt influence on the saga is confined to *The Man of Property*, the first book of the first trilogy. *The Man of Property* was published in 1906. Fourteen years elapsed before a more personally settled, mature Galsworthy returned to the Forsyte family. At that point he rethought the characters and repudiated or at least modified his earlier vision with a continuation of plot that earlier had seem resolved: “*The Man of Property* was so complete as a novel that to continue with it must have seemed pointless.” *The Forsyte Saga* turns the moving story of a love triangle and the woman pinned at its apex into only an incident within a *roman fluve*. This change lessens the impact of the earliest book, as the slammed door becomes a new beginning, not an ending. Irene shut away in her London-house prison will not die like Clarissa, but fight on in Vol. II. In order to become a survivor rather than a victim, Irene must come to resemble more closely heroines like Thackeray’s questionably respectable Becky Sharp or Beatrix, rather than the irreproachable Clarissa of Richardson’s pen. Catherine Dupre
points out that this precise transformation happens as the characters move from *The Man of Property* through *In Chancery* and into *To Let*: “So the ‘wicked’ Soames of the first novel becomes the ‘good’ Soames of the latter, and the ‘good’ Irene, who had never been very securely good, becomes the ‘at least not-very-good’ Irene” (Dupre, p. 251). Richardson’s model with its tragic resolution no longer oppresses Galsworthy with its possibility. Clarissa’s escape from Solmes results in her own re-imprisonment and death. Irene’s attempt to leave Soames is thwarted by the death of her lover, which returns her to the confines of marriage. Ada was more fortunate; her husband divorced her and she married John.

Though unexpected and slightly incongruous character transformation suggests that the married Galsworthy viewed the situation differently than Galsworthy the single and smitten young man, it also argues for a consideration of *The Man of Property* in the manner in which it was originally conceived, as a separate novel. Galsworthy worked on *The Man of Property* for a three year time span covering the years 1901-1905. In addition to being inspired by Richardson during this interval, he was impelled by his own personal situation, which he apparently understood in Richardson’s terms. Ada Galsworthy’s position, in this period, in some respects, paralleled that of Clarissa. Marriage with John, the man of her own choosing, remained an impossibility, although in her case the impediment was legal not familial. Ada was already married to John’s first cousin, Arthur. Identification of Soames with Arthur Galsworthy in the minds of Ada, John and their circle is made clear by the words Ada herself wrote to Rudolph and Vi Sauter, John Galsworthy’s nephew and his wife, in a letter after Arthur Galsworthy’s death: “Rosalie was here yesterday, and brought news of the death of ‘Soames’ (Major Galsworthy)” (Dupre, p. 114). The distress felt by John’s immediate family over his decision to publish his own story is also discussed in letters written by his sisters (Dupre, pp. 110-114). Speculation as to Galsworthy’s motivation for postponing his scandal of an elopement with Ada until after his father’s death bears no real relevance to a discussion of his works. Whether protection of his father’s sensibilities or of his own sizable inheritance prohibited the quick resolution of an obviously uncomfortable situation, the issue at stake for Galsworthy is unchanged: women are denied any escape from a marital destiny decided upon social and financial considerations alone. To run away with another man, as did Clarissa Harlowe and eventually, Ada Galsworthy, is to invite scandal and ruination. The very circumstances confronting Galsworthy which he inscribed in his most
noteworthy novel were originally detailed by the novelist he perhaps perversely scorned as “self-indulgent”: Samuel Richardson.

Ada Galsworthy and countless other women before and since the illustrious Clarissa all chose scandal over security. Clarissa, terrified by the arrangements for her marriage to Solmes being made by her family, falls easy victim to Lovelace’s lies. She goes with Lovelace, leaving her family behind but thinking to find refuge with another family, that of Lovelace. If her ultimate destination is to be the church, it can only be to participate in a different ceremony than that planned by the Harlowes. Ironically her journey does end at the church which blesses her final resting place, rather than her marriage bed. Irene similarly leaves her husband Soames to go to her lover, Phillip Bosinney. The note she leaves behind, which says “I think I have taken nothing that you or your people have given me,”\(^\text{11}\) indicates her complete rejection of Soames and the finality of her decision. By her disdain of the jewels he has bought her, Soames himself recognizes that she understands the full implications of her act: “Nothing that she could have done, nothing that she ‘had’ done, brought home to him like this the inner significance of her act” (TMOP, 317). But Bosinney has already died and Irene returns to No. 62 Montpellier Square “like an animal wounded to death” (TMOP, 340). So John Galsworthy must have pictured Ada as she returned from one of their many encounters to the home of Maj. Galsworthy.

Ada and John became lovers as early as 1895, although their marriage did not take place until Sept. 3, 1905. John Galsworthy writes in his diary on Sept. 3, 1916, of “‘our wedding day of twenty-one years ago; ‘de facto’ if not as yet ‘de jure’ then” (Dupre, p. 55). Ada had to have known the social consequences of her act; yet she faced them boldly and willingly. As Catherine Dupre observes,

It is impossible not to feel some admiration for Ada’s courage in embarking on a second relationship that was outside the social pale. Now, at the age of thirty, Ada as a married woman agreed to become the mistress of John Galsworthy; to become once again the object of ‘nice’ people’s scorn and pity. (Dupre, p. 55)

Ada encouraged John to become a writer. Her comment to him at the Gare du Nord, “‘Why don’t you become a writer? It’s just the thing for you’” apparently gave him the idea (Holloway, p. 21). Their love gave him a cause. Galsworthy needed to find the right literary vehicle to present Ada’s affair with him sympathetically. Although many literary
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critics wish to guard against reading the author’s life into his art, such caution is probably counterproductive for Galsworthy scholars. Dudley Barker suggests that

The dangers of culling biography from experiences which a writer has transmuted into a novel are obvious, though they are perhaps less than usual in the case of Galsworthy. He was not a highly imaginative novelist but rather a careful observer who had the patience (and the time) to acquire an immense technical skill. (Barker, p. 79)

At the time he was writing The Man of Property John Galsworthy lacked confidence in his own talent as a writer, so he used every resource available to him to improve his craft. His awareness of his own shortcomings made him unusually conscientious in his acknowledgements of literary debts to friends, family, editors and other writers both alive and dead. In the early years of his career, he solicited the advice of his wife, Joseph Conrad, Ford Maddox Hueffer and his publisher’s reader, Edward Garnett. The correspondence between Garnett and Galsworthy over the fate of Bosinney radically altered the final shape of The Man of Property and was instrumental in helping Galsworthy come to terms with the nature of the character he himself created. Galsworthy recognized this debt and characteristically expressed his gratitude in the simple dedication, "To Edward Garnett," which precedes the novel. Galsworthy also stressed the fact that his inspiration came from the books of men like de Maupassant and Turgeniev, from them he received “an insight into proportion of theme and economy of words” (Barker, p. 79). In light of Galsworthy’s willingness to give credit to so many mentors, his failure to acknowledge his dependence upon Richardson for the character of Soames Forsyte is uncharacteristic and intriguing.

Although no critic has yet pointed them out, the parallels between Solmes and Soames are clearly more than coincidental. The actions and personalities of the two characters in Clarissa inform and regulate those of their inheritors in The Man of Property. An examination of the two sets of characters together clarifies this relationship. Richardson’s Solmes has money and the mores of society on his side. Clarissa already occupies a somewhat unusual financial position within that society. Her grandfather in his will passed over his father, uncles, brother and sister and bequeathed to Clarissa a house and estate of her own. Her inheritance and the “social claim to independence” which it gives her are in actuality the impetus behind her family’s insistence on
the alliance with Solmes. The marriage will unite the estates of the two families and cost the Harlowes nothing as “Solmes is very rich but he is meanly born, and in return for such a grand alliance will not expect any more dowry from Clarissa than her grandfather’s estates, which is already hers and whose loss therefore cannot in any case be avoided” (Watt, p. 221). The meanness of Solmes’ birth puts the Harlowes at an advantage which Christopher Hill describes in his essay, “Clarissa Harlove and her Times”: “Mr. Solmes was ideal for their [the Harlowe’s] purposes. He had no relations whom he valued, and was prepared to bid high for the honor of union with the Harlowe’s.”14 Solmes’ bid inclues a willingness to overlook the claims of his own relations—“rob,” them as Clarissa puts it,15—and allow the combined estates of himself and Clarissa to revert to the Harlowes if he has no children. Clarissa was put into her present position through her grandfather’s exercise of will which privileges individual preference over convention and Clarissa has only her own feelings and the strength of her individual will to offer as a defense against the match. But Richardson proved, at least in the case of Clarissa, that feelings can be enough. The theme of feelings over fortune succeeds, it seems, where feelings are engendered by a spiritual repugnance rather than sexual passion.

Clarissa’s growing repulsion for Mr. Solmes appears noble; Galsworthy’s heroine must also be motivated by superior sensitivity. Their situations, while not the same, must be seen as the same because the women face the same threat. The danger of becoming Mrs. Solmes is expanded into the horror of being Mrs. Soames. It is at this point, where the menace is given a single homophonic name, that the texts merge. Clinamen is Bloom’s term for a point in a text where the misreading of the earlier work by the later writer allows him to alter the direction his own work will take. Bloom feels this movement is corrective in nature and deliberate on the part of the belated writer. Galsworthy undoubtedly felt that alteration and correction were necessary in light of the ending of Clarissa (Bloom, Anxiety, pp. 14, 19-45).

As Clarissa’s family becomes increasingly determined in their efforts to marry her to Mr. Solmes, she comes to recognize with a greater awareness the fate that is about to overtake her. The key words “Mrs. Solmes” and “Solmes’ wife” begin to appear frequently in her letters as she reports the conversations of others and her own thoughts. The words take on the quality of a litany or refrain punctuating and encircling all other thoughts and actions in the first section of the novel. Her family urges her “to think of being Mrs. Solmes” (Clarissa,
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Letter 16, 89) and eventually instruct her that she “must of necessity... be Solmes’ wife” (Clarissa, Letter 19, 105), until finally, when she is poised indecisively at the gate, Lovelace is able to manipulate her with these very same words. He inserts them into his speech three times, each time augmenting their ability to give immediacy to the threat they hold for her. First he simply asks, “Would you stay to be Solmes’ wife” (Clarissa, Letter 94, 375). Then he explains, “If you stay, you will inevitably be Solmes’ wife” (Clarissa, Letter 94, 375). Lastly he attempts to show her that she has no time left to waiver because “it will be more than a risk if you go back, that you will on Wednesday’s next be Solmes’ wife” (Clarissa, Letter 94, 375).

The terror that these words held for Clarissa reverberates in their usage throughout The Man of Property. Irene is also referred to as “Mrs. Soames” or “Soames’s wife,” especially by the older members of the family. The old aunts call June by her Christian name but Irene is assigned a title connoting her marital status, although the two women are close in age and bosom friends. The distinction is maintained when discussing the two simultaneously, as in the following report:

Had she [June] not said to Mrs. Soames—who was always so beautifully dressed—that feathers were vulgar? Mrs. Soames had actually given up wearing feathers, so dreadfully downright was dear June!

(TMOP, 6)

Other family members and social acquaintances delight in choosing this particular epithet to describe sightings of Irene and Bosinney together. Mrs. McAnders’s remark which precipitates the rape is phrased in just such suggestive terminology: “...whom do you think I passed in Richmond Park? You’ll never guess—Mrs. Soames and—Mr. Bosinney” (TMOP, 265). Even the servants identify Irene in this manner, so that James, when he calls at No. 62, is told not that Mrs. Forsythe or Irene but that “Mrs. Soames was in” (TMOP, 242). Conventional usage aside, the fact that the names are homophones and the phrases repeated in a liturgical manner in both Clarissa and The Man of Property causes the identification between Clarissa and Irene, as well as between Solmes and Soames, to be made.

While the obvious means of association between Solmes and Soames is an auditory one, the visual identification between the two men is also strong. It is not so much their physical appearance in which they resemble each other, but in their manner, the impression their persons project to the world. The expression on their faces rather
than the features themselves reveal a relationship of spirit not of blood. To Clarissa, Mr. Solmes looks "odious" (Clarissa, Letter 16, 87). She is repelled less by his lack of physical beauty, though she often calls him "ugly" (Clarissa, Letter 21, 113 and again 114), than by his indifference to his own shortcomings. As he attempts to insinuate himself into her family, he approaches them "with 'so much' assurance in his looks" (Clarissa, Letter 16, 87). In The Man of Property, "flat-shouldered, clean-shaved, flat-cheeked, flat-waisted" (TMOP, 14) Soames Forsyte seems unremarkable in appearance except for the "habitual sniff" on his face (TMOP, 2). Physiognomy by will not by nature best describes Solmes and Soames; both show the world at a glance that they are men confident of their place in it. Their confidence arises out of their wealth, their business acumen and their knowledge that they have always been faithful to their duty. A physical presence that suggests such attributes, while rejected by Clarissa and Irene, is appreciated by the other Harlowes and Forsytes. Clarissa's family wants her to marry Solmes for these very characteristics: "'He' an honest man! 'His' a good mind, madam! 'He' a virtuous man" (Clarissa, Letter 16, 92). Soames Forsyte similarly is recognized by all as having an opinion "worth having" (TMOP, 17) and the older members of the Forsyte family see in him their hope for the future for he is "a sure trustee of the family soul" (TMOP, 44), which in the case of the Forsyte family is synonymous with money. Like Solmes he has no vices in the eyes of the world: "It was not as if he drank! Did he run into debt, or gamble or swear; was he violent; were his friends rackety, did he stay out at night? On the contrary" (TMOP, 54).

It is not the physical mannerisms alone that unite the two characters. The manner in which they are perceived by the world is closely allied to the manner characteristic of their approach to it. More than any other quality tenacity defines their conduct. Both men choose to pursue women who are not interested in their proposals and, in fact, are repulsed by the very manner that other people esteem. Neither man is able to express his desire in words that might help to overcome the feminine objections to his suit. Although persistent with their presence, both men are rendered inarticulate in the face of emotion. Roger Solmes, in spite of his attempts at flowery speech, is handicapped by his perpetual, unattractive stutter and Soames Forsyte's taciturn nature reflects the niggardliness of his soul. Mute but undaunted, both continue in their suit in spite of numerous rejections. Soames is determined to marry Irene, although "she refused him five times" (TMOP, 19). Solmes has repeatedly pressed his addresses upon Clarissa in spite of her supplications to him to withdraw them,
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declaring that he “was determined to persevere” (Clarissa, Letter 53, 226). He is continually at Clarissa’s home until she is forced to take notice and remark upon it: “A strange diligence in this man! He says he almost lives upon the place; and I think so too” (Clarissa, Letter 86, 352). Soames Forsyte employs the same tactic in his courtship of Irene. For a year and a half “he had besieged and lain in wait for her” and kept “her other admirers away with his perpetual presence” (TMOP, 55). Perseverance, an unwillingness to abandon their objective, and an absolute belief that sheer will alone can ultimately gain their end characterizes these two men.

The behavior of the overzealous lovers is a natural outgrowth of their attitude toward women. This attitude is influenced by one important fact: both men are rich. Their money in the past enabled them to purchase many valuable items. Roger Solmes has centered his covetousness on land and houses, while Soames Forsyte has broadened the scope of his acquisitions to include “pictures.” Nevertheless, both men feel that their wealth gives them the right to possess any object other men value—including women. Clarissa and Irene are both desired by other men, a fact which increases their value to Solmes and Soames. Clarissa’s had is known to have been sought by a Mr. Symmes, a Mr. Mullins and a Mr. Wyerley, and even the notorious Lovelace’s interest in her is well known. In a similar mode, Soames carefully notes the appreciative glances of other men as they regard Irene, “Her power of attraction...[was] part of her value as his property” (TMOP, 55). Women, to Solmes and Soames, are objects whose worth is basically determined by their popularity in the market place, not their fortune. Mr. Solmes could have married Clarissa’s older sister Bella, Clarissa even having offered to settle her grandfather’s estate upon them if he did. But Bella obviously lacked Clarissa’s beauty and sweet nature, as well as her appeal to other men, and Solmes, therefore, found her unworthy of his consideration. Soames, for his part, is told from the first instant he sees Irene that “she’s a nice girl, a pretty girl, but no money” (TMOP, 117). Still he wanted her because he recognized that others wanted her and he is determined to possess her.

The two men of money believe that by virtue of their wealth they have the right to buy anything of value they desire: their money should be able to secure for them a particular woman just as it would a farm or a painting. As Soames Forsyte later thinks when looking around his home and appraising its worth:

Could a man own anything prettier than this dining-table with its deep tint, the starry, soft-petalled roses, the
rubycoloured glass, and the quaint silver furnishing; could a
man own anything prettier than the woman who sat at it?
(TMOP, 29)

While neither man is naive enough to assume that contracting for a
wife is as simple a matter as making financial contracts, they both use
the same approach to winning the love of a woman as they would to
obtain the good will of a business associate. They ply them with gifts.
Solmes makes generous settlements on Clarissa’s family (Letter 13,
81) and Soames Forsyte buys Irene gowns and jewels (TMOP, 317).
Both assume that since they have displayed their financial prowess and
generosity to the object of their affection, love will surely result in
time. Neither one has conceived that other factors might be relevant to
the arrangement and might influence the women’s decision. It is
simply a matter of value for value, and in marriage, the man has the
advantage of a buyer’s market. Solmes and Soames are unaware that as
far as they are concerned on the stock market controlled by Cupid there
is always a depression. Sobriety and wealth are not legal tender in the
realm of emotions, a domain where Solmes and Soames are paupers.

Clarissa rejects Solmes as one “whom my heart, unbidden, resists”
(Clarissa, Letter 16, 91) and Irene finds that even though she has
become Soames’s wife “she had made a mistake, and did not love him,
and tried to love him and could not love him” (TMOP, 54). The middle
class world finds determination and seeking value for a dollar admirable
qualities and fails to recognize the obvious, that in spite of these traits
these two men ultimately remain unlovable. The middle class
characteristics these men possess are not in themselves necessarily
distasteful to Irene and Clarissa, but Solmes and Soames have no other
facets to their personalities. They are as much what their money has
made them as what they have made of their money. From their
viewpoint, wealth belongs to them by virtue of their accomplishments
and their upright natures, which are free from vices and characterized by
strength of will. Their wealth entitles them to the good opinion of the
world, and that general esteem should be sufficient for any woman in
particular. It was not enough, however, for Clarissa, for Irene—or for
Ada Galsworthy.

In the eighteenth century, Clarissa’s mother identifies Solmes as “a
man of probity” (Clarissa, Letter 6, 90). With an echo of that epithet,
Soames Forsyte is recognized by all as “the man of property” (TMOP,
23). Galsworthy, for reasons of his own, has managed to muffle this
echo with a cacophony of literary false notes, and literary critics have
failed to recover it. Readers, however, who hear Galsworthy’s fine
melodic line enriched by the texture of Richardson’s bass should listen
secure in the knowledge that they at least are not tone deaf.

NOTES

1 At the time The Man of Property was being written, Ada
Galsworthy was the wife of Arthur Galsworthy, John’s cousin.
John and Ada were in love. This situation, I intend to argue,
impels Galsworthy’s misreading of Clarissa which produces The
Man of Property.

2 John Galsworthy, Candelabra, “Six Novelists in Profile” (New
York, 1933), p. 139.

31.
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8 Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Berkeley and Los Angeles,
1957), pp. 290-299.

9 Catherine Dupre, John Galsworthy A Biography (St. James’s

10 For a detailed treatment of the subject see The Man of
Principle where Dudley Barter reiterates Ada’s official explanation
as told to Marrot and augments his discussion of the issue with
some other “relevant facts.” (New York, 1963), pp. 66-68.

317. Subsequent references to this edition are included
parenthetically in the text and will be abbreviated as TMOP.

12 For an examination of this correspondence crucial to the
working out of the plot of The Man of Property in its final form
see Galsworthy’s letters to Garnett, ed. Letters from John


15 Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa* (Middlesex England, New York, Victoria, Australia, Ontario, Canada, Aukland, New Zealand, 1985), Letter 13, 81. Further references to this edition will be included parenthetically in the text by letter and page numbers.