

TRACING THE THREAD:
A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF *THE TURN OF THE SCREW*

By

ELIZABETH SUZANNE EMOND

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1984

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of English)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

June 1986

© Elizabeth Suzanne Emond

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of English

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date 86/7/9

Abstract

One of the finest examples of artistic ambiguity is Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw*, which was first published in 1898 in *Collier's* magazine, then revised slightly for book publication in *The Two Magics* later that year. Approximately three hundred more substantive revisions to the text were made before James published it in the New York Edition in 1908. These revisions, as my thesis shows, neither increase nor decrease the existing ambiguity of the story, but polarize it between a casual reading and a close one, such that the former renders the tale as a ghost story, and the latter as a story about a seriously disturbed governess. My contention is that James revised the tale not because his own interpretation of it changed, but because his conception of the best way to tell the story changed. James wished to tell a tale of evil, and his revisions enable him to tell two equally evil tales in the same breath.

Over eighty percent of James' revisions for the New York Edition fall into one or the other of two categories of equal size: those that increase the governess' credibility, and those that increase her psychosis. Each category occupies a chapter, within which the revisions are grouped and tabulated according to the specific functions which they serve—with appropriate explanatory commentary, of course. Chapter I examines the intensification of the governess' disturbed state of mind; Chapter II addresses itself to the methods James used to give his narrator a tone of authority.

None of James' revisions to *The Turn of the Screw* could be called extensive; most involve only the change, or the addition, or the transposition, of a single

word. Yet, in aggregate they show, more clearly than anything could, what James' own interpretation of the tale was. Moreover, they point readers to a standard of close reading for a James text. And finally, they show us the powerful effect on a story of a few hundred tiny but subtle substantive revisions.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I: The Case Against the Governess	7
Chapter II: The Governess' Cover	37
Conclusion	57
End Notes	59
Bibliography	62
Appendix	64

List of Tables

Table 1: Preliminary Impeachments	8
Table 2: "Edelisms"	12
Table 3: Suspiciously Schizophrenic Symptoms	15
Table 4: Naivete	18
Table 5: Grandiosity	18
Table 6: Paranoia	22
Table 7: Court and Prison Terms	24
Table 8: Morbidity	26
Table 9: Disassociation	28
Table 10: Thoughts of Employment	30
Table 11: Sexuality	32
Table 12: Violence	33
Table 13: Reactions to the Governess	35
Table 14: Corrections	37

Table 15:	
Contractions	39
Table 16:	
Indirect Speech	42
Table 17:	
Miscellaneous Conversationalisms	43
Table 18:	
Clarifiers	43
Table 19:	
Parallelisms	45
Table 20:	
Description	46
Table 21:	
Simplifications	48
Table 22:	
Economy of Expression	50
Table 23:	
Measurement	53
Table 24:	
Miscellaneous and Whimsical Revisions	66

Introduction

Time is the test of every work of literature. Even the work that is a major success on its first appearance may not be able to maintain an audience as the social conditions that produce it change over the course of years. Does a story, then, survive by stating so profound and universal a truth that every one of its readers can understand and appreciate it? Perhaps-- but the story in which everyone finds something different, the story that is flexible enough to accommodate a reader of nearly any day and age, follows a more interesting course. Ambiguity can be one of the greatest strengths of a tale, and the following paper proposes to examine the construction of a masterpiece of ambiguity, Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw*.

Over the course of its publishing history, *The Turn of the Screw* has inspired dozens of critical studies devoted to explaining what "really" happens in the story. What ostensibly happens in the story is, no doubt, familiar to my reader: a governess tells the story of how, as a young girl on her first job, she was plagued by the ghosts of her predecessor and her predecessor's lover, and how she defended the souls of the children in her care from the evil that she knew threatened them.

Critics have asked what is behind the governess' story. Is *The Turn of the Screw* really a story about ghosts who come to steal children's souls, as the governess would have us think, and as thousands of readers (opera librettist

Myfanwy Piper, for one¹) have obligingly thought? Or have the ghosts come to work their evil on the governess, as critic Allen Tate once suggested?² Is the tale, as Edmund Wilson and Oscar Cargill have both proposed, a psychological account of a sexually repressed governess who hallucinates ghosts?³ C. Knight Aldritch, M.D., has hypothesized that Mrs. Grose, the housekeeper, is actually the illegitimate mother of the children (by their Harley Street "uncle"), and that she is working to drive the governess insane by suggesting, then denying, the existence of the spirits.⁴ Douglas, the governess' friend from the framing narrative, has not been forgotten, either--Louis D. Rubin appears convinced that Douglas is Miles grown up and reading a fictionalized account of his sister's old governess' love for him.⁵

But what did Henry James think? And--which is a much more interesting question--how did he contrive to tell the tale so as not to make his thoughts obvious? We might expect to find the answer to the first of these, at least, in James' own critical remarks on *The Turn of the Screw*, such as those found in the Preface to Volume XII of the New York Edition of *The Novels and Tales of Henry James* (in which *The Turn of the Screw* appears), but if so, we are out of luck. Henry James' comments on the tale are as cryptic and ambiguous as the tale itself, as we realize when we consider the wide range of critics who cite the same passages from his criticism. For example, both Edna Kenton, who was one of the first proponents of what we may call the "Mad Governess" interpretation, and Oliver Evans, whose "James' Air of Evil: *The Turn of the Screw*" staunchly supports the governess, quote the same sentence from James' Preface in support of their respective views: " . . . it is a piece of ingenuity pure and simple, of cold artistic calculation, an *amulette* designed to catch those not easily caught (the 'fun' of the capture of the merely witless being ever but small), the jaded, the disillusioned, the fastidious."⁶ Let us, then,

avoid James as a secondary source (for the Preface appears to be a part of his trap for the jaded), and look directly at the work while we pose a single question. What did Henry James make of *The Turn of the Screw*?

"To make of" is an interesting phrase. We use it when we are referring to interpreting ("What do you make of all that?"), yet the literal meaning of the words suggests fashioning an object from materials at hand. A writer does both, of course--interprets and fashions--when he revises. When Henry James re-read *The Turn of the Screw*, and made the changes in wording we shall examine, he took the raw material of his copytext and turned out a more finished product. He made something *from* the earlier text. That is what anyone does when he "makes something" of an event or a narrative: he takes the incoming data (from whatever source), and edits it into a more "finished"--more structured, more meaningful--form. Consciously or unconsciously, revision and interpretation go hand in hand.

James revised *The Turn of the Screw* twice that we know of: once after sending a typescript of the tale to *Collier's* magazine, when preparing the first book version, *The Two Magics*; and once again for the 1908 New York Edition. He had dictated the story to his typist, James MacAlpine (trying without success, he said once, to make MacAlpine "leap from his chair"⁷), and the chances are that he revised the first typescript, for he regularly did so with his stories,⁸ but those early copies of the tale are now lost. The *Collier's* edition appeared in weekly installments, beginning in volume 20, number 17 (27 January 1898), and running until volume 21, number 2 (16 April 1898). On the date of the first installment of the serial, the British Museum received a second version of *The Turn of the Screw*, for copyright purposes, which differs from the first by approximately three hundred substantives. William Heinemann of London published that second version in October of 1898, at the same time that the Macmillan Company of New York published an edition of

The Two Magics. For this study, I collated the *Collier's* edition, the first American book version, and the New York Edition. Unfortunately, the William Heinemann edition could not be obtained by the time of writing; however, Robert Kimbrough, who edited *The Turn of the Screw* for the Norton edition of 1966, assures us that the 1898 London edition differs from the 1898 Macmillan edition only in a few accidentals of commas and hyphenation, and he, to judge from his abbreviated textual apparatus, considers a punctuation change to be a substantive revision if it affects the meaning of a phrase.⁹ Therefore, we seem secure in considering the American and English 1898 editions of *The Two Magics* to have, for our purposes, equal textual authority. James corrected a copy of one of them for the New York Edition, which differs from its *Two Magics* copytext in nearly four hundred substantives.

Fortunately for textual critics, James gave his complete approval to the New York Edition. In 1914, in a letter to J. B. Pinker, he stated that Martin Secker might publish *The Uniform Tales of Henry James*, but "on [Secker's] distinct understanding, please, that he conform literatim and punctuatim to [the New York Edition] text. It is vital that he adhere to that authentic punctuation--to the last comma or rather, more essentially, no-comma."¹⁰ We shall hold James to this sanction (although there is no need to take it as far as obvious typographical errors), and focus our attention on the differences between the New York Edition and the 1898 Macmillan *Two Magics* edition, without fear that we are examining revisions which James did not choose to make.

This is not, of course, the first textual analysis of *The Turn of the Screw*. However, it is the first to examine the ambiguity built into the story. Earlier textual critics have generally concentrated on determining James' interpretation of the story. Even there, however, opinions have diverged, although we shall see why by the end of our study. John Raunheim finds in his 1972 NYU dissertation, "A Study of the Revisions of the Tales of

Henry James Included in the New York Edition," that "the revisions . . . tend to accentuate all of [the governess'] eccentricities,"¹¹ and, as we shall see in Chapter I of the present work, his statement is true of many of the revisions. But it is not true for all, or even half of them. In 1976, David Timms, in "The Governess' Feelings and the Argument from Textual Revision of *The Turn of the Screw*," concludes that "James revised for clarity and elegance, not to reveal the state of the governess' mind,"¹² but the revisions to which he must refer are not all, or even half, of the revisions. The closest approach to our reading has been made by Thomas M. Cranfill and Robert L. Clark, Jr., who agree that the governess is unhinged, but claim that "practically without exception [James'] alterations are improvements, stylistically and semantically."¹³ But many important revisions are not, as we shall see, improvements, and even if they were, Drs. Cranfill and Clark do not address themselves to the significance of stylistic improvements in the writings of an unhinged narrator. If we are to arrive at a reasonable picture of Henry James' state of mind as he read *The Turn of the Screw*, then we must examine and account for all the substantive variants.

When we do so, we find that James made the governess' speech more fluid and polished in 1908: she contracts words in direct quotations more often, and she eliminates the word "that" from expressions of reported speech. At the same time, her syntax is more elegant and her descriptions are more vivid and seemingly more accurate. But the 1908 narrator is also a more eccentric character than her *Two Magics* predecessor: she interprets events in a more morbid fashion, and her perceptions are no longer all we would wish of an objective reporter.

Those of us who have ever had the misfortune to associate with a chronic liar and hear him tell the same story again and again may recognize a pattern,

especially when we realize that not a single revision of 1908 adds substance to the ghosts. The only revisions that could be said to vindicate the governess, to add to her credibility, occur in the *way* she tells her tale, not in what she *says*. What she has to say sounds more and more bizarre as she proceeds from edition to edition, but she becomes more conventional at saying it. To read the first three versions of *The Turn of the Screw* gives one as clear an idea of the governess, compared to reading only one version, as looking at a moving picture would compared to looking at a photograph. In any particular edition of the tale, the governess is well-spoken enough to gain the unquestioning trust of a naive reader, and even to face down the close scrutiny of a generous reader. But the worldly-wise collationist is forced to conclude that James did not place any reliance on the governess, no matter how well she used words.

None of James' revisions to *The Turn of the Screw* could be called extensive; most involve only the change, or the addition, or the transposition, of a single word. Yet, in aggregate, they show clearly James' own view of his "irresponsible little fiction."¹⁴ Moreover, they point to a standard of close reading for a James text, by showing James' care for the finest details of his finished products. But their greatest importance lies in what they tell us about stories in general--that a few hundred tiny changes in wording can have a subtle but powerful effect on a story. We shall see in the following chapters how powerful that effect is.

Chapter I

The Case Against the Governess

The governess has always been a liar. As Oscar Cargill points out in his 1956 essay "Henry James as Freudian Pioneer" (*Chicago Review*, 10, 13-29), she lies to Mrs. Grose about the contents of her letter to the master, and about Flora's conduct during the first meeting with Miss Jessel's shade, and about the encounter with that lady's ghost in the schoolroom--where we, the readers, witness that the only words spoken are our heroine's.

Several critics have leapt to the governess' defense since Dr. Cargill's paper appeared. Among the most emphatic is Alexander E. Jones, who, in "Point of View in *The Turn of the Screw*," specifically attacks the last-mentioned of Cargill's defamations:

Of course, she [the governess] does not flatly state that Miss Jessel has talked to her; rather, she says, "It came to that"--that is, the encounter has been *equivalent* [italics Jones] to a conversation since Miss Jessel's facial expression has spoken volumes. But as might be expected, Mrs. Grose misunderstands the governess' remark--and so does Cargill, who confuses overstatement with deliberate falsehood.

One trusts that Dr. Jones has more respect for the truth in the conversations of his daily life. He goes on:

When the governess later mentions the above scene to Mrs. Grose, the latter asks, "Do you mean she spoke?" And the governess replies, "It came to that," by which she means, "It amounted to that." Where is the deception? At most, the governess can be charged only with ambiguity.¹

Although Dr. Jones' rationalizations may satisfy some, especially if they have grown morally lax, we may intelligently permit ourselves to take a more

suspicious view of our main character after we look at a few of James' modifications to her, listed below in Table I, which show her to be more manipulative and more ambiguous in 1908 than she had been in 1898.

TABLE 1*

PRELIMINARY IMPEACHMENTS

Revision Number	
19	wish not to show it TM 18] wish <i>not</i> to show it NY 160]
36	I hesitated TM 25] I cast about NY 166]
64	that I could sound TM 44] that I might easily sound NY 180]
112a	I have it from you TM 63] I <i>have</i> it from you NY 196]
130a	in these circumstances TM 69] amid these elements NY 200]
141	"Yes. But someone TM 73] "Never. But some one NY 204]

* The tables which follow show the variant readings in their historical order, rather than in order of preferred reading, so as to illustrate the development of the New York Edition.

The letters and the texts which they identify are as follows:

C the edition which appeared in *Collier's* magazine in Volumes XX (27 Jan. - 2 Apr.) and XXI (9 - 16 Apr.), 1898. Reference to pages in the *Collier's* edition is explained in the Appendix.

TM the first American edition, published by the Macmillan Company of New York in *The Two Magics*, set up in September, 1898.

NY *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, New York Edition, Volume XII, published in New York by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1908.

Where a text is not referred to in a given entry, its reading is the same as the one in *The Two Magics*.

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
175a	<i>not</i> literally 'ever,' TM 84] <i>not</i> , truly, 'ever,' NY 212]
176	It was a dreadfully austere inquiry TM 84] It was a straight question enough NY 212]
181	so far as a frank overture on the subject to Miss Jessel C 13b] so far on the subject as a frank overture to Miss Jessel TM 85] so far on the subject as a frank overture to Miss Jessel would take her NY 212]
190	but I shall not TM 87] though I shall not NY 214]
285	by a governess whose prime TM 118] by a person enjoying his confidence and whose prime NY 239]
382	<i>They're</i> in C 24a] <i>They're</i> in TM 161] <i>They'll</i> be in NY 271]
389	with a confidence! TM 164] with an assurance! NY 274]
430a	you will, at the worst TM 184] you at the worst NY 289]
435a	but I just hesitated TM 186] but I just waited NY 290]
457	he had been driven TM 195] he had been expelled NY 297]

Let us consider a few of these in detail, beginning with the first, which occurs during the governess' first meeting with Mrs. Grose. The latter, the governess declares, is so glad to see her "as to be positively on her guard against showing it too much. I wondered even then a little why she should wish not [1898; *not*, 1908] to show it" Our heroine, in other words, opens her acquaintance with the housekeeper by accusing the latter of concealing

something--and strengthens the force of that concealment in the New York Edition. What are we to make of it when one character makes an unprovable allegation against another? Were these flesh-and-blood characters, we would have to entertain the notion that the governess is lying to us, and leaving Mrs. Grose no scope for defense.

But there are variants yet more damaging to the governess' credibility in the above table. Consider revision #130a. The governess has taken Flora to the pond, where the child is playing a "let's pretend" game, which involves the governess as "something very important and very quiet," and the pond as the Sea of Azof. "Suddenly," tells the 1898 governess, "in these circumstances, I became aware that . . . we had an interested spectator," who turns out to be Miss Jessel's ghost. However, in 1908, the governess becomes aware of the ghost, not "in these circumstances," but "amid these elements"--which are the elements of fantasy, of making-believe. Inspired by Flora's game, the governess takes up one of her own.

Certainly the 1908 governess is well into a make-believe game by the time the story is half done. Witness the following exchange between our heroine and Mrs. Grose, as of 1898:

"And who's to make [the children's uncle take them away?" demands the governess.]

She had been scanning the distance, but she now dropped on me a foolish face. "You, Miss."

"By writing to him that his house is poisoned and his little nephew and niece mad?"

"But if they *are*, Miss?"

"And if I am myself, you mean? That's charming news to be sent him by a governess whose prime undertaking was to give him no worry."

As of the New York Edition, the governess has advanced herself a few steps.

She no longer calls herself "a governess" in the last speech; instead, she ex-claims,

"That's charming news to be sent to him by a person enjoying his confidence and whose prime undertaking was to give him no worry."
(#285)

It must surely come as a surprise to the close reader of the New York Edition (or its descendants) that the governess is a person enjoying the master's confidence. By her own account--or rather, by Douglas' in the framing narrative--she has only met her employer twice. If we are not to make the absurd assumption that Henry James did not know what "confidence" meant, then we must assume that he himself did not place much reliance on the governess' word.

In fact, from her first appearance in 1898, James did not seem to have had faith in his character's narrative, as we can see from a brief glance at the revisions to the *Collier's* edition for *The Two Magics*. Throughout her tale, the governess has claimed that the children have never spoken of Miss Jessel, that she has never heard the former governess' name pass anyone's lips. Yet, in *The Two Magics*, when Mrs. Grose mentions the late governess' name for the first time, our governess recognizes it immediately:

Then, to show how I had thought it all out: "My predecessor--the one who died."

"Miss Jessel?"

"Miss Jessel. You don't believe me?" (*TM*, pp. 73-74)

The governess' last question successfully distracts Mrs. Grose, but it need not distract us. Where did the governess learn Miss Jessel's name, to react so positively? In the *Collier's* edition, she had learned it long before, in an early conversation with Mrs. Grose in Part II (p. 4b), but that mention is gone from subsequent editions. How, then, does she come to respond so flatly with "Miss Jessel"--rather than, say, "Was that her name?"? Does she

know Peter Quint's history much better than she has previously let on, or is she pretending to recognize a name that she has never heard before? Either way, her integrity is tarnished.

The next group of variants which we shall examine damages her reputation still further. These were noted by Leon Edel in his introduction to *The Turn of the Screw* in *The Ghostly Tales of Henry James*, where he remarks that James' revisions for the New York Edition "alter the nature of the governess' testimony from that of a report of things observed, perceived, recalled, to things *felt*."²

TABLE 2

"EDELISMS"

Revision Number	
10b	appeared to me TM 17] affected me NY 159]
16	The only thing indeed that in this early outlook might have made me shrink again was the clear circumstance TM 18] The one appearance indeed that in this early outlook might have made me shrink again was that NY 159]
18	I perceived within TM 18] I felt within NY 159]
59	I had the sharpest sense TM 41] it was intense to me NY 178]
81	I found nothing at all TM 47] I could reconstitute nothing at all NY 182]
150	see their evocation TM 78] trace their evocation NY 207]
158	was least TM 80] seemed least NY 209]
162	I had already found to be a thing TM 81] I had already recognised as a resource NY 210]

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
197	when, by an irresistible impulse, I found myself catching them up and pressing them to my heart TM 91] when I knew myself to catch them up by an irresistible impulse and press them to my heart NY 217]
219	I saw that there was someone TM 96] I knew that there was a figure NY 222]
225	perceived an agitation TM 99] noticed an agitation NY 224]
231	to prove that TM 102] to show how NY 226]
237	with watching I had happened to feel C 16b] with watching, I had felt TM 103] with vigils, I had conceived NY 227]
319	reflect, if I C 20a] reflect, that//I TM 128-29] feel, since I NY 247]
329a	I perceived TM 136] I recognised NY 252]
330a	it appeared to me TM 136] it struck me NY 252]
398	instantly made sure C 25b] instantly became sure TM 167] at once felt sure NY 276]
404	you see her as well as you see me! TM 172] you know it as well as you know me! NY 279]
441a	I now perceived TM 187] I now felt NY 291]
447	I speedily perceived, TM 190] I quickly recognised NY 293]
473	My sense of how TM 204] My grasp of how NY 303]

Before 1908, the governess' report could justify remarks such as Mark Van Doren's "The statement 'the governess sees the ghosts' is a true statement."³ But in the New York Edition, the evidence of the governess' senses is on the wane. For instance, as Edel points out in *The Ghostly Tales*, when she rises from her bed in the middle of the night to go out to the darkened hallway,

I precipitately found myself aware of three things. They were practically simultaneous, yet they had flashes of succession. My candle, under a bold flourish, went out, and I perceived, by the uncovered window, that the yielding dusk of earliest morning rendered it unnecessary. Without it, the next instant, *I saw that there was someone on the stair.* [Italics added.]

So she says in *The Two Magics*. In the New York Edition, however, she "knows," not "sees," that there is "a figure" on the stair (#219). Likewise, when she sees--well, detects--Miss Jessel's ghost for the last time, while in company with Mrs. Grose and Flora, she turns on Flora in 1898 with: "She's there, you little unhappy thing--there, there, *there*, and you see her as well as you see me!" Ten years later, her exclamation changes to "you know it as well as you know me!" (#404). Some readers might think that the governess' knowing amounts to her seeing--but if Henry James thought so, why did he not leave the text as it was at such points? His New York Edition of the governess has taken up telling half-truths (at a charitable estimate) to the reader, which are very much along the lines of the half-truth she tells Mrs. Grose about her conversation with Miss Jessel in the schoolroom.

Even in places where the governess' report has been one of things felt, rather than seen, James amends the text for the New York Edition to take some of her statements a bit further from her senses. On the eleventh night after she meets Quint on the stairs, she not having slept much since that incident, "I had felt," she says in 1898, "I might again without laxity lay myself down at my old hour"--but in 1908, "I had conceived I might again without laxity

lay myself down at my old hour" (#237). No longer does the governess feel tired; she conceives that she is tired. Even her kinesthetic appreciation is removed to a mental sphere in 1908. In *The Two Magics*, there are

moments when, by an irresistible impulse, I found myself catching [the children] up and pressing them to my heart.

In the New York Edition, these become

moments when I *knew myself* [emphasis added] to catch them up by an irresistible impulse and press them to my heart.

(#197)

In 1908, then, the governess' senses are no longer called in so much to give evidence of her story. Something else happens to her senses; her vision becomes warped and distorted, like a schizophrenic's. Her senses of proportion and of logic are diminished.

TABLE 3

SUSPICIOUSLY SCHIZOPHRENIC SYMPTOMS

Revision Number	
20	look at such portions TM 19] look at such stretches NY 160]
21	one wouldn't flatter a child TM 20] one would n't, it was already conveyed between us, too grossly flatter a child NY 161]
32	still older, half replaced TM 23] still older, half-displaced NY 163]
191	particular deadly C 14a] particularly deadly TM 88] particular deadly NY 215]
267	his little teeth TM 112] his clear teeth NY 233]
294	the eccentric habits C 19a] the eccentric nature TM 122] the whimsical bent NY 242]

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
312	chill which TM 127] chill that NY 246]
401	She was there, and TM 170] She was there, so NY 278]
419	cried and sobbed TM 176] cried and wailed NY 282]
431	so inscrutably embarrassed TM 184] so lost in other reasons NY 289]

In some of these, James has replaced an ordinary expression with one a bit more questionable. In #20, the governess first looks from her window at "such portions of the rest of the house as I could catch." This changes to "such stretches of the rest of the house." How big can the house at Bly be, that its portions can turn to stretches? And why is it "half replaced" in 1898 and "half-displaced" in 1908 (#32)? A house does not occur naturally in a given place; it cannot be displaced, although it can be replaced. And what of the "chill which we [the children and the governess] denied we felt" in 1898? In the New York Edition, this becomes "a chill that we denied we felt." There is nothing wrong with "which," for it is used here to refer to a thing, the chill. "That" is correct, too, but "that" can also be used to refer to a person, and therefore it gives the chill a touch of personality. We might seem unfair in expecting the governess to tell her story in a Plain Style, but she is, after all, telling us about something that results in the death of a small boy, and so we can feel justified in wanting to know just what happened.

Our heroine, however, is not always in touch with what is happening, and is a little less often so in the New York Edition. Let us examine, for example, revision #21:

"And the little boy--does he look like her? Is he too so very remarkable?"

One wouldn't flatter a child. [Says Mrs. Grose:] "Oh, Miss, *most* remarkable. If you think well of this one!"-- . . .

"Yes, if I do--?"

"You *will* be carried away by the little gentleman!" (TM)

What can the governess mean, "one wouldn't flatter a child," when she has only just asked an intensely flattering question right in front of the child? She seems not to be aware of what she is saying, either to Mrs. Grose or to the reader. And the situation worsens in the 1908 edition. There, "one would n't, it was already conveyed between us [the heroine and Mrs. Grose], too grossly flatter a child." But Mrs. Grose, in the New York Edition, joins in the flattery as wholeheartedly as the governess. Has the maxim really been conveyed between them, then, and does Mrs. Grose understand as little as the governess how she is breaking it? Or is the governess mistaken again, this time about her relations with the housekeeper?

The governess's problems may have been inherited. She says very little about herself, except in a couple of unguarded moments which Oscar Cargill notes in "*The Turn of the Screw* and Alice James."

From the beginning to the end she reiterates that she is highly disturbed, excited, and in a nervous state. She is, in addition, "in receipt these days of disturbing letters from home, where things are not going well" [NY, p. 183]. There is a broad hint that her trouble is hereditary--she speaks of "the eccentric nature of my father" [TM, p. 122].⁴

Cargill's essay cites the *Two Magics* version. In the New York Edition, the governess' father drew Henry James's attention (#294), so that the author changed his "eccentric nature" to a "whimsical bent." "Whimsical" sounds much easier to

live with than "eccentric," but there is something a little sinister about a man who is "bent."

Harold C. Goddard's posthumously published essay, "A Pre-Freudian Reading of *The Turn of the Screw*" notes the hint about the governess' father, and suggests further that the governess' mental problems could have been triggered by her sudden rise in fortune, by the responsibilities which she, an inexperienced girl, must suddenly assume at Bly.⁵ She loses her head, in short, because she is naive.

By 1908, at least, Henry James thought that she was naive at the start, too.

TABLE 4

NAIVETE

Revision Number	
4a	as a kind of favour TM 11] as a favour NY 153]
23	expressed that the proper as well as the pleasant and friendly thing would be therefore TM 21] wanted to know if the proper as well as the pleasant and friendly thing would n't therefore be NY 162]
25	an idea in which Mrs. Grose concurred TM 21] a proposition to which Mrs. Grose assented NY 162]
31	now appear sufficiently contracted TM 23] show a very reduced importance NY 163]
58	the sense that my office demanded TM 40] the sense of how my office seemed to require NY 177]

In the New York Edition, the children's uncle no longer has to use enough salesmanship to "put the whole thing to her as a kind of favour"; she is now ready to do this handsome stranger simply "a favour." She asks Mrs. Grose to

decide protocol for her (#23), and obtains the housekeeper's permission to go meet Miles (#25). She is unsure about what is expected of a governess (#58). But her naivete does not last. It is certainly gone by the time she writes her memoir to Douglas (#31), but long before that, it begins to be replaced by a feeling of grandiosity.

Our heroine is not without nerve, but she tends to jump to conclusions. Some of the conclusions to which she jumps are rather interesting, psychologically--for instance, her deductions from her second sight of Quint:

I had an absolute certainty that I should see again what I had already seen, but something within me said that that by offering myself bravely as the sole subject of such experience, by accepting, by inviting, by surmounting it all, I should serve as an expiatory victim and guard the tranquillity of the household.

(NY, p. 195)

Now, this is rather an unusual response to a ghost, compared to, say, moving its matching corpse to consecrated ground, or having its murderer found out and punished, or any of the other remedies to be found in folklore. But it is a response typical of an egocentric. Something within the governess tells her that a martyr is needed and that she should volunteer for the task. She is not at all a modest young lady, and her ego swells further in the New York Edition.

TABLE 5

GRANDIOSITY

Revision Number	
47	[three times over:] "Nothing." TM 33] "Nothing at all." NY 172]
69	that I could throw myself into it in trouble TM 45] that to throw myself into it was to throw myself out of my trouble NY 181]
79	a child no long one, C 7b] a small child a scant one, TM 46] a small child scant enough "antecedents," NY 182]

TABLE 5 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
91	the most extraordinary effect, started TM 49] the most extraordinary effect, starting NY; 184]
103	an expression of the sense of my more than TM 60] a deference to my more than NY 193]
109	of my companions TM 62] of the rest of the household NY 195]
133	instantly, passionately TM 70] instantly and passionately NY 201]
137b	what besides C 11b] what else besides TM 72] what more besides NY 203]
157	in the face of what TM 80] in the face of all that NY 209]
220	that didn't meet and measure him TM 97] unable to meet and measure him NY 222]
229	that, to withstand it TM 101] that, to resist it NY 225]
236	chance for nerve TM 103] call for nerve NY 227]
253	borne the business alone TM 107] borne the strain alone NY 230]
306-i	I made my actual inductions. TM 125] I drew my actual conclusions NY 245]
315b	his trust of me TM 128] his trust of myself NY 247]
339	made up my mind to fly C 21a] made up my mind I would fly TM 140] made up my mind to cynical flight NY 256]
342	upon my resistance TM 140] upon resistance NY 256]
406	that description of her TM 172] my description of her NY 279]

We can see from these that the New York Edition's governess does not like to lose an opportunity for self-aggrandisement. Not for her the stiff upper lip; she is more likely than ever to exaggerate her danger (see, for instance, #69 or #157) and her response to it (#220, #236). An especially interesting case of the latter sort of revision is #91, which occurs in the following sentence:

The flash of this knowledge--for it was knowledge in the midst of dread--produced in me the most extraordinary effect, started/ing, as I stood there, a sudden vibration of duty and courage.

The preterite "started" has a different subject--the flash of this knowledge--from the participle "starting," whose subject is the extraordinary effect produced in the governess. That is, in 1908, the vibration of duty and courage no longer originates in the flash of knowledge, but in something inside the governess herself. By her own account, she is a true heroine.

Revision #69 shows a similar subtlety. In *The Two Magics*, the governess "could" throw herself into her charming work (which is, as she says, her life with Miles and Flora) in trouble. "Could" indicates that the trouble is not yet urgent enough to merit her throwing herself therein. In the New York Edition, the trouble is upon her and she needs must throw herself into her life with the children. Although the ghosts have become less real--as we saw in Table 2--the governess' sense of danger has grown, and with it her sense of importance, so she is now able to accept Mrs. Grose's "deference," rather than simply "an expression" (#103), and those who were once her "companions" can now be lowered to "the rest of the household" (#109).

Paranoia is a particular manifestation of a tendency to grandiosity which the governess manifests rather often as her tale proceeds. In Part XII, she

denounces the children to Mrs. Grose, and provides "evidence":

The four, depend upon it, perpetually meet. If on either of these last nights you had been with either child you'd clearly have understood. The more I've watched and waited the more I've felt that if there were nothing else to make it sure it would be made so by the systematic silence of each. *Never*, by a slip of the tongue, have they so much as alluded to their old friends, any more than Miles has alluded to his expulsion.

(NY, p. 236)

In other words, the governess finds that because Miles and Flora never talk about Quint and Miss Jessel, the latter pair must be constantly on the former's minds. She goes on, and concludes her speech:

What I've seen would have made *you* [crazy]; but it has only made me more lucid, made me get hold of still other things."

. . . "Of what other things have you got hold?" [asks Mrs. Grose.]

"Why of the very things that have delighted, fascinated and yet, at bottom, as I now so strangely see, mystified and troubled me. Their more than earthly beauty, their absolutely unnatural goodness. It's a game," I went on; "it's a policy and a fraud!"

(NY, pp. 236-37)

Some readers--Edmund Wilson, for instance--feel that in *The Turn of the Screw*, "almost everything from beginning to end can be read equally in either of two senses."⁶ Those of us who feel that the beauty and goodness of children is equally evidence of their evil and corruption as it is of their youth and innocence had perhaps better re-examine their standards of evidence. They are being taken in by a narrator with paranoid delusions that bloom in the New York Edition.

TABLE 6

PARANOIA

Revision
Number

128	an occasional excess of the restless	TM 68]
	a certain ingenuity of restlessness	NY 200]

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
129	appearing to surround TM 68] appearing to oppress NY 200]
135	all sounds from her TM 71] all spontaneous sounds from her NY 202]
168	was, for each of the parties to it, a matter quite of habit. C 13b] was a matter, for either party, of habit. TM 82] must have been for both parties a matter of habit. NY 211]
188	that he covered and concealed their relation TM 87] his covering and concealing their relation NY 214]
262	trap for the inscrutable! He couldn't play any longer at innocence; so how the deuce would he get out of it? TM 110] trap for any game hitherto successful. He could play no longer at perfect propriety, nor could he pretend to it; so how the deuce would he get out of the scrape? NY 232]
277	vision of the dead C 18a] vision of the dead restored TM 115] vision of the dead restored to them NY 236]
281	overcome the obstacle; and TM 117] overcome the obstacle: so NY 238]
335	close, silent contact TM 138] close mute contact NY 255]
349	having to take account that they were dumb about my absence C 22a] having to take into account that they were dumb about my absence TM 143] having to find them merely dumb and discreet about my desertion NY 258]
372a	God knows I never wished TM 155] God knows <i>I</i> never wished NY 266]
396	performance were C 25b] performance was TM 167] performance had now become NY 276]
437	she applies C 28] she applied TM 186] she applies NY 290]

Revision #396 comes at the point when the governess and Mrs. Grose find the strayed Flora. In *Collier's*,

"There she is," we both exclaimed at once.

Flora, a short way off, stood before us on the grass and smiled as if her performance were now complete.

But the subjunctive "were" is rendered "was" in *The Two Magics*, and the effect of this is to give fact to the word "performance." In the New York Edition, "was" is bumped back a tense to "had . . . become," and those words make the performance an accomplished, and perhaps premeditated, fact. As in the other revisions in Table 7, the governess declares the mischief of another on no evidence at all.

We might have expected better from the New York Edition's governess, when she herself seems to have the courts on her mind more than her 1898 counterpart did.

TABLE 7

COURT AND PRISON TERMS

Revision Number	
10a	might be something beyond TM 17] might be a matter beyond NY 159]
28	suffered some delay TM 22] suffered some wrong NY 163]
37	my letter--which TM 25] my document--which NY 166]
49	enclosed and protected TM 35] fenced about and ordered and arranged NY 173]
80	found the trace. TM 47] found the trace, should have felt the wound and the dishonour; NY 182]
105	my honest ally TM 60] my honest comrade NY 194]

TABLE 7 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
115	I pressed my interlocutress TM 64] I pressed my informant NY 197]
161	I encountered her on the ground of a probability that TM 81] I closed with her cordially on the article of the likelihood that NY 209]
178	and, at any rate, before the grey dawn admonished us to separate, I had got my answer. TM 84] and in any case I had before the grey dawn admonished us to separate got my answer NY 212]
179a	It was nothing less than the circumstance that C 13b] It was neither more nor less than the circumstance that TM 84] It was neither more nor less than the particular fact that; NY 212]
180	It was nothing less than the circumstance that she had ventured; C 13b] It was in fact the very appropriate truth that she had ventured; TM 85] It was indeed the very appropriate item of evidence of her having ventured NY 212]
257	sad case I presented C 17a] sad case presented by their instructress TM 108] sad case presented by their deputy-guardian NY 231]
280	the inquiry she launched TM 117] the appeal she launched NY 238]
315a	he had done TM 128] he had admin-//istered NY 246-47]
379	to the uninitiated eye TM 158] to the uninformed eye NY 268]

Although the governess' evidence is less reliable in the New York Edition than it was ever before, she takes more the tone of a prosecuting attorney or a head warden than she did before. This may have something to do with the disturbing letters she had been receiving from home; her whimsical father may have

been in trouble with the law. Or--more to the point--perhaps she has the law on her mind because she would certainly be asked to appear at an inquest into Miles' death. In any case, the 1908 governess' thinking about the penal system fits in with her increased morbidity.

One of the things that has always made *The Turn of the Screw* such a haunting tale is the governess' preoccupation with good and evil. The reader can hardly help but become involved when such important issues seem to be at stake. The governess of 1908 puts them more at stake, in keeping with her increased grandiosity and intensified paranoia.

TABLE 8

MORBIDITY

Revision Number	
7a	found myself doubtful again TM 16] found all my doubts bristle again NY 158]
17	her being so glad TM 18] her being so inordinately glad NY 159]
54	for the minute TM 39] for the unspeakable minute NY 176]
65	a liberty rather gross TM 44] a liberty rather monstrous NY 180]
73	growing used to them TM 45] growing deadly used to them NY 181]
119	indeed, in retrospect TM 65] indeed, in raking it all over NY 198]
211	take my plunge TM 94] take my horrid plunge NY 220]
212	push my way TM 94] push my dreadful way NY 220]

TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
232	passage and even TM 102] passage. I even NY 226]
261	his little mind TM 110] his dreadful little mind NY 232]
336	end to my predicament TM 139] end to my ordeal NY 255]
341	in my bewilderment, TM 140] in my turmoil, NY 256]

Ghosts may be disconcerting phenomena, but they are not inherently evil, or the governess would not have to spend so much time explaining the danger of her situation to Mrs. Grose. The governess seems to see her world in a lurid light that makes her the source of much of the evil--if not all the evil--she detects.

Incidentally, let us note revision #65. Eric Solomon's tongue-in-cheek essay "The Return of the Screw" puts forth the proposition that Mrs. Grose, out of jealousy for Flora, practices upon the governess in order to drive her mad and get rid of her, as she has already got rid of Miss Jessel. Taking a Sherlock Holmsian tone, Dr. Solomon cites phrase after phrase from the tale with a gleeful disregard for context. However, he slips up seriously when he discusses the governess' first sighting of Peter Quint:

Someone, the governess thinks, is practising upon her. But who? She does not know. "There was but one sane inference: someone had taken a liberty rather *gross*." [Solomon's italics] Even Dr. Watson would catch the clue.⁷

Revision #65, where James replaces "gross" with "monstrous," effectively clears the housekeeper (and adds a suggestion of ugliness to an adjective of size, of

course). If Dr. Solomon had read the New York Edition, as Henry James intended him to do, he may never have slandered Mrs. Grose so.

But be that as it may. Between 1898 and 1908, the governess' world seems to her darker and more dangerous. And she grows further distant from the people around her.

TABLE 9

DISASSOCIATION

Revision Number	
7b	country to which the summer sweetness seemed to offer me a friendly welcome TM 16] country the summer sweetness of which served as a friendly welcome NY 158]
15	--like the extraordinary charm TM 18] --like the wonderful appeal NY 159]
42	looking at me, however, C 4b] looking to me, however, TM 27] looking at me, however NY 167]
85	with my children TM 47] with this joy of my children NY 183]
163	supposed I had brushed away the ugly signs TM 81] supposed the ugly signs of it brushed away NY 210]
209	a cloud of music and love TM 93] a cloud of music and affection NY 219]
372	a beautiful little dignity C 23b] a singular little dignity TM 155] a strange little dignity NY 266]

Where the governess was, in 1898, united with the children, she is now a step further away from them. Consider, for instance, her discussion of her work in Part IV:

Of course I was under the spell, and the wonderful part is that, even at the time, I perfectly knew I was. But I gave myself up to it; it was an antidote to any pain, and I had more pains than one. I was in receipt in these days of disturbing letters from home, where things were not going well. But with my children, what things in the world mattered?

So in *The Two Magics*. But in the New York Edition, our heroine no longer finds consolation in the children themselves, but in her joy of them (#85). Something, even if joy, has come between her and her charges. Even at the outset of her adventures, when she first meets Flora, she is not so wholeheartedly approving of the child in 1908 as she had been before. Whereas Flora once had "extraordinary charm," she now has "wonderful appeal." Veteran readers of Henry James' works know that "wonderful," in the James canon, is not the unequivocally honorific designation it has come to be in our own everyday speech. Nearly every James character, nice or nasty, has the word applied to him at some time or another. A character with "wonderful appeal" may or may not be charming.

Our heroine draws further away from Miles, too. On her visit to his room two nights before his death, she demands to know if the boy wishes to tell her anything.

He turned off a little, facing round towards the wall and holding up his hand to look at as one had seen sick children look. "I've told you--I told you this morning."

Oh, I was sorry for him! "That you just want me not to worry you?"

He looked round at me now, as if in recognition of my understanding him; then ever so gently, "To let me alone," he replied.

"There was even a beautiful little dignity in it," she says of his reply in *Collier's*. But by the time James prepared the tale for *The Two Magics*, Miles' dignity was no longer beautiful; it was "singular." And in the New York Edition, it has gone beyond "singular"; it is now "strange." The governess seems no longer prepared to grant Miles any real dignity at all.

But she seems just as distant from herself as she does from the children. When, after crying on Mrs. Grose's bosom, she rejoins the children, Flora remarks that she has wept. In 1898, she uses the active voice to comment on this: "I had supposed I had brushed away the ugly signs." However, she uses the passive in 1908: "I had supposed the ugly signs of it brushed away." Perhaps Mrs. Grose is the one who has dried her tears, and not she herself--but even so, why not use the active voice, unless she has so lost touch in the New York Edition that she does not even notice who comforts her?

There is one character from whom the governess does not distance herself in 1908, and that is her employer. In the earlier editions, she thinks of him often enough, but she thinks of him, and the fact that she is working for him, to an even greater extent in her New York incarnation. Of course, readers have known from the beginning of the tale in *Collier's* that the governess is in love with the man from Harley Street, but he seems positively to prey on her mind by 1908.

TABLE 10

THOUGHTS OF EMPLOYMENT

Revision Number	
12	that my employer had not told me more of her TM 18] why my employer had n't made more of a point to me of this NY 159]
122	one's own committed heart TM 67] one's own engaged affection NY 199]
130	and that engaged me TM 68] and that employed me NY 200]
194	to address myself to this source TM 90] to apply at this source NY 217]

TABLE 10 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
213	the affair seems to me TM 95] the business seems to me NY 220]
316	his comfort; and I TM 128] his comfort. So I NY 247]
317	let my charges TM 128] let our young friends NY 247]
318	as if my charges TM 128] as if our young friends NY 247]
331	what my little friend TM 137] what our young friend NY 254]

By far the most damaging of these is the first. The governess is describing her first meeting with Flora, in which she finds that the latter "was the most beautiful child I had ever seen." Afterwards, she wonders: first in 1898 that her employer hasn't told her more about his niece, then in 1908 that he hasn't "made more of a point" to her that Flora is beautiful. Certainly Flora's uncle should tell her governess as much about the child as he can; the governess' puzzlement is justified in 1898. But it is not in 1908. If the Harley Street uncle were to make a point to her of his niece's beauty, he would be treating the relationship between them not as that of employer and governess, but as that of doting uncle and sympathetic friend. Our heroine is something less than professional in the expectations she brings to her 1908 interview.

Perhaps we ought not to be surprised at the governess' obsession with her employer. Edmund Wilson, in "The Ambiguity of Henry James," calls her "a neurotic case of sex repression," and supports this charge with a Freudian interpretation.

A less psychoanalytic reader might reach the same conclusion from the way the governess likes to touch Mrs. Grose:

I put out my hand to [Mrs. Grose] and she took it; I held her hard a little, liking to feel her close to me. (NY, p. 187)

" . . . I've made up my mind. I came home, my dear," I went on, "for a talk with Miss Jessel."

I had by this time formed the habit of having Mrs. Grose *literally* well in hand in advance of sounding that note [*italics mine*]; so that even now, as she bravely blinked under the signal of my word, I could keep her comparatively firm. (NY, p. 259)

But if repressed sexuality is the governess' problem, then James paid surprisingly little attention to it in preparing the text for the New York Edition.

TABLE 11

SEXUALITY

Revision Number	
106	so compromising a contract TM 60] so stiff an agreement NY 194]
121	saw my service TM 67] saw my response NY 199]
195	whatever it would yield TM 90] whatever balm it would yield NY 217]
453	of a rude long arm over his character? C 29a] of an angular arm over his character? TM 194] of a stiff arm across his character? NY 296]

Dr. Wilson's observations notwithstanding, perhaps something other than sexuality causes the governess to introduce a physical element into her conversations. Some people, we know, are simply in the habit of touching others when they talk; the governess may be one of these. After all, she comes of a large family, with

brothers, and lived in a "scant home," and so she is perhaps used even to a certain amount of roughhousing. In fact, some of James' revisions show her to be of a distinctly violent turn.

TABLE 12

VIOLENCE

Revision Number		
50	pressure I had responded	TM 36]
	pressure I had yielded	NY 174]
153	motherly breast, and my	TM 79]
	motherly breast, where my	NY 208]
160	To hold her perfectly in the pinch of this I found	C 13a]
	To hold her perfectly in the pinch of that I found	TM 80]
	I found that to keep her perfectly in the grip of this	NY 209]
183	pressed, again, of course, at this.	TM 85]
	pressed, again, of course, the closer for that	NY 213]
228a	such singular intensity	TM 101]
	such singular force	NY 225]
230	to hold her hand	TM 102]
	for the retention of her hand	NY 226]
335a	I felt, completely	TM 139]
	I felt, and completely	NY 255]
369	person--imposed him almost as an intellectual equal	TM 152]
	person, forced me to treat him as an intelligent equal	NY 264]
472	scruples, like fighters	TM 202]
	scruples, fighters	NY 302]

Not all of these are equally sinister, of course. There is no especial harm, for instance, in the governess' hurling herself onto Mrs. Grose's breast (which becomes a literal breast, not just a figurative one, in 1908) for a good cry (#153). And sometimes the governess is merely using an expression, such as in #369, where she is discussing how her "absolute conviction of [Miles'] secret

precocity" in 1898 "imposed" him as an equal, and in 1908, "forced" her to treat him as an equal. Yet although the force is not there in fact, that does not stop her from speaking of it. Such violent habits of thought are the precursors of violent actions.

The violent actions come about indeed. When the governess returns to her room after her midnight encounter with Quint, she finds Flora up and awake and looking out of the window.

[She asks Flora:] "And did you see anyone?"

"Ah *no!*" she returned . . .

At that moment, in the state of my nerves, I absolutely believed she lied; and if I once more closed my eyes it was before the dazzle of the three or four possible ways in which I might take this up. One of these, for a moment, tempted me with such singular intensity that, to withstand it, I must have gripped my little girl with a spasm that, wonderfully, she submitted to without a cry or a sign of fright.

In the New York Edition, she is tempted with singular force (#228a)--which could either mean that the temptation is a forceful one, or that force is the temptation offered. In either case, she responds with a force of her own that is almost harmful to Flora. Later in the same scene, she admits to almost sitting on the child--in 1908, "for the retention of her hand" (#230), surely a less gentle way of putting it than the 1898 "to hold her hand."

And finally, her violent tendencies come to be directed against Miles. During their last interview, they are, says the 1898 governess, "like fighters not daring to close." But the simile becomes a metaphor--if not a straightforward description--in 1908: then they *are* fighters (#472). And when the fight finally breaks out, Miles, who had threatened to report her to her employer, loses to his tough-minded adversary.

How do the other characters feel about the governess? Well, as she becomes less reliable and less aware of the world around her from 1898 to 1908, her associates come to be more upset by and frightened of her.

TABLE 13

RESPONSES TO THE GOVERNESS

Revision Number	
187	the poor woman groaned TM 86] the poor woman wailed NY 214]
210	Sometimes, indeed, when I dropped into coarseness, I perhaps came TM 94] Sometimes perhaps indeed (when I dropped into coarseness) I came NY 220]
370a	to tell him-- TM 153] to <i>tell</i> him-- NY 265]
390	exposure of my association C 25a] exposure of my society TM 164] exposure of sticking to me NY 274]
407	for all answer to this TM 172] for all notice of this NY 279]
414	in pained opposition TM 174] in shocked opposition NY 281]
415	mask of reprobation TM 174] mask of disaffection NY 281]
416	she produced TM 175] she launched NY 281]
433a	with a sudden sob TM 185] with a sudden cry NY 289]
481	with a sudden fury TM 211] with sudden fury NY 308]

Not only does the governess come, in the New York Edition, to produce reactions such as wails and cries from Mrs. Grose--where in 1898 she could only evoke groans and sobs (#187 and #433a)--but the children become a little more

obvious about trying to escape her from time to time (#210). And, most significantly, Miles definitely decides that the governess must answer to his uncle:

I was silent a little, and it was I now, I think, who changed colour. "My dear, I don't want to get off!"

"You can't even if you do. You can't, you can't!"--he lay beautifully staring. "My uncle must come down and you must completely settle things."

"If we do," I returned with some spirit, "you may be sure it will be to take you quite away."

"Well, don't you understand that that's exactly what I'm working for? You'll have to *tell* him--about the way you've let it all drop: you'll have to tell him a tremendous lot!"

Without the italics on "tell," Miles' last speech loses much of its urgency.

There is a difference we can all feel between having to tell someone something and having to *tell* someone something. Miles of 1908, who, like his 1898 brother, sits up late at night and thinks about his governess, has reached the conclusion that the governess has an explanation to make for the way she has "let it all drop."

We have seen how Henry James made the governess into a less reliable, less realistic, and less stable individual for the New York Edition. That being so, why were readers' suspicions of her not stirred earlier and more often before Edmund Wilson popularized the Freudian interpretation in 1934? Why have so many accepted her story at face value? The answer is that James made her story slide by the reader more smoothly in 1908. The more rough edges he gave her psychologically, the more he lubricated her verbally. In Chapter 2, we shall examine the lubricating process in detail.

Chapter II

The Governess' Cover

To begin with, James corrected the governess' account at a number of points. We must note that in these instances, James was not merely correcting his 1898 self, for if he were, Mrs. Grose would no longer be saying to the governess in 1908, "Yes, he do hate worry" (NY, p. 239). Mrs. Grose, unlearned woman that she is, can be allowed her ungrammatical moments. But if we are to accept our narrator in spite of her peculiarities, then she had better sound as competent as she can be made to sound.

TABLE 14

CORRECTIONS

Revision Number	
13	full, figured draperies TM 18] figured full draperies NY 159]
29a	courage with the way TM 23] courage, with the way NY 163]
164	with their voices TM 82] with our small friends' voices NY 210]
228	, almost, with the full privilege of childish in consequence, resentfully C 16a] , almost with the full//privilege of childish in consequence, resentfully TM 100-101] almost (with the full privilege of childish in consequence) resentfully NY 225]
238	had shook TM 103] had shaken NY 227]

TABLE 14 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
241	in the same quarter TM 104] turned to the same quarter NY 228]
271	I would know TM 113] I should know NY 234]
302	out to see either Quint or Miss Jessel TM 125] out either for Quint or for Miss Jessel NY 245]
337	if I got away TM 139] if I should get away NY 255]
403b	called it TM 172] called her NY 279]
411	if she could TM 173] if she had been able NY 280]

Here we have further examples of James' subtlety and care. The first revision on the table, #13, eliminates a needless pun that might otherwise cause a reader to stop and titter. In #228, James sorts out a tangle in punctuation. *Collier's* had printed the full sentence thus:

"Ah, *no!*" she returned, almost, with the full privilege of childish in consequence, resentfully, though with a long sweetness in her little drawl of the negative.

Does Flora almost return "Ah, *no!*" resentfully, or does she return "Ah, *no!*" almost resentfully? In the *Two Magics* version, the sentence is just as baffling:

"Ah, *no!*" she returned, almost with the full privilege of childish in consequence, resentfully, though with a long sweetness in her little drawl of the negative.

But the New York Edition clears everything up. The word "almost" belongs with the word "resentfully":

"Ah *no!*" she returned almost (with the full privilege of childish in consequence) resentfully, though with a long sweetness in her little drawl of the negative.

Many have criticized Henry James for his long and complicated sentences, but such examples as this show that he did not write them wantonly.

Revision #302 might seem to belong in Table 2 with the "Edelisms," those revisions which suppress the mention of sense perceptions, but in this instance, the word "see" was not a good choice in the first place. The governess, retracing the strange steps of her obsession in Part XIII, is recalling the night that she looked out of the tower window and saw Miles on the lawn. She cannot really say that she looked out "to see" the ghosts of her late fellow servants, because she looked only with that purpose, not with that result. That she looked out "for" the ghosts better expresses her action.

The 1908 governess is more careful about her grammar than her *Two Magics* counterpart, but at the same time, she is less formal. For one thing, she is more inclined to use contractions, especially when quoting directly.

TABLE 15

CONTRACTIONS

Revision Number	
55	was not. We TM 40] was n't. We NY 177]
62	was not so much TM 44] was n't so much NY 180]
97	I have my duty." TM 56] I've my duty." NY 190]
98	"What is he like?" TM 56] What's he like? NY 190]
100	"Yes. Yes. Quint is dead." C 9a] "Yes. Mr. Quint is dead." TM 58] "Yes. Mr. Quint's dead." NY 192]
117	they were <i>not</i> C 11a] they were not TM 64] they were n't NY 197]

TABLE 15 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
170	[twice:] should not TM 83] should n't NY 211]
174	for him that he had not literally TM 84] for him that he had n't literally NY 212]
190a	I must not for TM 87] I must n't for NY 215]
221	knew I had not TM 97] knew I had n't NY 222]
244	it was not TM 105] it was n't NY 228]
276	you would clearly TM 114] you'd clearly NY 236]
290	avoidance could not TM 120] avoidance could n't NY 241]
329	There are not TM 135] There are n't NY 251]
330	that would not TM 136] that would n't NY 252]
351a	yes, I have TM 144] yes, I've NY 258]
352	you would like TM 144] you'd like NY 259]
401a	and there was not TM 171] and there was n't NY 278]
406a	could not have TM 172] could n't have NY 279]
432	I would engage TM 185] I'd engage NY 289]
445b	he is already TM 189] he's already NY 292]

TABLE 15 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
458	it was not TM 195] it was n't NY 297]
464	we have the others TM 197] we've the others NY 298]
464-i	We have the others TM 197] We've the others NY 298]
464-ii	we have indeed TM 197] we've indeed NY 298]
466	You would certainly TM 199] You'd certainly NY 299]

According to John Raunheim, Henry James made hundreds of contractions in the New York Edition, so this table ought not to startle us.¹ There are three more contractions made in the frame (#2b, #3-i, and #7). Nonetheless, we cannot suppose that James contracted expressions for the New York Edition by reflex. When the governess uses contractions in 1908, she sounds more colloquial, more like one of the reader's friends, than she sounded ten years before. As well, the speeches she reports sound more like real speeches. Altogether, the 1908 governess is better calculated to draw the reader in.

She calms down, too, between her debut in *Collier's* and her appearance in the New York Edition. As in revision #117, several words which were italicized in the periodical become romanized in *The Two Magics* and remain roman in the New York Edition, so the governess of the first edition sounds by far the most hysterical of the three. By comparison, the New York governess, romanized and colloquialized, sounds quite normal.

The New York Edition's governess is also more inclined than her forebears to eliminate the word "that" from expressions of indirect speech--again, more in line with the patterns of the vernacular.

TABLE 16

INDIRECT SPEECH

Revision Number	
134	things that they TM 70] things they NY 201]
140	saw that she was TM 73] saw she was NY 203]
168a	pity that I should TM 82] pity I should NY 211]
169	pity that I needed TM 83] pity I needed NY 211]
313	denied that we TM 127] denied we NY 246]
323	aware that I TM 131] aware I NY 249]
327	felt that I TM 133] felt I NY 250]
328a	felt that he TM 135] felt he NY 251]
370	felt that I TM 153] felt I NY 265]
373a	to me that I TM 155] to me I NY 267]

And there are a few other ways in which James made the 1908 governess more informal than the 1898 governess.

TABLE 17

MISCELLANEOUS CONVERSATIONALISMS

Revision Number	
184	impress upon me TM 85] impress on me NY 213]
197a	peace that I TM 91] peace I NY 218]
268a	replying only TM 112] answering only NY 233]
303	had beheld TM 125] had seen NY 245]
353	<i>Do</i> you like it C 22a] Do you like it TM 144] <i>Do</i> you like it NY 259]

Not only does the governess sound friendlier in 1908, she also seems less vague. For all the overall ambiguity of *The Turn of the Screw*, James clarified the governess' account for the New York Edition.

TABLE 18

CLARIFIERS

Revision Number	
30	my older TM 23] my present older NY 163]
38	opened my letter TM 26] opened the letter NY 166]
41	, for all the next TM 27] , all the next; 167]
63	It took little time TM 44] It took me little time NY 180]

TABLE 18 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
75	such differences TM 46] such individual differences NY 182]
109a	way." TM 62] way. They've never alluded to it." NY 195]
125	something else TM 67] another matter NY 199]
182	very strange manner C 13b] most strange manner TM 85] very high manner about it NY 212]
200	languished over C 14b] bowed over TM 91] bowed down over NY 218]
264	how, in our TM 111] how, during our NY 233]
265a	brush in TM 111] brush there in NY 233]
343	in the clear C 21b] in clear TM 140] in the clear NY 256]
348	expected that the return of my pupils would be marked TM 143] expected the return of the others to be marked NY 258]
377	window tight TM 156] window still tight NY 267]
381	contrary, on the spot TM 161] contrary, where she stood NY 271]
394	suggestion of my friend's eyes TM 165] suggestion in my friend's eyes NY 274]
403a	into the very presence that could make me quail. I quailed TM 172] into a figure portentous. I gaped at her coolness NY 279]
422a	at Bly had TM 177] at Bly was to have had NY 283]

Let us consider revision #38. The letter to which the governess refers is

the one from the headmaster of Miles' school. That letter has not been sent directly to her, but been forwarded by her employer, who as also himself sent her a letter. She has, then, two letters in her hands, one of which, the one addressed to her, she has already opened. If she refers to the other letter as her letter--"my letter"--as she does in 1898, then there is a momentary ripple of confusion in the reader's mind, for "her" letter ought really to mean the one from the uncle. She sounds much less ambiguous in 1908, with the definite article instead of the personal pronoun. What ambiguity there is in the 1908 tale does not arise because the governess is careless with her language; James made sure that the New York governess sounds as definite as she can.

The governess also adds elegance to her account in 1908 by increasing her use of parallelism. This does not, of course, render her intrinsically more reliable, but it does make her sound as if she could fit into relatively high social circles. Unfortunately, most of us tend to show our gullible sides when confronted with members of higher social circles, perhaps because they seem less motivated to deceive us. In any event, our heroine takes several opportunities to show her command of choice English.

TABLE 19

PARALLELISMS

Revision Number	
72	I mean that I can C 7b] I mean I can TM 45] I mean that I can NY 181]
204	, and indulged TM 92] ; they indulged NY 219]
242	he too were TM 105] he also NY 228]

TABLE 19 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
304	turned it on TM 125] turned on NY 245]
359	Why, sending TM 146] Why, to sending NY 260]
376	that the drawn curtains were unstirred TM 156] the drawn curtains unstirred NY 267]

Whereas such devices as contractions and parallelisms tend to influence our perceptions of a narrator, other devices affect our judgement of the story itself. One of these is description. The more information a story contains, the more trust we place in it. In 1908, James appeared happy to exploit this fact on his narrator's behalf.

TABLE 20

DESCRIPTION

Revision Number	
8	fortitude mounted afresh and, as we turned into the avenue, encountered a reprieve TM 16] fortitude revived and, as we turned into the avenue, took a flight NY 158]
99	to articulate C 9a] to utter TM 58] to express NY 192]
309	any deepened exhilaration TM 126] any intensified mirth NY 246]
391	came straight down C 25a] came down to the water TM 165] came down to the pond NY 274]

TABLE 20 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number		
392	The pond, oblong in shape, had a width so scant compared This expanse, oblong in shape, was so narrow compared	TM 165] NY 274]
393	empty expanse empty stretch	TM 165] NY 274]
395a	ever too much ever too strong	TM 166] NY 275]
399	she launched. she launched me. she addressed me	C 26a] TM 168] NY 277]
410	looked, even looked, just	TM 173] NY 280]
425	me once more me afresh	TM 179] NY 285]

Here we see James extending and unifying metaphors (#8 and #395a), and toning down an unnecessarily strong expression (#399). We also see him increasing the force of shock in Mrs. Grose's first important revelation about Peter Quint. In Part V, after the governess has given her description of the figure on the tower (who sounds as much like a pantomime devil as a person), Mrs. Grose tags the figure as Quint and adds that Quint has died. In *The Two Magics*,

She seemed fairly to square herself, plant herself more firmly to
utter the wonder of it. "Yes. Mr. Quint is dead."

When making a similar announcement in 1908 ("Yes. Mr. Quint's dead."), Mrs. Grose seems to shift her person for a slightly different purpose:

She seemed fairly to square herself, plant herself more firmly to
express the wonder of it.

(#99)

In the former version, Mrs. Grose seems merely to be striking a pose so that she

may speak--"utter"--her startling news. In the latter, though, Mrs. Grose assumes her pose not only to verbalize, but to express physically, the amazing nature of her announcement.

In revision #410, James again finds a synonym in 1908 with a wider range of meaning than the word it replaces. The governess is exhorting Mrs. Grose to look across the pond at the presence of Miss Jessel:

"You don't see her exactly as *we* see?--you mean to say you don't now--*now*? She's as big as a blazing fire! Only look, dearest woman, *look*--!"

In 1898, "She looked, even as I did," follows these words, but in 1908, "She looked, just as I did." "Even" tells us that Mrs. Grose looked *at the same time* as our narrator. "Just" carries that meaning, too, but it also says that Mrs. Grose looked *in the same manner* as the governess. Thus a change in a single word gives the reader a more vivid picture of the scene.

In many ways, the New York Edition of *The Turn of the Screw* is a more elegant story than its *Two Magics* predecessor. James eliminated dozens of commas in 1908, thereby giving the tale a smoother cadence, and often rearranged words to this end. And he took some care to avoid repeating words unnecessarily.

TABLE 21

SIMPLIFICATIONS

Revision Number	
--------------------	--

- | | |
|----|--|
| 45 | <p>I felt, as he stood wistfully looking out for me (I was a little late on the scene,) before the door of the inn at which the coach had put him down--I felt that C 5a]</p> <p>I was a little late on the scene, and I felt, as he stood wistfully looking out for me before the door of the inn at which the coach had put him down, that TM 32]</p> <p>I was a little late on the scene of his arrival, and I felt, as he stood wistfully looking out for me before the door of the inn at which the coach had put him down, that NY 171]</p> |
|----|--|

TABLE 21 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
59a	passed from TM 41] moved from NY 178]
110	least allusion TM 62] least reference NY 195]
116	, probably, I showed TM 64] I probably showed NY 197]
192b	days, as they elapsed, took TM 90] days took as they elapsed NY 217]
199	remember wondering TM 91] remember asking NY 218]
203	in these days, I overscored TM 92] I in these days overscored NY 218]
207	content not, for the time, TM 93] content for the time not NY 219]
234	, for going up, the same nerve TM 103] the same nerve for going up that NY 227]
258	added strain TM 108] added worry NY 231]
301	shock, in truth, had TM 125] shock had in truth NY 245]
328	that, for more than an hour, he would have to TM 134] that he would have for more than an hour to NY 251]
395b	I had lived, by this time, TM 167] I had by this time lived NY 276]
444	still blush, almost TM 188] still almost blush NY 292]
465	which, now, I gained TM 198] which I now gained NY 298]
474	recovered her grasp TM 204] recovered her command NY 303]
480	I shrieked, as I tried to press him against me, to my visitant. TM 211] I shrieked to my visitant as I tried to press him against me NY 308]

There is evidence here that James revised in a linear fashion: that is, that he read the story from start to finish and revised as he went along, rather than skipped laterally about from randomly chosen spots. Some of the revisions in Table 21 make sense only when considered in conjunction with revisions that occur a few lines before them. In #110, the word "allusion" is changed in 1908 to "reference." The only reason for this modification seems to be that six short paragraphs before, James added the words "They've never alluded to it" to a speech of the governess' (Table 19, #109a). Revision #474, where "command" replaces "grasp," closely follows #473, which appears with the "Edelisms" in Table 2. Likewise, #258 eliminates the repetition of "sträin" after the change made by #253, of Table 6. Revision #199 is connected with #197-i, which appears on our next table.

TABLE 22

ECONOMY OF EXPRESSION

Revision Number	
24	I should be in waiting for him TM 21] I should await him NY 162]
61	for I was rooted as deeply as I was shaken. TM 42] since I was as deeply rooted as shaken. NY 179]
90	he had come there. TM 49] he had come. NY 184]
92	, I almost dropped, TM 49] , almost dropped, NY 185]
136	had previously dropped TM 71] had dropped NY 202]
169-i	needed once more to describe TM 83] needed to recapitulate NY 211]

TABLE 22 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
179	proved to be immensely TM 84] proved immensely NY 212]
197-i	used to say to myself: TM 91] used to wonder-- NY 217]
214	or to prepare it TM 95] or prepare it NY 220]
229a	had, for a long time TM 102] had, a long time NY 226]
233	on the other hand TM 102] nevertheless NY 226]
249	as quietly as I could TM 106] in all quietness NY 229]
251	, and the more TM 107] : the more NY 230]
260	than a signal more resonant TM 109] than any noisier process NY 232]
270	least of my TM 112] least my NY 234]
291	been so successfully//effected without TM 120-121] been made successful without NY 241]
306	it was in the condition of nerves produced by it that I made my actual inductions. TM 125 it was in the scared state that I drew my actual conclusions.; NY 245]
307	and I covered TM 126] and covered NY 245]
315	with a kind of wild TM 127] with a wild NY 246]
366	was a gaiety TM 149] was gaiety NY 262]
368	but half to phrase) TM 152] but half-phrase-- NY 264]

TABLE 22 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
373	, to lose him TM 155] , lose him NY 266]
388	--a direction that made her TM 164] --a direction making her NY 273]
402	as a sovereign sign TM 171] as showing NY 279]
403	immediately shaken C 26a] shaken, on the spot, TM 171] at once shaken NY 279]
408	a concession, an admission, of her eyes, TM 172] an expressional concession or admission NY 279]
409	was simultaneously with this TM 172] was quite simultaneously NY 280]
424a	feet of course, and TM 179] feet, and NY 285]
450	I had uttered TM 192; I uttered NY 295]
452a	outside of the window TM 193] outside the window NY 295]
459	but he was TM 195] but was NY 297]

Many small children, when telling a lie, talk as fast as they can, for they have a crude grasp of a principle that James was employing here. An unreliable narrator is best to streamline his tale so that his audience has less time to stop and question him. In prose, an excess word gives the reader a moment to think while his mind is not needed. The fewer such moments our governess gives us, the better for her credibility--and as we have seen, her credibility requires all the help James gave it.

The revisions we have studied so far in this chapter, while significant, are not surprising. From the first, the governess has sounded plausible, like a reliable narrator, and her tale direct, like the facts in a ghost story, so the differences we have examined are of degree rather than of kind.

However, there is an area in which Henry James added something new to the governess for the New York Edition. Not only does she sound calm and friendly (relative to the way she sounds in *Collier's* and *The Two Magics*), she also sounds scientific, for she employs the concept of measurement.

TABLE 23

MEASUREMENT

Revision Number	
2	to remark that it was C 1a] to say that it was TM 3] to note it as NY 147]
5	she conceived him as rich TM 11] she figured him as rich NY 153]
10	most pleasant TM 17] thoroughly pleasant NY 158]
27	Lessons, in this TM 22] Regular lessons, in this NY 163]
56	instants more TM 40] seconds more NY 177]
78	no history TM 46] nothing to call even an infinitesimal history NY 182]
95	any innocence TM 52] any degree of innocence NY 187]
96	abrupt in consequence TM 54] full in consequence NY 189]
108	moment, at any rate: TM 61] moment. NY 194]

TABLE 23 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
192-i	This came out when TM 89] This was marked when NY 216]
233a	knew, none the less, TM 103] knew, for all that, NY 227]
245	rooms at TM 105] rooms enough at NY 229]
252	my horrible confidences TM 107] the least of my horrible confidences NY 230]
332	proof of it TM 137] gage of it NY 254]
387	though I reflect that it may in fact have been a sheet of water less remarkable than it appeared to my untravelled eyes. TM 163] though it may have been a sheet of water less remarkable than my untravelled eyes supposed it. NY 273]
412	I was conscious TM 173] I took the measure NY 280]
422	that it was as if it were more than it had ever been TM 177] that it fairly measured more than it had ever measured NY 283]
445a	note, at any rate TM 188] note, at all events NY 292]
447-i	at least, that it would give me a measure TM 190] that it would give me at least a measure NY 293]
448	was precisely, in short, TM 191] was in short NY 293]
449	there was a queer relief, at all events TM 192] there was at the least a queer relief NY 294]
465a	saw him, at any rate TM 198] saw him, in any case NY 299]

Many of these deserve comment. The first two, although they are not part of the governess' own account, are included in the table because they show James

preparing the reader of the New York Edition for a tone of observation (#2) and calculation (#5), on which he follows through admirably. The 1908 governess brings measurement into her tale in a variety of ways, from the obvious--"any degree of innocence" rather than "any innocence" (#95)--to the subtle, such as #96. "Full" is used in so many settings that we often do not think of it as a measure, but measure it is, however crude, whereas "abrupt" is not.

When an expression of measurement does not appear to refer to anything, the New York Edition of our story removes it. In Part VI, while the governess and Mrs. Grose are discussing Peter Quint's apparition, there is a momentary lull in the conversation, which Mrs. Grose breaks:

She resumed in a moment, at any rate: "What if *he* should see him?"
(*TM*, p. 61)

If one tries to apply the idea of "rate" to the housekeeper's resumption of the talk, then one is at a loss for anything but somewhat foolish images. Like a good scientist, then, the governess suppresses the term in 1908.

Also like a good scientist, the governess keeps herself out of the measurements she makes. In #387, when talking about the pond, she admits in 1898, in so many words, that she is estimating the size of the pond from memory: ". . . I reflect that" She is still estimating from memory in 1908, but the omission of the personal pronoun makes her source seem a more objective one.

In fact, we have seen throughout this chapter how the 1908 governess, though she is less reliable than her 1898 other, sounds more objective, more perceptive, more factual, and homier, too. A naive reader, one unaccustomed to questioning the narrator's word, stands scarce a chance against her, any more than did Douglas, meeting her as a young man and deciding that she would have been worthy of any place whatever. We might note at this point that in the two tales that flank

The Turn of the Screw in the New York Edition, *The Aspern Papers* and "The Liar," characters as highly placed as Douglas are taken in by fraudulent characters just as highly placed. In *The Turn of the Screw*, the naive reader is taken in along with Douglas.

But we have lost our naivete long since in this study, and now we are ready to gather all our data into a single picture.

Conclusion

Now, we have not looked at all the revisions James made to *The Turn of the Screw* for the New York Edition, because approximately fifty of them (listed in Table 24 in the Appendix) seem to have been made on the spur of the moment, in the full gallop of revision. Why, for instance, does "it was most impossible" change to "it was least possible" in #311a? We would be hard pressed to find a reason without stretching some point or other, so we are probably best advised to attribute such changes to momentary whims of James'.

The three hundred revisions we have studied, though, form too clear a pattern to be dismissed as whims. We have seen how they fall into one or the other of two categories of equal size: those that lead the naive reader into trusting the governess, and those that warn a careful reader not to trust the governess. In short, in the revisions we have studied, Henry James polarized the ambiguity of *The Turn of the Screw*.

Of course, ambiguity is a polarized concept in the first place. In order for ambiguity to exist in a situation, there must be at least two ways of looking at it, and two different ways at that. However, one can further separate those two potential viewpoints, and strengthen each of them, should one wish to polarize an existing ambiguity--and that is what Henry James did with his tale.

The Turn of the Screw, as it appears in *The Two Magics*, is an ambiguous tale in the sense that, once suspicion of the governess' sanity is planted in the reader's mind, he can shuffle easily between a psychoanalytic interpretation and

an apparitionist one--between not believing and believing the governess--as he chooses. Take the first critic to publicly question our heroine, an anonymous reviewer in *The Critic* of December, 1898. His mistrust of the governess scarcely became strong enough to carry him through two sentences:

. . . the heroine . . . has nothing in the least substantial on which to base her deep and startling cognitions. She perceives what is beyond all perception, and the reader who begins by questioning whether she is supposed to be sane ends by accepting her conclusions and thrilling over the horrors they involve.¹

The 1908 *Turn of the Screw* has a different kind of ambiguity. In that tale, there is more for a reader to question, and less incentive to question it. In revising the tale for the New York Edition, James took a single ambiguous tale, and transformed it into two tales in one, two texts collapsed into a single work, much like the two sets of chromosomes in a cell just before it divides, which have been created from one set. In the fertile mind of the close reader, the division completes itself, and the tale flourishes, until virtually any reading can take root.

What is *The Turn of the Screw* "about"? We can say of each edition we have examined that it is about a governess who claims to defend her charges from ghosts. But the New York Edition of the tale is something more. It is a tale about reading, about the traps that can be laid for a reader (such as we saw in Chapter II), and the extent to which he can be trapped (as we saw in Chapter I). That Henry James could manage that effect with only a few hundred changes in wording must surely convince the most demanding critics among us that he was an artist of the first order.

Notes

Introduction:

¹ Myfanwy Piper, Libretto, *The Turn of the Screw*, by Benjamin Britten (London: Hawkes & Son Ltd., 1955).

² "James: *The Turn of the Screw*," *Invitation to Learning*, CBS, 3 May 1942; rpt. in Gerald Willen, ed., *A Casebook on Henry James's "The Turn of the Screw,"* 2nd ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969), pp. 160-170.

³ Edmund Wilson, "The Ambiguity of Henry James" in *The Triple Thinkers*, Revised and Enlarged Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), pp. 88-132, rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 115-153; and Oscar Cargill, "The Turn of the Screw and Alice James," in Robert Kimbrough, ed., *The Turn of the Screw*, by Henry James (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1966), pp. 145-165.

⁴ C. Knight Aldritch, M.D., "Another Twist to *The Turn of the Screw*," *Modern Fiction Studies* 13 (Summer 1967), 167-178; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 367-378.

⁵ Louis D. Rubin, Jr., "One More Turn of the Screw," *Modern Fiction Studies*, 9 (Winter 1963-1964), 314-328; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 350-366.

⁶ Henry James, "Preface," Vol. XII of *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, New York Edition (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), p. xviii. Quoted by Edna Kenton, "Henry James to the Ruminant Reader: *The Turn of the Screw*," *The Arts*, 6 (November 1924), 245-255; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 102-114; and by Oliver Evans, "James' Air of Evil: *The Turn of the Screw*," *Partisan Review*, 16 (February 1949), 175-187; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 200-211.

⁷ William Lyon Phelps, "Henry James," *The Yale Review*, V (July 1916), 794. Excerpted in Kimbrough, ed., *The Turn of the Screw* (Norton), p. 178.

⁸ Theodora Bosanquet, *Henry James at Work* (London: Hogarth Press, 1924).

⁹ Robert Kimbrough, "Textual History," in *The Turn of the Screw*, by Henry James (Norton), pp. 89-91. This work is the source of all my information regarding the 1898 William Heinemann edition.

¹⁰ Henry James, unpublished letter to J. B. Pinker, Sept. 11, 1914, in the Yale University Library, cited in Leon Edel and Dan H. Lawrence, *A Bibliography of Henry James* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1957), p. 155.

¹¹ John Raunheim, "A Study of the Revisions of the Tales of Henry James Included in the New York Edition," Diss. New York University 1972, p. 356.

¹² David Timms, "The Governess' Feelings and the Argument from Textual Revision of *The Turn of the Screw*," *Yearbook of English Studies*, 6 (1976), 194-201.

¹³ Thomas Cranfill and Robert Clark, Jr., "James' Revisions of *The Turn of the Screw*," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 19 (March 1965), 394-398.

¹⁴ Henry James, "Preface," Vol. XII of *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, New York Edition, p. xiv.

Chapter I

¹ Alexander E. Jones, "Point of View in *The Turn of the Screw*," *PMLA* 74 (March 1959), 112-122; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 298-318.

² Leon Edel, ed., *The Ghostly Tales of Henry James* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1948), p. 434.

³ "James: *The Turn of the Screw*," *Invitation to Learning*, CBS, 3 May 1942.

⁴ Oscar Cargill, "The Turn of the Screw and Alice James," in Kimbrough, ed., *The Turn of the Screw* (Norton), pp. 145-165.

⁵ Harold C. Goddard, "A Pre-Freudian Reading of *The Turn of the Screw*," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 12, No. 1 (June 1957), 1-36; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 244-272.

⁶ Edmund Wilson, "The Ambiguity of Henry James," *The Triple Thinkers*, Revised and Enlarged Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), pp. 88-132; rpt. in Willen, *Casebook*, pp. 115-153.

⁷ Eric Solomon, "The Return of the Screw," *The University Review--Kansas City*, 30 (Spring, 1964), 205-211; rpt. in Kimbrough, ed., *The Turn of the Screw* (Norton), pp. 237-245.

Chapter II

¹ John Peter Raunheim, "A Study of the Revisions of the Tales of Henry James Included in the New York Edition," Diss. New York University 1972, p. 78.

Conclusion

¹ Rev. of *In the Cage* and *The Two Magics*, *The Critic*, 33 (December 1898), 523-4; rpt. in Roger Gard, ed., *Henry James: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), p. 276.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- James, Henry. "The Turn of the Screw." *Collier's*. Vol. XX, no. 17 (27 January 1898) through vol. XXI, no. 2 (16 April 1898).
- James, Henry. "The Turn of the Screw." In *The Two Magics*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898, pp. 3-213.
- James, Henry. "The Turn of the Screw." In Vol. XII of *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*. New York Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908, pp. 145-309.

Secondary Sources:

Bibliography:

- Budd, John. *Henry James: A Bibliography of Criticism, 1975-1981*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Edel, Leon and Dan. H. Lawrence. *A Bibliography of Henry James*. 3rd. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- McColgan, Kristin Pruitt. *Henry James 1917-1959: A Reference Guide*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1979.
- Ricks, Beatrice. *Henry James: A Bibliography of Secondary Works*. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1975.
- Scura, Dorothy McInnis. *Henry James 1960-1974: A Reference Guide*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1979.

Revisions:

Bosanquet, Theodora. *Henry James at Work*. London: Hogarth Press, 1924.

Cranfill, Thomas. and Robert Clark, Jr. "James' Revisions of *The Turn of the Screw*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 19 (March 1965), 394-398.

Edel, Leon. "The Turn of the Screw." In *The Ghostly Tales of Henry James*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1948, pp. 425-435.

Kimbrough, Robert. "Textual Notes." In *The Turn of the Screw*. By Henry James. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1966, pp. 91-94.

Raunheim, John P. "A Study of the Revisions of the Tales of Henry James Included in the New York Edition." Diss. New York University 1972.

Timms, David. "The Governess' Feelings and the Argument from Textual Revision of *The Turn of the Screw*." *Yearbook of English Studies*, 6 (1976), 194-201.

Criticism and Interpretation:

James, Henry. *The Turn of the Screw*. Ed. Robert Kimbrough. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1966.

Piper, Myfanwy. Libretto. *The Turn of the Screw*. By Benjamin Britten. London: Hawkes & Son Ltd., 1955.

Thomas, Glen Ray. "The Freudian Approach to James' 'The Turn of the Screw': Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism." Diss. Emory 1969. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1975.

Willen, Gerald. *A Casebook on Henry James's "The Turn of the Screw."* 2nd. ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Appendix

1. Pagination of the *Collier's* edition:

The page numbers used for the *Collier's* edition in this thesis correspond to the pages in the periodical as follows:

<u>this thesis</u>	<u><i>Collier's</i></u>
1, 2	Vol. XX, #17 (27 Jan., 1898), pp. 20 and 22
3, 4	#18 (5 Feb.), pp. 20, 21
5, 6	#19 (12 Feb.), pp. 20, 22
7, 8, 9	#20 (19 Feb.), pp. 20, 21, 22
10, 11, 12	#21 (26 Feb.), pp. 20, 21, 22
13, 14, 15	#22 (5 Mar.), pp. 16, 18, 19
16, 17, 18	#23 (12 Mar.), pp. 16, 17, 18
19, 20, 21	#24 (19 Mar.), pp. 9, 10, 11
22, 23, 24	#25 (26 Mar.), pp. 20, 21, 22
25, 26	#26 (2 Apr.), pp. 17, 18
27, 28, 29	Vol. XXI, #1 (9 Apr.), pp. 18, 19, 22
30, 31, 32	#2 (16 Apr.), pp. 16, 17, 18

The letters "a" and "b" in the tables denote left-hand and right-hand columns in *Collier's*, except for our pages 27 and 28, which appear in the 9 April 1898 issue without columns.

2. Revision Numbers

This appendix was originally to have contained a complete list of the revisions made by James to *The Turn of the Screw*, both for *The Two Magics* and the New York Edition, but the result of that plan would have been to produce an appendix almost as large as the text, composed mainly of material either already in the text or outside the scope of the present study. Therefore my reader would find, if he took the time, that the revisions referred to in this study do not follow an unbroken sequence in their numbers--that is, that there are gaps (no revision #44, for example) as well as the "filler" numbers such as #445a. He is advised to regard the revision numbers as tags, and nothing more.

3. Miscellaneous and Whimsical Revisions

The following table lists those revisions made to *The Turn of the Screw* for the New York Edition which do not appear on tables in Chapters I or II. Several of these (up to and including #7) occur in the framing narrative, and so are not properly a part of the governess' account, where our attention has been focused. The rest appear to have been made by James on impulse, with no clear purpose in mind.

TABLE 24

MISCELLANEOUS AND WHIMSICAL REVISIONS

Revision Number	
2a	had shaken him TM 3] had shocked him NY 147]
2a-i	to have involved a child TM 4] to have been concerned with a child NY 148]
2a-ii	that they TM 4] that two children NY 148]
2a-iii	at his interlocutor TM 4] at this converser NY 148]
2a-iv	This, naturally, was TM 4] This was naturally NY 148]
2b	was not so simple TM 5] was n't so simple NY 148]
3-i	she would have been TM 6] she'd have been NY 149]
3-ii	she had been TM 7] she <i>had</i> been NY 150]
3a	I inquired TM 7] I said NY 150]
5a	his town C 2a] his own town TM 11] his town NY 153]
5b	of their parents TM 11] of his parents NY 153]
6	very heavily TM 12] very heavy NY 153]
6-ii	"Excuse me-- TM 13] "Pardon me-- NY 155]
6-iii	left us again TM 15] again left us NY 156]
7	What is TM 15] What's NY 156]

TABLE 24 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
9	melancholy TM 16] dreary NY 158]
11	so charming as to make it TM 17] too charming not to make it NY 159]
22	pretension TM 21] pretensions NY 162]
26	scared as well as TM 22] scared not less than NY 163]
29	immense TM 22] tremendous NY 163]
33	in keen apprehension TM 24] to a change of note NY 165]
39	only one TM 26] but one NY 166]
46	in my room, in a drawer TM 33] in one of the drawers of my room NY 171]
76a	the cherubs TM 46] those cherubs NY 182]
87	only to show TM 49] just to show NY 184]
94	on just <i>my</i> lines TM 51] just on <i>my</i> lines NY 185]
95a	distance, then TM 54] distance and then NY 189]
107	she resumed TM 61] she took it up NY 194]
114	he himself kept C 10b] <i>he</i> kept TM 64] he himself kept NY 197]
118	not to be well TM 64] not to be quite in health NY 197]

TABLE 24 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
123	a disguised excitement TM 67] a disguised tension NY 199]
131	at a distance TM 69] a good way off NY 201]
142	I don't understand you. TM 74] I don't understand. NY 205]
149a	as if from TM 75] as from NY 205]
192	presenting to my own tenderness an occasion for doing TM 89] pointing // out to my own tenderness any way to do NY 215-16]
193	actively cultivate TM 90] actively promote in myself NY 217]
196	have been, however, a greater tension still TM 90] have been a greater tension still, however, NY 217]
259	before us, at a distance, but within TM 108] before us and at a distance, yet within NY 231]
266	little shoulders TM 111] small shoulders NY 233]
291a	survive, in memory, TM 121] survive, for memory, NY 242]
300	in just the TM 125] just in the NY 245]
305	above me TM 125] above us NY 245]
311a	it was most impossible TM 127] it was least possible NY 246]
314	time, almost automatically, to mark the close of the incident, TM 127] time, to mark the close of the incident, almost automatically; NY 246]
324	see? that's-- TM 132] see? who's-- NY 250]

TABLE 24 (CONTINUED)

Revision Number	
325	it was to TM 133] it was just to NY 250]
333	for that was TM 137] since that was NY 254]
336b	and retreat TM 139] and bolt NY 255]
340	fairly excited TM 140] fairly stirred NY 256]
350	clean image TM 144] clean picture NY 258]
365	last answered TM 148] last returned NY 261]
371	"Oh, I don't TM 154] "I don't NY 265]
395	but it's far TM 166] yet it's far NY 275]
418b	on the ground TM 176] to the ground NY 282]
421	hand as by an ambiguous compensation, I saw TM 177] hand I saw, as by an ambiguous compensation, NY 283]
424	was promptly TM 179] was at once NY 285]
433b	the grief TM 185] the anguish NY 289]
446a	him. If C 28] him. He'll meet me--he'll confess. If TM 189] him. He'll meet me. He'll confess. If NY 292]
456	terribly suddenly TM 195] terribly all at once NY 296]
462	I fancy TM 197] I imagine NY 298]