Robert A. Elderdice, Doctor of Philosophy, 1953

"Henry James's Revisions of His Early Short Stories and Short Novels."

Dissertation and abstract approved _____

Date: _____

rtrtic submitted to the aculty of the
of the niversity of ryland in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of hilosophy

UMI Number: DP70329

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI DP70329

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION. . . . . .

CHAPTER II

THE REVISIONS OF A PASSIONATE PILGRIM . . .37

CHAPTER III

THE REVISIONS OF "THE MADONNA OF THE FUTURE". . 115

CHAPTER IV

THE REVISIONS OF MADAME DE MAUVES . . 160

CHAPTER V

THE REVISIONS OF DAISY MILLER . . . 210

CHAPTER VI

THE REVISIONS OF "A BUNDLE OF LETTERS". . . 272

CHAPTER VII

THE REVISIONS OF THE SIEGE OF LONDON . 314

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION. 372

BIBLIOGRAPHY. . 382

73284

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Doctor Hugh looked grave an instant; then he said: "I see you've been altering the text!" Dencombe was a passionate corrector, a fingerer of style; the last thing he ever arrived at was a form final for himself. His ideal would have been to publish secretly, and then, on the published text, treat himself to the terrified revise, sacrificing always a first edition and beginning for posterity and even for the collectors, poor dears, with a second. This morning, in The Middle Years, his pencil had pricked a dozen lights.[1]

One may be assured that Dencombe had James's complete blessing—a generation earlier than "The Middle Years" (1893) it was the wont of young Henry James, Jr. to revise his travel pieces, reviews, short stories, and novels before their reappearance in book form.[2] Even more thoroughgoing proof of James's dedication

1 Ten Short Stories of Henry James, ed. Michael Swan (London, 1948), p.200. Leon Edel has pointed out that The Jolly Corner, first printed in Ford Madox Ford's new English Review for December, 1908, reappeared in the New York Edition's ghost stories volume (XVII) almost immediately thereafter (not later than March, 1909), and, "True to his practice of revision, even its late text underwent some trifling modifications in passing from magazine to Edition, such as the alteration of the housekeeper's name from Mrs. Muldoody to Mrs. Muldoon" (The Ghostly Tales of Henry James, New Brunswick, 1948, p. 725). (Sidney E. Lind's dissertation, "Henry James and the Supernatural: A Study in Conflict and Fantasy" [New York, 1946], should be helpful in augmenting the work of Mr. Edel.)

2 Percy Lubbock accepts a bit too unquestioningly James's remarks in his Preface for Roderick Hudson: "To read his own books was an entirely new amusement to him; they had always been rigidly thrust out of sight from the moment they were finished and done with..." (The Letters of Henry James, New York, 1920, II, 4).

In the August to December issues of the 1871 Atlantic James's first novel, Watch and Ward, appeared. It was a work certain to give "Doctor Hugh" his worried moments: "Still, seven years later, and this is most surprising, James considered this first novel good enough for him to take valuable time from much better work in order to revise and republish it in book form.

to the idea of revision, his conviction as to its efficacy,[3] began more than a decade after "The Middle Years," when, at the zenith of his creative power but in the early twilight of his life (he was sixty-two in 1905), he in effect cloistered himself until 1909, carefully revising twenty-four volumes of earlier fiction, much of it more than a quarter of a century old.

Even careful verbal alterations, however, could not remedy the lack of direct observation and did not tone down the story sufficiently, and the present day reader of it, who becomes acquainted with it invariably in this edition of 1878, instead of through the pages of the Atlantic, finds it quite as loud and melodramatic and unpromising as the reader who seeks out the original draft" (Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley, The Early Development of Henry James, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, IV, Nos. 1-2, Urbana, 1930, p. 126. See pp. 122-126, for an interesting criticism of the "original draft.") F. O. Matthiessen concurs: "...he felt so unsure of it that he did not issue it as a volume until seven years later, and then only after he had rewritten it" (The American Novels and Stories of Henry James, New York, 1947, p.viii).

Since James ultimately gave up trying to salvage Watch and Ward, Roderick Hudson is spoken of as his first novel. After its original appearance in the Atlantic throughout 1875, Osgood published it in 1876; for this edition James made revisions designed to differentiate Roderick from Rowland Mallet (Early Development, p. 192,n.); in 1879, Macmillan of London brought it out, "revised, retrenched, and in places rewritten for the English public, to whom it appears practically as a fresh work" (Publishers' Weekly, July 12, 1879, p. 31). Miss Kelley analyses these 1879 revisions: "...James rewrote much of the conversation of Mary with Rowland in the latter part of the book, making it more subtle, in an attempt to show her charm and wit" (p. 193,n.). Miss Hélène Harvitt, in her study of the revisions of Roderick, used none of these three editions, but instead one of 1883 (see notes 74,77). See Early Development, Chapter XIV, passim, for illustrations of James's revisions of his reviews and essays during the 1870's.

3 George Meredith and Thomas Hardy, among James's contemporaries, revised, but some of Meredith's seem to have been restorations of original passages that had been omitted in order that the work be brief enough for acceptance by the periodicals; Hardy's, as is well known, were out of deference to the gentle Victorian reader of magazines.

On his way back to Lamb House in the summer of 1905, following his lecture tour in this country, James was so flushed with the success of his recent negotiations with Charles Scribner's Sons that even while on shipboard he could not resist getting in some revisory work on Roderick Hudson, despite the murmurs of an uneasy conscience that his first committment was The American Scene.[4] In the autumn (November 3), glowing with anticipation, he wrote to Margaret "And then (please mention to your Dad [William James]) all the time I haven't been doing the American Book, I have been revising with extreme minuteness three or four of my early works for the Edition Définitive (the settlement of some of the details of which seem to be hanging fire a little between my 'agent' and my New York publisher; not, however, in a manner to indicate, I think, a real hitch.) Please, however, say nothing

4 The crossing seems to have been in July. Miss Elizabeth Robins recalled that James "did not stick very closely to his revision of 'Roderick Hudson'" (Theatre and Friendship: Some Henry James Letters, with a Commentary, New York, 1932, p. 251). His chief literary plan at the time was not "the Revised Collected Edition. He was committed first of all to do the book of traveller's impressions called The American Scene" (ibid., p. 252). Yet even James's New England heritage could not prod him into going beyond the first of the two intended volumes of American impressions, when his dream of the Edition seemed so near at hand—what George Meredith called the "tour of the inside of my dear Henry James" remained on the Atlantic seaboard, and the date of its Preface (September 23, 1906) may be misleading. Had James but emulated the prolific Anthony Trollope, he would perhaps have finished both volumes of The American Scene before docking in England—and he would have relinquished any idea of revision. (The 1946 Scribner reprint of The American Scene added three essays of 1870-71 which had been reprinted in Portraits of Places [1883]. The 1948 Lear edition of Portraits of Places omitted these three, as well as three others.)

whatever, any of you to any one, about the existence of any such plan. These things should be spoken of only when they are in full feather."[5]

In 1906 James was at work in earnest, revising, and writing the Prefaces (all the arrangements with Scribner seem to have been ironed out by March—the New York Edition would be brought out simultaneously in London by Macmillan and Company);[6] his zealous application, indeed, was relieved only by a short vacation in London.[7] No real respite came until 1907, when his desk lay idle from March until late June or early July.[8] On the eve of his departure for Paris to meet the Chartons (following a month with them, he was to go on alone to Italy), James wrote Grace Norton (March 5), sketching the work thus far accomplished; it is interesting to see that not the revisions (many of which, one feels sure, were almost automatic) but the Prefaces (of which he was proud) were "the real tussle" for their author: "I have been very busy all these last months in reising [sic] my Productions for a (severely-sifted)

Letters, II, 36-37.

6 He wrote Miss Robins (March 28) of his agent having "transformed my situation little by little about which I had been idiotically helpless myself. He has just arranged a very complex and very difficult job for me in a masterly way—the matter of a 'handsome' collective (and selective)Edition Définitive of my writings, in the U. S. and here—a tiresome worrying business through the scatterment of all my books through a number of publishers, who were all to be triumphantly dealt with. He has so dealt and made the thing possible—I couldn't have touched it by myself... (This affair of the Edition, by the bye, please,is very private and confidential)" (Theatre and Friendship, pp.256-257). See note 9.

7 "1906. At work at Rye, revising his works; takes a short vacation in London" (Lyon N. Richardson, ed. Henry James: Representative Selections; with Introduction, Bibliography and Notes, American Writers Series, New York, 1941, p.cxx).

8 See Letters, II, 5, and Representative Selections, ibid.

Collective and Definitive Edition....[9] and a 'handsome'—I hope really handsome and not too cheap—in fact sufficiently dear—array will be the result—owing much to close amendment (and even 'rewriting') of the four earliest novels and to illuminating classification, collocation, juxtaposition and separation through the whole series. The work on the earlier novels has involved much labour—to the best effect for the vile things, I'm convinced; but the real tussle is in writing the Prefaces (to each vol. or book,) which are to be long—very long!—and loquacious—and competent perhaps to pousser à la vente. The Edition is to be of 23 vols.[10] and there are to be some 15 Prefaces[11] (as some of the books are in two,) and twenty-three lovely frontispieces—all of which I have this winter very ingeniously called into being;[12] so that they at least only await 'process' reproduction. The Prefaces, as I say,

9 The ellipsis is mine: "—of which I even spoke to you, I think, when I saw you last, as it was then more or less definitely planned. Then hitches and halts supervened—the whole matter being complicated by the variety and the conflict of my scattered publishers, till at last the thing is on the right basis (in the two countries—for it has all had to be brought about by quite separate arts here and in America,)..." (Letters, II,70). See note 6.

10 Twenty-four volumes were needed in the 1907-09 series. The year after James's death, The Ivory Tower and The Sense of the Past were added (1917), giving to the series the rather misleading date of 1907-17. Miss Rebecca West and her followers date the Edition 1908-09. See Léon Edel, "The Architecture of James's New York Edition," New England Quarterly, XXIV (June, 1951), 169-176.

11 There were eighteen Prefaces.

12 One of the most charming sections of the Preface to The Golden Bowl is that in which James describes himself and A. L. Coburn tramping the London streets, searching for the "small pictures of our 'set' stage with the actors left out," for the "certain inanimate characteristics of London streets." James commented upon "the 'picture-book' quality that contemporary English and American

are difficult to do—but I have found them of a jolly interest; and though I am not going to let you read one of the fictions themselves over I shall expect you to read all of the said Introductions."[13]

Autumn of 1907 saw the New York Edition begin to appear, at the rate of one volume a month; in the best manner of the serialized Victorian novelist, James never got far ahead of the remorselessly-turning presses. During Christmas week he could see no vacation in prospect until the following May: he wrote that he expected "to bide quietly here, where a continuity of occupation—strange to say—causes the days and months to melt in my grasp...."[14] Despite his ill-health (testified to by his close friend Elizabeth Robins)[15] he allowed himself to be once more lured into playwriting;[16] small

---

prose appears more and more destined, by the conditions of publication, to consent...to see imputed to it," warning that "Anything that relieves responsible prose of the duty of being...good enough, interesting enough and...pictorial enough, above all in itself... may well inspire in the lover of literature certain lively questions as to the future of that institution" (The Art of the Novel; Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur, New York, 1934, pp. 331-334).

13 Letters, II, 70.

14 Letters, II, 85. The letter, to W. E. Norris, is dated December 23, 1907. James expected to be in London during May and June. He writes to Norris, anticipating "my ten weeks in Paris with the Whartons" (ibid.). According to Lubbock, James went to France for a short while, and to America with the Whartons (Letters, II,5); Richardson makes no reference to any 1908 vacation (Representative Selections, pp. cxx-cxxi).

15 See notes 21, and 16 (paragraph 4).

16 Percy Lubbock believed that James's theatrical work at this time was "stimulated, no doubt, by the comparative failure of the laborious edition of his works" (Letters, II,6). Mr. Edel agrees: "He was in a mood, therefore, to be receptive to the over-

wonder, then, that on April 3, 1908, the printers were again treading "on my heels," or that the "Edition Définitive" of some two years before was now, as he wrote his namesake, "The Nightmare of the Edition (of my Works!)...the real mot de L'Énigme of all my long gaps and delinquencies these many months past—my terror of not keeping sufficiently ahead in doing my part of it (all the revising, rewriting, retouching, Preface-making and proof-correcting) has so paralysed me—as a panic fear—that I have let all other decencies go to the wall. The printers and publishers tread on my heels, and I feel their hot breath behind me—whereby I keep at it in order not to be overtaken. Fortunately I have kept at it so

---

tures now made to him by the theatre" (The Complete Plays of Henry James, Philadelphia and New York, 1949, p. 66).

Some years before, James had written a one-act play, Summer Soft (some elements of which reminded Edel [p.521] a great deal of A Passionate Pilgrim); this he later re-wrote as Covering End, which in turn (1907) was made into the three-act The High Bid, for Johnston Forbes-Robertson. The High Bid was staged successfully in Edinborough in February, 1908, and in London in March, 1909.

According to Mr. Edel, "James settled down through 1908 and 1909 to write plays again even while he was dictating his final prefaces and correcting final proof for the Definitive Edition. He had begun to dictate his work during 1896 and by now was addicted to his 'remingtonese.' His plays, however, were drafted by hand, and dictated from the draft" (p.67).

Of the plays James was writing during this period, only one other, The Saloon (a one-act dramatisation of Owen Wingrave—see note 71, last two paragraphs) was produced during his lifetime; it was staged in 1910 by Miss Gertrude Kingston. Mr. Edel believes that "the worries over the plays, combined with the shock over the failure of the Definitive Edition, together with a growing morbid fear that he was suffering from a heart ailment...brought on a nervous illness and deep depression" (Complete Plays, p. 68). Late in 1909 and early in 1910 James was too ill to work: "He had offered the world his lifetime of work, or what he deemed to be the quintessential portion of it, only to discover once again, and for the last time, that he remained unread. The 'trauma' of Guy Domville [1895] was repeated here, in attenuated form" (p.66). See text for note 22.

that I am almost out of the wood, and the next very few weeks or so will completely lay the spectre. The case has been complicated badly, moreover, the last month—and even before—by my having, of all things in the world, let myself be drawn into a theatrical adventure—which fortunately appeared to have turned out as well as I could have possibly expected or desired."[17]

Four months later James was still not completely "out of the wood," nor was the spectre entirely laid. Weary of his "Preface-making," he was pardonably proud of them; still convinced (and our own contemporary critics agree with him) that The Bostonians had never been fairly received, and realising its sales appeal, he grieved over his inability to include it in the Edition; finally (this was three years after his tattered copy of Roderick Hudson had accompanied him in his Atlantic crossing)he was "yearning to get back...to too dreadfully postponed and neglected 'creative' work." James wrote Howells on August 17, 1906:

> My actual attitude about the Lucubrations is almost only, and quite inevitably, that they make to me, for weariness; by reason of their number and extent—I've now but a couple more to write.... They are, in general, a sort of plea for Criticism, for Discrimination, for Appreciation on other than infantile lines—as against the so almost universal Anglo-Saxon absence of these things; which tends so, in our general trade, it seems to me, to break the heart. However, I am afraid I'm too sick of the mere doing of them, and of the general strain of the effort to avoid the deadly danger of repetition, to say much to the purpose about them. They ought, collected together, none the less, to form a sort of comprehensive manual or vademecum for aspirants in our arduous profession. Still, it will be long before I shall want to collect them together for that purpose and furnish them with a final Preface.[18] I've done with prefaces forever. As for the Edition itself, it has racked me a little that I've had to leave out so many things that would have helped to make for rather a more vivid completeness. I don't at all regret the things, pretty numerous,

17 Letters, II, 96.

18 R. P. Blackmur skillfully did this for James—see note 12. Mr. Blackmur also wrote the chapter on James for the recent (1949) Literary History of the United States (II, 1039-1064).

that I've omitted from deep-seated preference and design;[19] but I do a little those that are crowded out by want of space and by the rigour of the 23 vols. and 23 only, which were the condition of my being able to arrange the matter with the Scribners at all. Twenty-three do seem a fairly blatant array—and yet I rather surmise that there may have to be a couple of supplementary volumes for certain too marked omissions; such being, on the whole, detrimental to an all professedly comprehensive presentation of one's stuff. Only these, I pray God, without Prefaces! And I have even, in addition, a dim vague view of reintroducing, with a good deal of titivation and cancellation, the too-diffuse but, I somehow feel, tolerably full and good Bostonians of nearly a quarter of a century ago; that production never having, even to my much disciplined patience, received any sort of justice. But it will take, doubtless, a great deal of artful redoing—and I haven't, now, had the courage or time for anything so formidable as touching and re-touching it. I feel at the same time how the series suffers commercially from its having been dropped so completely out....

I could really shed salt tears of impatience and yearning to get back, after so prolonged a blocking of traffic, to too dreadfully postponed and neglected 'creative' work; an accumulated store of ideas and reachings-out for which even now clogs my brain....I never have had such a sense of almost bursting, late in the day though it be, with violent and lately too much repressed creative (again!) intention.[20]

That autumn, in such ill health that he compared himself to "'a stopped clock'" (and when even going up to London was "'alas, heartbreakingly impossible'")[21] James probably made bitter revisions to Sydney Smith's famous quip: his magnum opus, more than a year old now, had had inordinately poor sales.[22] Despite "the measure known

19 According to John Samuel Lucas, fifty-three short stories (stories of less than 30,000 words) were omitted ("Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories," Chicago, 1948, pp.1-3).

20 F. O. Matthiessen, The James Family: Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, Henry, and Alice James (New York, 1948), pp.514-515. Both elisions are Matthiessen's; Lubbock makes the second elision, and omits the second paragraph, without indicating his omission (Letters, II, 99-100).

21 Robins, Theatre and Friendship, pp.274-275. See note 16, last paragraph.

22 In 1908, James brought out Views and Reviews, a collection of twelve reviews and critical essays, only one of which had been reprinted later than 1879, and three of which had originally appeared in 1865, and never again been reprinted.

only to myself, of the treasurers of ingenuity and labour I have lavished on the thing," on October 23, 1908, James had received nothing from either Scribner or Macmillan, although "those unexplained—though so grim-looking!—figure-lists of Scribner's" did seem to show that "a certain $211...*is*, all the same owing me."[23] Perhaps, the sixty-five year old author added bitterly, *he* owed Scribner $211. Yet "like the convolutions of a vast smothering boa-constrictor, such voluminosities of Proof—of the Edition—to be carefully read—still keep rolling in...."[24]

In 1909, James brought out *Italian Hours*, a collection of twenty-two travel pieces, fourteen of which had first appeared before 1875, when they were retouched as *Transatlantic Sketches* (and retouched again in 1883 for *Foreign Parts*). Slight changes or additions were made to these fourteen essays and five later ones, and three new chapters were written for *Italian Hours* (See LeRoy Phillips, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James*, New York, 1930, pp.4-6, 22-23, 66-69).

These two collections have all the earmarks of "quick cash" pieces. In May, 1909, James had trouble meeting the printer's deadline, apparently for *Italian Hours*. He wrote Miss Robins on May 9 that he was "in the all-else blighted predicament of the feverish finish of a belated book (by May 20th)...four-fifths of it are set up and printed and waiting ferociously for my now solemnly promised remainder (so that the book may be out by July 1st,) and I have surrendered myself as regards everything else to abysses of ineptitude" (*Theatre and Friendship*, p. 276).

23 *Letters*, II, 106. The letter was in part an invitation to J. B. Pinker to come down to Lamb House for an overnight visit—whether or not Pinker was the "agent" (James always modestly put the term within quotes) I have not yet been able to determine. Part of the letter follows: "I am afraid my anti-climax *has* come from the fact that since the publication of the Series began no dimmest light or lead as to its actualities or possibilities of profit has reached me—whereby, in the absence of special warning, I found myself concluding in the sense of some probable fair return—beguiled thereto also by the measure known only to myself, of the treasures of ingenuity and labour I have lavished on the ameliorations of every page of the thing, and as to which I felt that they couldn't *not* somehow 'tell.' I warned *myself* indeed, and kept down my hopes—said to myself that any present payments would be moderate and fragmentary—very; but this didn't prevent my rather building on something that at the end of a very frequented and invaded and hospitable summer might make such a difference as would outweigh—a little—my so disconcerting failure to get anything from _____. The non-response of *both* sources has left me rather high and dry..." (*Ibid.*).

24 *Letters*, II, 107.

On the last day of the year, James wrote the ever-loyal and sympathetic Howells that he has "but just come to the end of my really very insidious and ingenious labour on behalf of all that series—though it has just been rather a blow to me to find that I've come (as yet) to no reward whatever....It will have landed me in Bankruptcy—unless it picks up; for it has prevented my doing any other work whatever...."[25]

Although James adopted the practice of dictation[26] in the late 1890's (perhaps 1896—his letters after that date contain many delighted references to him "Remingtonese")[27] and dictated his three great novels of the major phase, ere is no proof— and indeed no internal evidence— that he dictated the revisions for the New York Edition. Everything points to his having made his emendations by hand.

25 Letters, II, 119. See note 22. Besides the Edition, James seems (Phillips, Bibliography, pp. 64-68, 96, 109, 217-218) to have turned out, 1906-08, only The American Scene (1907), "Speech of American Women" and "Manners of American Women" (for Harper's Bazar, 1907), a Special Introduction to The Tempest (1907), Views and Reviews (1908), Julia Bride (1908), and Chapter VII of The Whole Family; a Novel by Twelve Authors (1908).

26 F. O. Matthiessen writes that "since he had taken advantage of the typewriter and had begun, in the mid-eighteen-nineties, to dictate his work, James had evolved his final elaborate manner, the qualifications and circumlocutions of which strike many readers as oppressively disproportionate in a story of such small content as ["Crapy Cornelia," 1908—adverse critics (see note 60) object to the later style being superimposed upon the early "slight works"; apparently James composed "slight works" with "small content" both early and late]. But another quality that goes far to alleviate any impression of overstuffed heaviness is James's resilient refinement of the gift he had always possessed for visual images..." (American Novels and Stories, p.xxii).

Mr. Edel notes that after the chief playwriting period (1890-1895) James took up the habit of making full-length scenarios for his novels and that "After he started dictating directly to the typewriter he did not include these in his notebooks, and most of them were destroyed"—James burned much of his material in 1915 (Complete Plays, p. 63). See note 16, paragraph 3.

Michael Swan, editor of the recent John Lehmann reprint of The Spoils of Poynton, suggests that James began dictation part way through this nouvelle, which appeared as The Old Things in the Atlantic

(April - October, 1896): "But before much of the novel was written he had that accident to his right hand (about which, characteristically, he gives his correspondents no details) which later led him into the habit of dictation—a habit which had some effect on his style. He could not work, and began to be 'pursued by printers and illustrators, fatigue, pain and rheumatism.' [See note 27, paragraph 1]. He makes no mention in his letters of having dictated any part of the book" (The Spoils of Poynton, A London Life, The Chaperon, London, 1947, p.v).

Robert Herrick maintained that James took up the practice of dictation midway through The Princess Casamassima (1885-86)—he had discovered a marked change in its style—and that James did not deny his direct assertion on the matter ("A Visit to Henry James," Yale Review, XII, 724-26, July, 1923). Miss Theodora Bosanquet, James's "priestess of the Remington," disputes Herrick's statement strongly, but gives only the 1890's as the date (Henry James at Work, London, 1924, p. 7). She takes issue with Herrick, as a matter of fact, on several points.

Mrs. Cadwallader Jones, sister-in-law of Edith Wharton, wrote to James objecting to the "misplaced middle" of The Wings of the Dove, and laying it to James's habit of dictation. With something of a worried conscience, but helping us to establish a date at least as early as 1897, he answered on October 23, 1902: "And dictating, please, has moreover nothing to do with it. The value of that process for me is in its help to do over and over, for which it is extremely adapted, and which is the only way I can do it at all. It soon enough, accordingly, becomes intellectually absolutely identical with the act of writing—or has become so, after five years now, with me; so that the difference is only material and illusory—only the difference, that is, that I walk up and down, which is so much to the good—But I must stop walking now" (Letters, I, 403).

27 On September 15, 1897, James wrote to A. C. Benson of the "glad" fact that "since we last corresponded [February 18,1897 (?)] I have been reduced to Remingtonese altogether. It's a question of that or eternal silence..." (Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod, ed. E. F. Benson, London and New York, 1930, p. 43).

On June 17, 1898, James let the "Remington shamelessly loose" on Gaillard T. Lapsley (Letters, I, 285); in August, Howells and Paul Bourget received dictated letters. So late as January 1, 1908, James still was conscious of the pleasures afforded him by the "Friendly sound of my Remington" (Letters, II, 88-89).

On October 27, 1911, enjoying better health than for several years, James wrote to Miss Bosanquet appealing to her to find him a flat in London; he wished to do A Small Boy and Others and "the need of expressing myself, of pushing the job on, on the old Remingtonese terms, grows daily stronger within me. But I haven't a seat and temple for the Remington and its priestess..." (Letters, II, 204-205).

The note immediately preceding dealt in part with the reaction of the reader to the work that James dictated. E. F. Benson describes the reactions of the listener:

"When he talked one watched entranced the gradual building up of an architectural structure. He paused, he corrected a

The alterations of his later stories (studied by Dr. John S. Lucas)[28] are so slight— a word substituted here, a comma omitted there— that they could have been conveniently made on the pages of the recent volume itself. For the early work, some other technique had to be devised: Percy Lubbock's edition of the Letters of James

---

phrase, he amplified, he defined, and one heard all that his typist heard as he paced up and down the garden-room of Lamb House while he arrived at the precise, the beautifully creaking package of words, until the charged sentence would hold no more."

"...thirty years ago I sat on just such a day of June and heard his voice from within [the garden-room] dictating to his typist the novel on which he was engaged. It boomed out through the open window...now louder, now softer, as he paced up and down the length of the room, and the metallic click of the typewriter made response. From breakfast until the stroke of the gong for lunch he was thus invisible though not inaudible..." (Letters to Benson and Mrs. Fisher, pp.vii-ix).

28 "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948). The stories of the period 1891-94 had very little, quantitatively speaking, to reveal to the collator. "Brooksmith" had only "a scant half-dozen significant revisions" (p.171); "Greville Fane" furnished "only seven changes worth noting," dealt with in pages 146-50; in "The Middle Years" "nothing really new or important can be singled out" (p.152), but a longer work, "The Death of the Lion," provided fourteen items worth Lucas's attention (pp.152-55); "The Coxon Fund" was treated in three pages (155-57). The most significant of the revisions of these stories were made by James in the interest of better (and more) alliteration and more extended imagery.

James's revisions of his stories written after 1895 also were often those of figurative language; other diction changes usually involved only single words. Frequently Dr. Lucas could discuss all of a story's revisions in less than one page.

Léon Edel ("A Further Note on 'An Error in The Ambassadors,'" American Literature, XXIII, 128-130, March, 1951) writes that "The history of this edition clearly shows that James revised minutely only the early works, confining himself in the later works...to the harmonising of punctuation and occasional verbal changes. The elimination of commas, a mechanical matter, is hardly 'minute' revision, as Mr. Young suggests. James was not revising matters of substance in the final novels as he was in his rewriting of Roderick Hudson and The American. In fact, among the unpublished evidence which supplements the published, there is a letter to Scribner assuring the publisher that the later novels will not undergo the extensive 'retouching' of the earlier ones." Mr. Edel blames "the house of Harper" for "so gross an error" as the reversal of two chapters of The Ambassadors (p.129).

Robert E. Young's article had appeared in AL, XXII (November 1950), 245-253. His answer to Mr. Edel, "A Final Note on The Ambassadors," appeared in AL, XXIII (January 1952), 487-490.

contains a photograph of a typical revised sheet of The American (1876-77);[29] each of the four margins around the printed text was as wide as the text itself. In these inviting margins James, in his difficult scrawl, had written emendations, circled them, and drawn connecting lines to the appropriate lined-out word(s); in one instance, a single word replaced a lone original one; once, twelve words in the printed text were replaced by twenty written ones; and once a twenty-three word passage replaced a single word. Even this much white space was at times insufficient: Professor F. O. Matthiessen, describing to his less-privileged reader the James material in the Houghton Library, reported that "James' copies of both The American and The Portrait of a Lady, [contained] his innumerable revisions in longhand on the margins and in inserted pages of typescript...."[30] Miss Theodora Bosanquet, his typist throughout the years of the definitive revisions (and at least as late as

---

Although the title is a bit misleading, since James wrote no novels between The Tragic Muse (1889-90), and The Spoils of Poynton (The Old Things, 1896), a dissertation announced (in 1949) should be helpful in the matter of James's evolving style: Regina Roth (Ohio State), "Henry James's The Tragic Muse: A Critical and Textual Study of the Last Novel of the 'Middle Years.'"

29 Letters, II, 70. The photograph is of part "original" version.

30 Henry James: The Major Phase (New York, 1944), p. 153. Mr. Edel provides interesting and apposite material from his inexhaustible knowledge of James the dramatist. One copy of The American, for instance, is "interleaved with corrections inserted in his hand" (Complete Plays, p. 621).

One copy of Guy Domville has "a sheaf of manuscript in James's hand, individual sheets containing a series of corrections and alterations made by the novelist. These were copied into prompt-books, apparently by a copyist or secretary at the theatre, and this explains the fact that other copies which have turned up in the rare book market are interleaved and contain numerous textual changes" (ibid.).

At one point in the manuscript of The Other House "Henry James's corrections, written in his hand, have been pasted over the typewritten sheets" (ibid.). And there were, Edel noted, corrections also in the hand of Theodora Bosanquet.

1911) recalled that he read over "the work of former years" in the evening, "treating the printed pages like so many proof-sheets of extremely corrupt text."[31] Specifically referring to the earlier tales, she related his having "found it necessary to spend a good deal of time working on [them] before he considered them fit for appearance in the company of those composed later."[32] As James remarked to Miss Bosanquet, "'They seem...so bad until I have read them that I can't force myself to go through them except with a pen in my hand, altering as I go the crudities and ineptitudes that to my sense deform each page.'"[33] For most of the six early tales and nouvelles to be examined here, the present writer envisions a jungle of marginalia and a mountain of inserted pages, the latter not from any disproportionate length of the revised passages (as compared to the originals) but (especially in the case of A Passionate Pilgrim) from the completeness with which long passages in the original were almost totally rewritten. The early revisions of the Pilgrim—those before 1885—were so sweeping that it might be well to add, parenthetically, that the method of James implied by Matthiessen's description was one

31 James at Work, p. 12. Nowhere did Miss Bosanquet say, or imply, that James dictated from his written-upon sheets. The "priestess of the Reckington" recalled also that James admitted "'I know...that I'm too diffuse when I'm dictating,'" that his plays were copied straight from his manuscript (Edel however thinks there was ultimately some slight dictation of them), but that with his short stories "he allowed himself a little more freedom, dictating them from his written draft and expanding them as he went on an extent which inevitably defeated his original purpose [that is, the brevity of a hand-written work]" (ibid., pp.7-8). It should be noted however that the 1885-95 stories in the New York Edition average 18,500 words (59 pages) and those of 1895-1905—13,000 (43 pages). The early ones (1875-85) average 73 pages (22,000 words). ("Revisions of Short Stories," p.9).

James's later novels were wholly dictated and seemed to her to be soliloquies "recorded on a typewriter" (p.9).

32 Ibid., p. 13. 33 Ibid., p. 12.

t [illegible] the author well in hand even before the "middle v-

---

...we are really both right, for to attempt to retouch the substance of the thing would be as foolish as it would be (in a done and impenetrable structure) impracticable. What I have tried for is a mere revision of surface and expression, as the thing is positively in many places quite vilely written! The essence of the matter is wholly unaltered--save for seeming in places, I think, a little better brought out.[34]

Mrs. Lew-Smith, to whom James was writing, had apparently objected to revision in general, and revision of Roderick Hudson in particular. The author had by this time (November 12, 1906) revised his early novel and written its Preface, which suggested to him the imagery he employed in allaying the fears of his worried correspondent: in the first volume of the New York Edition James was reminded of "the painter...and...his relation to the old picture, the work of his hand, that has been lost to sight and that, when found again, is put back on the easel for measure of what time and the weather may, in the interval, have done to it. Has it too fatally faded, has it blackened or 'sunk'...or has it only, blest thought, strengthened... and taken up...some shade of the all appreciable, yet all indescribable grace that we know as pictorial tone?"[35] For the artist's relation had not too fatally faded, "the creative intimacy is [illegible]ned, and appreciation, critical appreciation, insists on second [illegible]ative as it can. "To what shall say, granted this, where it shall [illegible]gin and where it shall consent to end? The painter who passes over his old sunk canvas the wet sponge that shows him what may still come out again makes his criticism essentially active. When having seen.. that the canvas has kept a few buried secrets, he proceeds to repeat

34 Letters, II, 55.

35 Critical Prefaces, p. 10. See note 18 for full citation.

fond fear that any tidying-up of the uncanny brood, any removal of accumulated dust, any washing of wizened faces...might let one in... for expensive renovations."[39] Convinced that it would be "detestable" to rewrite his early works,[40] he nonetheless feared that he would yield to the temptation to do so. James's gloomy forebodings "sprang...from my too abject acceptance of the grand air with which the term Revision had somehow, to my imagination, carried itself— and from my frivolous failure to analyse the content of the word."[41] But really, Revision was but an instinctive process, a re-reading, with actively critical pen in hand (recall his remark to Miss Bosenquet about "altering as I go the crudities and ineptitudes"):

> To revise is to see, or to look over, again—which means in the case of a written thing neither more nor less than to re-read it. I had attached to it, in my brooding spirit, the idea of re-writing—with which it was to have in the event, for my conscious play of mind, almost nothing in common. I had thought of re-writing as so difficult, and even so absurd, as to be impossible—having also indeed, for that matter, thought of re-reading in the same light. But the felicity under the test was that where I had thus ruefully prefigured two efforts there proved to be but one—and this an effort but at the first blush. What re-writing might be was to remain—it has remained for me to this hour—a mystery. On the other hand the act of revision, the act of seeing it again, caused whatever I looked at on any page to flower before me as into the only terms that honourably expressed it; and the "revised" element in the present Edition is accordingly these terms, these rigid conditions of re-perusal, registered; so many close notes, as who should say, on the particular vision of the matter itself that experience had at last made the only possible one.[42]

Referring to his revisions for the New York Edition, James mused, not fully aware of the poignancy that his words would later take on, "What has the affair been at the worst, I am most moved to

39 Ibid., p. 337.
40 Ibid., p. 336.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid., pp. 338-339.

sek, but an earnest invitation to the reader to dream again in my company and in the interest of his own larger absorption of my sense?"[43]

The Literary Digest's response to James's wistful R. S. V. P. is representative. Its issue for August 21, 1909, carries a typical account--it could scarcely be called either a review or a criticism: "An outcry of objection was raised a year or more ago[44] when it was announced that Mr. Henry James would reissue his early novels in a 'revised' form. Many who frankly voiced their high admiration for his earlier novels, but were completely baffled by his later ones, have asked with some heat whether an author's published work does not belong to the public, and it was sorely questioned if such an author was keeping faith with these early admirers by translating the early novels into the later manner. What Mr. James thought about the question was not disclosed until the recent issue of 'The Golden Bowl,'[45] the last of the reissued series. In a preface to that work the matter is taken up and discust at some length. It is not, however, so much a discussion with the public, that is, the reader, as with the author himself. It is an examination of the author's good faith with himself as an artist. We are treated to another instance of what the late George Meredith called in regard to this author's book about America, a 'tour of the inside of my dear Henry James.'"[46] From this point on, the Digest led its reluctant reader through a reticulum of quoted matter in the

43 Ibid., p. 345.

44 Two years, possibly three.

45 Apparently the Roderick Hudson Preface, two years before, had been masticated but not assimilated.

46 "Why Mr. James 'Revised,'" The Literary Digest, XXXIX (August 21, 1909), 275-276. Other contemporary accounts may be found in the Digest for March 28, 1908, and in the Dial for March 16, 1908.

Preface itself, giving particular rumination to James's explanation that he regarded rewriting (here interpreted as revision, which he is defending) to be "detestable." It is important to observe that the detractors of the late revisions treat the early works (which James revised by hand) in the definitive edition as if they are couched in the same style as the late dictated novels and partially-dictated stories that they found so impenetrable. But James was not guilty of "translating the early novels into the later manner"—he could have done this only by dictating entirely new novels based upon the earlier ones. Worth noting too is the sentiment that a novelist (but not a poet) who revises a work (albeit in an attempt to improve it) is breaking faith with a loyal public that liked his early (but to him, inept) fiction; the same sentiment, pushed ruthlessly to a conclusion, would result in Shakespeare's being damned for not spending a lifetime writing Gentlemen from Verona and uncorrected Comedies of Errors. It is ironic indeed that his "loyal public" had forgotten (or never noticed) how extensively yo[u]r. revised, even in the 1870's, such works as A Passionate Pilgrim.

In 1912, readers of PMLA were offered "The Later Manner of Mr. Henry James," the fruits of the collations of Clara F. McIntyre, who by her own admission read three or four of James's novels, "side by side in the two editions."[47] By predelection a classicist, Miss McIntyre invokes the golden mean of Horace, praising the early version of

47 XX (April 1912), 354. The first half of Miss McIntyre's study (pp.354-362) deals with Roderick. In the second half (pp.362-371) there is occasional reference to The Portrait of a Lady, The Awkward Age (1899), and The Golden Bowl (1903). Two such late novels as these would seem to offer little to one attempting to compare early and late styles.

Roderick Hudson (1875) because, more than any other of James's works, the average reader would find it appealing, with its stylistically "no very marked peculiarities. It is straightforward, without excessive use of figures, but rich in apt and expressive phrases."[48] However, when he revised Roderick James perversely blurred the clean, clear-cut lines, replacing the apt word by the roundabout phrase (often chosen only because it was unnatural), and resorting to his "later favorites of expression," among them the adverbs "wonderfully" and "beautifully."[49] Even the Jacobite (if he has the "candour" so admired by the Master) will confess to a similar annoyance at James's reliance upon adverbs,, but he cannont share Miss McIntyre's disapproval of the author's "seeming attempt to approach the forms of conversational English,"[50] an attempt marked by his fondness for "abbreviations" ("I'll," "she'll" contractions).

The later James was given to verbosity and prolixity; further (although more recent adverse critics have taken the reverse stand) he had too much imagination. Instead of amplifying, the mannered James diluted:[51] his parenthetical construction is away from clearness, since unrelated matter is packed into the parenthesis—in trying "to explain fully and precisely every turn of his thought, [he] has weakened the effect by putting in too much."[52] John Donne not

48 "Later Manner of James," p. 355.

49 Ibid., p. 366. James, I have discovered, also had "earlier favorites of expression." See Chapter II, notes 200, 204.

50 Ibid., pp. 357-358.

51 Ibid., p. 356.

52 Ibid., pp. 359-360.

yet having been revived, the term was not used, but the metaphysical quality of James's revised work was very objectionable; in the definitive Portrait of a Lady "Figures are used more freely, and they are often rather far-fetched; we feel that the author must have strained his imagination to see a comparison."[53]

Victory soon proves heady, and Miss McIntyre carelessly lowers her guard (italics mine): "there are some passages in which no definite fault can be found with the new form of expression except perhaps some slight awkwardness or vagueness that makes it less effective than the old."[54] After this rueful confession, she leaves herself wide open (italics mine): "In almost every case, where I have compared the two versions, I have preferred the earlier form."[55] One strongly suspects Miss McIntyre of searching the revised version for passages that would illustrate her pre-determined conclusions, and then leafing through her dog-eared early text in quest of the apposite clear, literal passage, but one "rich in apt and expressive phrases." If a scholar is going to make a study of textual revisions, must he not, in fairness to both author and reader, carefully compare every line on every page of both works—and then draw his conclusions? Should not the scholar leave the propaganda device to the politician?

In the year of James's death, 1916, there appeared two book-length studies of his art, a thin one by Miss Rebecca West,[56] the other by his staunch admirer Ford Madox Ford.[57] Miss West, a devoted

53 Ibid., pp. 362-363.

54 Ibid., p. 361.

55 Ibid.

56 Henry James (London, 1916).

57 Henry James: A Critical Study (New York, 1916). (The recent Literary History of the United States, III, incorrectly cites 1913 as the date.) It is both puzzling and disappointing that

friend of H. G. Wells, whose anecdotal description of the fiction of James is still dutifully repeated in the college classroom,[58] dismissed the revisions in one crisp sentence, which she relegated to the

---

such critics as Ford and Pelham Edgar, who knew James intimately and understood his work, should have devoted so little attention to the matter of the revisions. Ford's thirteen-page Appendix (pp.179-192) prints in comparative columns a passage from Daisy Miller (1883 and 1908) and two from "Four Meetings" (1883 and 1909). Ford's only editorial comment was that "The following comparisons of passages from the earlier editions of Mr. James,' with the same passages revised and amplified for the Definitive Edition, published by Messrs. Macmillan, may be of interest to the reader" (p. 179). It is interesting that the same two stories should have been chosen by both Ford and Miss West; if one knew which book appeared first, some tentative conjecture could be made.

O. Cargill and D. Lerner have recently shown that both Miss West and Mr. Ford, who felt that James was not well-read in the classics, were less well-read themselves. James, it was shown, intentionally omitted references that would be unrecognized by his reader; and The Bostonians and The Other House (1896) recall Sophocles and Euripedes ("Henry James at the Grecian Urn," PMLA, LXVI, 316-331, June, 1951).

Pelham Edgar, whose Henry James: Man and Author (New York and Boston, 1927) is (until Mr. Léon Edel brings out his eagerly-awaited work) the standard biography, devotes only six or seven pages to the question of revisions (pp.205-206, 237-241). He reproduces a few comparative columns from The American and allows the reader to explicate for himself. His own generalizations, however, while brief, are sound and unbiased. The revised dialogue, Edgar felt, showed a marked advance in point and naturalness. James's later greater length was noted, as well as the fact that in his effort to escape banality, he sometimes paid the penalty in an unpardonable ponderosity of phrase—the reader might well prefer the flat to the mannered. The revisions of both Roderick Hudson and The American were "mere mechanical readjustments, involving principally the elimination of commonplaces and the substitution where possible of the characteristic for the obvious phrase. The result is that the revised Roderick Hudson gives us an example [italics mine] of his simpler manner in perfection, without the polyphonic harmonies and the megaphonic amplifications that developed when he substituted voice for pen in the act of composition" (pp. 205-206).

58 "And on the altar, very reverently placed, intensely there, is [sic] a dead kitten, an egg-shell, a bit of string." Wells and James were seldom in agreement.

bibliography: "All the early works have been subjected to a revision which in several cases, notably Daisy Miller and Four Meetings, amounts to their ruin."[59] Ever since this pontification in 1916, reprint editors in search of a satisfactory explanation for their use of James's early texts have made their salaam to the omniscent Miss West—most recently in this country by one Arthur Zeiger,[60] and in England by David Garnett.[61] In other instances, no names are mentioned by the reprint editors; Penguin's edition of Daisy Miller (and the ubiquitous An International Episode), for instance, informs that "These two short nouvelles serve as excellent examples

59 Henry James, p. 123. This sentence is repeated on all of the Library of Congress catalogue cards of the New York Edition that I have seen.

60 Selected Novels of Henry James ([New York], 1946). See Chapter V, note 32, for full citation. In Zeiger's introduction one reads: "The texts employed are those of the original editions, rather [sic] those of the revised New York edition [sic] which James undertook in 1905. This procedure has seemed advisable because, though James's later style is beautifully wrought and of a surpassing subtlety, its superimposition upon a novel conceived along essentially simple lines, sets up a faintly absurd stylistic antimony. Rebecca West holds that in several novels [one nouvelle and one short story] (notably Daisy Miller), the revision amounted to their ruin. Our objection is not William James's, who complained of the 'complication of innuendo and associative reference' of his brother's later style. But we do believe that these novels, at any rate, are crafts too slight to be freighted with the ponderous paraphernalia of their maker's perceptivity, to say nothing of his punctuation" (pp.viii-ix).

F. W. Dupee, who besides editing The Question of Henry James in 1945 wrote the American Men of Letters Series Henry James (New York, 1951), remarks in the latter the "fascinated discussion" always produced by the question of rewriting. To him "the question is hardly one of principle nor is it unique with James. Revision is common practice among writers, and the rights and wrongs of it are a matter of tact and degree. In reworking his prose for the Edition, James sometimes spoiled but he also in most cases improved....in general only the revision of books composed prior to The Portrait of a Lady is seriously suspect. With that novel the style was already rich, and James's alterations, confined as they were to matters of verbal detail, gave color and point to many an ineffectual passage" (p.279).

61 Editor of the James reprints issued by Hart-Davis. See notes 71,72.

of what was best in Henry James. Written early in James's career, they are free from the contortions of the later 'James style.'"[62] No less a critic and editor than Philip Rahv has lent his support (The Great Short Novels of Henry James)[63] to the anti-revisionists; the peregrinating reader who persists to the end of the volume might find, in the limbo of the back of an unnumbered page, this note: "The text is that of the original editions. James introduced quite a few verbal alterations into the text of the collected edition, but these revisions produce an impression of stylistic uniformity the value of which has been questioned by a number of authorities on James, with regard to its effect on his early work. The use of the original editions enables the reader to gain a direct impression of the development of James's style." This partisan reviewer admits the fairness of selection by Mr. Rahv, and wishes that the English house of Hart-Davis had given its readers the same chance to judge James's changing style.[64]

62 From "About This Book," an unnumbered page preceding the title page. Penguin issued Daisy in 1947. See Chapter V, note 28.

63 (New York, 1944). See Chapter V, note 32, for full citation—James would have called these works nouvelles.

64 See note 72. John Lehmann's Ten Short Stories of Henry James (London, 1948) covers the years 1868 to 1910, but uses the definitive New York Edition text if the work was included there. Clifton Fadiman chose the definitive texts for his The Short Stories of Henry James (New York, 1945). In texts designed primarily for the college classroom, Lyon N. Richardson (American Writer Series James, 1941) elected to use the definitive ones, usually of Macmillan 1921-23 (and furnishes an excellent though necessarily brief treatment of the matter of revision), and Raymond W. Short in his Four Great American Novels (New York, 1946) reprinted the definitive Daisy Miller (see Chapter V, note 38).

The young scholar less intellectually isolated than the present writer might be interested in examining, from the standpoint of early or definitively revised text, many of the reprints

Five years ago, in England, the case of which of James's texts to publish—early or definitively revised—came up for decision. The Times Literary Supplement for February 5, 1949, briefed its reader: "Until James's books disappeared together from both new and second-hand markets in the recent war, the revised versions alone were obtainable."[65] (While this[66] would be a pleasant fact for some of us Tory Jacobites to contemplate, it unfortunately is not true.) The war over, and the paper shortage no longer

---

listed in American Literature a few years back: Eunice C. Hamilton, "Biographical and Critical Studies of Henry James, 1941-48," AL, XX (January 1949), 424-427, 433-435; Viola R. Dunbar, "Addenda to 'Biographical and Critical Studies of Henry James, 1941-48,'" AL, XXII (March 1950), 59-61.

65 "Henry James Reprints," p. 96. The Times, incidentally, felt that the question whether James "improved or spoiled his early works by his late revisions of them" was "endlessly debatable." All quotations from this article are from page 96.

66 See Chapter V, notes 18-27, 32, and corresponding text for the matter of perseverance in print (after the New York Edition) of the Harper 1892 version of Daisy Miller.

It would be hypercritical to do more than point out that such well known Scribner Edition omissions as Washington Square and The Bostonians appeared, without benefit of definitive revision, in the Macmillan (1921-23) set; or that many of the early works reissued by Macmillan had not been revised since 1885. (All of James's fiction that had appeared in book form during his lifetime was included in the Macmillan edition.) But one feels certain that James would have strongly objected to the reappearance in 1918 of an 1879 text (Daisy Miller: A Study, An International Episode, and Four Meetings), and an 1869 (and never revised) text (of Gabrielle de Bergerac). Nor would he have given his blessing to the 1919 volume of seven pre-1879 (and unrevised) tales cleverly titled by the publisher Travelling Companions, and furnished with a three-page introduction by Albert Mordell, who pointed out that none of the stories had ever before been printed in book form in America. (One is reminded of the recent unauthorized publication, the copyright having run out, of some of Eugene O'Neill's apprentice work.) Totally different in spirit is the recent (honestly if awkwardly titled) publication (1950) by the Rutgers University Press, Eight Uncollected Tales of Henry James, a volume valuable for the brilliant twenty-page introduction by an outstanding James scholar, Miss Edna Kenton. (These tales and those in Travelling Companions make up the fifteen not included in Macmillan's 35 volume "Complete" edition.)

highly critical, Macmillan could have republished James—"economy might have dictated the use of existing stereotypes, and have explained the perpetuation of the revised versions." A situation rather to be dreaded than hoped for, the Times seems to think. Macmillan having failed to hear the James bandwagon, two new publishers began in 1947[67] to reissue his works: Rupert Hart-Davis[68] "decided to revert to first-edition simplicities," while John Lehmann chose "to respect the old James's preference for his more elaborate second thoughts."[69] (Even the incensed Jacobite cannot help being amused at the sight of the Master, who seemed never to miss a chance to disparage journalism, being fully repaid in his own coin.) The following year (1948) three other publishers issued works of James: all three chose the "more elaborate second thoughts," two of them prefacing the volumes with critical introductions by Graham Greene

---

On July 23, 1914, James wrote to J. A. Hammerton: "In reply to your letter of July 20th. I should absolutely object to your publishing in your Collection of a thousand Short Stories the little old thing of mine your inquire about, The Romance of Certain Old Clothes. This small tale of nearly fifty years ago, and one of the very first short stories I ever wrote, is not a thing that I have the least wish to see disinterred, and nothing could possibly please me less than to see it figure, as a representative tale of mine, at the end of a long period during which I have written so many other and better ones, in a collection claiming importance and significance for its constituent parts." (Raymond D. Havens, "Henry James on One of His Early Stories," American Literature, XXIII, 131-132, March, 1951). (See Chapter VII, note 5, for a similar attitude toward a French translation of the relatively early work [1868], The Siege of London.) James was "at a loss to account for the inclusion [1898] of the story...in The International Library that you speak of. I suppose I must on that occasion have had my assent in some manner extorted from me; but I have no remembrance at all of the transaction or of ever having seen the publication" (p.132). It would be well to bear in mind this non-remembrance of James's in connection with the disappointing 1897 edition of "The Madonna of the Future" (Chapter III).

67 Actually, Hart-Davis began in 1946, with Fourteen Stories by Henry James.

68 Hart-Davis's excellent recent biography of the tremendously successful (financially) Hugh Walpole would lead one to expect from him a shrewd decision, so far as popular taste is concerned.

and Herbert Read.[70] These two obscure Fleet Streeters apparently said nothing worth repeating, for the Times quoted copiously and approvingly the perspicacious insights of Mr. David Garnett, one of Hart-Davis's hired hands, agreeing with him that "the older James put a veil between the reader and the younger James,"[71] and that "'to read Henry James in the definitive edition is to obscure his development and to miss the full flavour of his middle years.' If this is arguable [the Times added] of the stories of the middle years ...then a fortiori to read the stories that made James's name in 1875-80...in the texts that he sophisticated after thirty years is to make a mockery of 'development' and to deaden the impact of a fresh mind upon a receptive generation."[72]

---

69 Lehmann brought out (1947-48) in the definitive text, Roderick Hudson, The American, The Spoils of Poynton, and What Maisie Knew, not to mention, among shorter works, "The Madonna of the Future," "The Author of 'Beltraffio,'" "A London Life," "The Lesson of the Master," and "The Chaperon." In 1946-48 Hart-Davis issued only Fourteen Stories, The Other Houses, and The Tragic Muse.

70 Greene's of The Portrait of a Lady and Read's of The Wings of the Dove.

71 The Times had quoted, two sentences before, Garnett's actual words ("To my ears the second version puts a veil between the reader and the boy lying dead." [Fourteen Stories, p. viii]) but its sly revision makes this passage also seem his. The above quote is the extent of Garnett's explanation for his preference for James's earlier closing sentence to "Owen Wingrave"; instantly the editor summoned Miss West—"I am fortified in my opinion by Miss Rebecca West, who wrote '...'."

Leon Edel, on the other hand, independently arrived at the conclusion that the revision "pointed up sharply the intended irony." (The original version of "Owen" ended, "He looked like a young soldier on the battlefield." The revised one ended, "He was all the young soldier on the gained field.") Edel feels that the newer sentence shows that "In death...Owen had gained a victory. He had been the soldier to the end. The Spirit of Family had triumphed in him as well as over him." In killing him the family destroyed itself (Ghostly Tales, p. 315).

In discussing The Saloon, under which title "Owen" appeared on the stage, Mr. Edel points out that Owen, who would rather read poetry than be a soldier, "defies his family's military tradition but nevertheless is so much a part of it that in doing so he acts and dies like a soldier; young Wingrave wins his grave, and implicit in this is his renunciation of life" (Complete Plays, p. 641). He has his revenge on his exacting ancestors and makes certain by his own death that the family line will vanish.

As James wrote (January 23, 1909) George Bernard Shaw, "The whole point of the little piece is that he, while protesting against the tradition of his 'race,' proceeds and pays exactly like the soldier that he declares he'll never be" (pp.646-647).

72 Garnett's anxiety that the new James reader not "miss the full flavour of his middle years" (which period is usually designated by those who insist upon such matter as, roughly, 1885-1895—and by R. P. Blackmur [Literary History, II, 1042]as 1882-1897) is puzzling in view of the fact that of the fourteen stories he edited, one is of 1879 vintage, four of 1900, one of 1903, and one of 1908; the other seven appeared in 1892 and 1893, rather late in the "middle years" and certainly not of a wide enough time span to be representative. Garnett has nothing to illustrate the work of 1879 to 1892. If he shared the Times' burning passion that the "receptive generation" of new readers have no veil dropped between them and the "younger James," and that they view clearly his "development," could he not have given them more than one story written before 1892, at which times James's "fresh mind" was forty-nine years old?

But as Garnett said, "...his best short stories were written round about his fiftieth year" (p.vii). Puzzling too is that while he twice infers (pp.vii,x) that James dictated his late stories and that this "late manner" for "short stories...was fatal," (p.vii) Garnett chose six stories written in the late manner (since within the period when James dictated). Or, for that matter, wherein would lie the great stylistic difference between six stories originally written 1900-08 and their New York Edition revised versions appearing 1907-09? Finally, as nearly as James's proliferation of style can be traced down to any five year period, it began 1895-1900, when he became accustomed to writing long scenarios of his works (as a result of his playwriting experience), and when he took up dictation: Garnett states that "Those who read these stories in the order in which they are printed will observe the growing proliferation of his style" (p.x.). Garnett has nothing for the period 1893-1900. See note 64, second sentence.

The James the First, James the Second, James the Great Pretender joke somehow got mislaid, but the incipient streak of the raconteur in the unnamed critic accounted for the time-tested one about the "tyro who, having embarked hopefully on an uncharted course of James, becomes discouraged half-way through The Golden Bowl." Then came the plausible-sounding argument that the tyro be allowed to start at the logical place and work toward The Golden Bowl without having the chronology obscured by a late revision of an early work;[73] perhaps he need not go too far— the implication is strong that "Four Meetings" (1877) might make a good stopping point, for "it was in the unsophisticated texts that the early novels and stories brought him the only wide popularity he ever enjoyed." Since the real question at issue is "which of the two [early texts, or definitively revised ones] will bring in the new readers," the affections of the Times clearly are for the throbbing, pulsating presses and the healthy circulation of Hart-Davis.

Among scholars, whose interest has traditionally been more in aesthetics than in dollar signs, James's revisions have since his death been increasingly well received. Miss Hélène Harvitt's article in 1924, "How Henry James Revised 'Roderick Hudson': A Study in Style,"[74] is not as unfavorable to the definitive revisions as seems

73 This is based on the assumption (embraced by Zeiger— see note 60), which I believe strongly is a false one, that the late-revised early works are the same stylistically as the works conceived late, and written or dictated late. Pelham Edgar does not share the Times-Zeiger view (see note 57).

74 PMLA, XXXIX (March 1924), 203-227. The previous year, Robert Herrick had published an unfavorable criticism of the revision of The American ("A Visit to Henry James," Yale Review, XII, 724-741, July, 1923). Herrick contended that by revision James altered not merely the surface, but also the basic characterisation of Christopher Newman (p.739), making him too subtle and too complex. The later more deeply analytical and summarizing passages, he felt, were attributable to James's old age at the time of the revisions. As part of his

generally to be supposed, for she points out the improvements made in dialogue, the compression of diffuse passages, and the felicitous "minute brushing up" and "accentuating" of characterizations,[75] particularly those strokes that made Mary Garland more convincing. Like Miss McIntyre, Miss Harvitt made reference to James's later fondness for similes and metaphors, and for certain particular expressions, but without the earlier lady's harshness of disapproval. Strongly anti-revisionist however were Miss Harvitt's conclusions that certain conceptions became obscure, that the later style too often is obscure and analytical, and that the life and the spontaneity of straightforward, natural prose were sacrificed for the obscurity of psychological analysis. The favorable or unfavorable reaction of readers of James, it may be added parenthetically, usually depends upon their reaction to figurative language and psychological analysis.

Fifteen months after the Harvitt article, there appeared (June, 1929) a brief one by Professor Raymond D. Havens,[76] in which he pointed out flaws in her scholarship,[77] before going on to document

---

"Visit" Herrick quoted at some length from letters between Henry and brother William on the subject of style. One suspects Herrick, like Miss McIntyre, of searching for overdone, vulnerable later passages.

Another younger American writer disliked the revisions—Hamlin Garland (see Roadside Meetings, New York, 1930, pp.454-465).

75 "'Roderick Hudson,'" p. 207.

76 "The Revisions of Roderick Hudson," PMLA, XL, 433-434.

77 Professor Havens showed that "the text, which she quotes throughout her article as from the first edition, comes in reality from a thoroughly revised later version" (p.433). Mr. Havens notes that "minute and fastidious correction was an early habit with Henry James" (ibid.).

Laurence Barrett ("Young Henry James, Critic," American Literature, XI, 385-400, January, 1949) takes some cognisance of the New York Edition revisions of Roderick; in "dealing with the young James" he quotes from "the most easily available of the earlier

his own belief that "the changes were made in the interest of greater clarity and definiteness, of euphony, and of fresher, less hackneyed phrasing."[78] With the moderation and fairness of the true scholar ("It is inevitable that not all the changes should be for the better")[79] Mr. Havens then gave illustrations to show that some of the revised dialogue was "not so well adapted to the speaker as it was originally."[80]

Prominent in the early years of the James revival were studies by Professors Royal A. Gettmann (1945) and F. O. Matthiessen (1944) of the revisions of the other two early novels, The American and The Portrait of a Lady.[81] Matthiessen emphasizes James's later more dramatic treatment of scenes, his sharpenings of characterisations, and the logical and important interaction of the two. James came to see and to remedy his original insufficient reliance on incident; and he advanced from idea to image, furnishing each major figure in the foreground of the Portrait with a characterizing image. The later dialogue, objected to by James's detractors, is commended by Matthiessen for the manner in which the sensitive conversationalists seem to keep in the air not simply what is said, but what is not.

---

editions" (p.397,n.). Lloyd Moses Hoff has written an unpublished dissertation on "The Revision of Roderick Hudson: Its Extent, Nature, and Result" (Ohio State, 1930).

78 "Revisions of Roderick Hudson," p. 433.

79 Ibid., p. 434.

80 Ibid.

81 Matthiessen's article, "The Painter's Sponge and Varnish Bottle," included in Henry James: The Major Phase (pp.152-186) as the Appendix, originally appeared in The American Bookman, I (Winter 1944), 49-69, under the full title of "The Painter's Sponge and Varnish Bottle: Henry James's Revision of The Portrait of a Lady."

Mr. Gettmann[82] commented upon the more idiomatic dialogue of the revised American, and like Matthiessen called the reader's attention to James's almost automatic use of the subject-verb contractions (to which Miss McIntyre had objected). Newman and the Bellegardes (in keeping with James's commendable refusal to re-write)[83] undergo no essential change, but James did at times go deeper into his characters, speculating about the reasons for their speeches or actions and underscoring the interplay of consciousness. Seeing more clearly than earlier critics what the older author was striving for, Gettmann illustrated how diction was made more specific, explicit, and concrete, and how James's search for the exact word and his reliance upon modifiers led to greater clarity and expressiveness. Granting Miss Rebecca West's (gleefully made) point that some of the Master's extended metaphors were laboriously contrived for the sake of decorating an idea more simply and clearly expressed earlier, Gettmann then proceeded to show that James's images often altered, refined, or expanded the thought, and to discuss (with insight beyond the ken of Miss McIntyre) their metaphysical quality.

Except for the work of Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley (1930)[84] and Joseph Warren Beach (1918)[85] James's revisions of his short stories attracted no scholarship until quite recently. But the value of Mr. Beach's comments has not dimmed with the years: "The style of the

82 Royal A. Gettmann, "Henry James's Revision of The American," American Literature, XVI (January 1945), 279-295. Isadore Traschen (Columbia) has announced a dissertation on "The Art of Henry James: A Comparison of the Original and Revised Versions of The American."

83 He made no major change to the crucial dramatic passages, and he omitted, added, or re-disposed no episodes. But, as Gettmann pointed out, Robert Herrick had described the changes as so radical that Newman was "transmogrified from an ingenuous young man into an old, self-conscious, sophisticated egoist..."(p.279).

84 See note 2.

later novels is not so markedly different from that of the earlier ones as is sometimes supposed; and a close study of alterations made by James in the early stories in revising them for the collective edition shows that the directions taken by his style in its evolution was not, in these cases, towards the difficult and precious. In dialogue there is a tendency in the later work towards greater informality, towards a truly colloquial manner; in characterization, towards greater exactness. What may be called the density of the style in the narrative passages must be referred to the uncommonly reflective quality of the thought of his characters, of characters intensely self-conscious."[86]

The revisions of A Passionate Pilgrim (1871) and Daisy Miller (1878) have recently been studied by Albert Frank Gegenheimer,[87] and Viola R. Dunbar.[88] Each article is rewarding in a different way,

---

85 The Method of Henry James (New Haven, 1918). The year before, Beach had written the James chapter for the Cambridge History of American Literature, a history which accorded (to illustrate a revival which is, compared to that of James, downright orgiastic) one paragraph to Herman Melville.

86 Method of James, p. 6. Apparently those who insisted that they wanted reprints only of the early, unadulterated James did not mean the James of before 1875, for in discussing the twenty-five tales of this period, Mr. Beach noted the young author's "reckless prodigality of manner" (his tales had the plots of novels), his inability to use foreshortening or suggestion, his too great a number of scenes, his use only of the omniscient point of view (or at best the first-person narrator), his long account of the characters at or near the beginning, and his dialogue—bald and plain to the point of boredom (pp.174-181).

87 "Early and Late Revisions in Henry James's 'A Passionate Pilgrim,'" American Literature, XXIII (May 1951),233-242.

88 "The Revision of Daisy Miller," Modern Language Notes, LXV (May 1950), 311-317.
Miss Dunbar has done other work on James. Her dissertation dealt with "Studies in Satire and Irony in the Works of Henry James" (Northwestern, 1942). And see above, note 64, final citation.

Miss Dunbar's in that like Matthiessen she deals with characterization rather than style per se,[89] Gegenheimer's in that he stresses the point (not emphasized since the work of Havens and Miss Kelley) that James revised extensively early in his career. John Samuel Lucas for his dissertation[90] undertook the (seemingly) herculean chore of comparing original and definitive versions of all forty-seven of the short stories[91] (those that occupy fewer than one hundred pages) in the New York Edition, among them "The Madonna of the Future," Daisy Miller and "A Bundle of Letters"; since limitations of space restricted him to a total of forty-three pages for these three stories,[92] the present writer feels it not presumptuous to supplement Dr. Lucas's findings. The same may be said of Gegenheimer's ten-page article on revisions of the Pilgrim; this work cries out for careful and detailed study, not alone because it is the earliest fiction preserved in the New York Edition, but because in the years immediately following it James developed with such astonishing rapidity; and, conveniently enough, its final early revision (1885) coincides with the end of his early period and the start of his (dogmatically defined) "middle years."[93] The revisions of Madame de Mauves (1874) and The Siege of London (1883) are here studied for the first time.[94]

She has also published "A Note on the Genesis of Daisy Miller," Philological Quarterly, XXVII (April 1948), 184-186; "A Source for Roderick Hudson," MLN, LXIII (May 1948), 309-310; "The Problem in Roderick Hudson," MLN, LXVII (February 1952), 109-113.

89 The concept that matter and manner are separate and unrelated elements has, I believe, been a weakness in some of the studies of James's revisions.

90 "Henry James's Revisions of his Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948).

91 See note 28.

92 He was, in fact, able to devote only 97 pages to the period up to 1885, a period which strikes me as by far the most

important one in James's development, and one to which Miss Kelley devoted the whole of her excellent book.

93 George A. Finch, who in 1943 edited the Leer edition of Portraits of Places, wrote his dissertation on "The Development of the Fiction of Henry James from 1879 to 1886" (New York, 1947).

94 New light may be thrown on these nouvelles in a dissertation announced by Charles Hoffman (Wisconsin), "The Development of the Short Novel in American Literature, with Special Reference to Hawthorne, Melville, and James."

CHAPTER II

THE REVISIONS OF A PASSIONATE PILGRIM

A Passionate Pilgrim, the earliest fictional piece preserved by Henry James in his definitive New York Edition,[1] was written in 1870,[2] first printed in 1871,[3] and revised[4] for its initial appearance in book form in 1875[5] (James was by then committed to the idea of

1 The Novels and Tales of Henry James (New York, 1908), XIII, 333-434. For a recent bibliographical and critical treatment of James's earliest stories, see D. R. McElderry, Jr., "The Uncollected Stories of Henry James," American Literature, XXI (November 1949), 279-291.

The standard bibliography is LeRoy Phillips, A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James (New York, 1930). This should be supplemented by Alfred H. Ferguson, "Some Bibliographical Notes on the Short Stories of Henry James," American Literature, XXI (November 1949), 292-297.

2 James wrote little while abroad from March, 1867, to April, 1870, so for the next two years, while living in Cambridge, he worked vigorously. In the spring of 1872 he returned to Europe. See Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley, The Early Development of Henry James, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, IV, Nos. 1-2 (Urbana, 1930), pp.103-104,112.

3 Atlantic Monthly, XXVII (March, April 1871), 352-371; 476-499. (James dropped the use of the term "Junior" at his father's death in 1882.)

4 Miss Kelley in her otherwise impeccable study errs in calling the first revisions "slight, usually of a single word here and there in the interest of a greater felicity of expression or of meaning...nothing more than any conscientious author might make when assembling magazine stories for reprinting in book form" (Early Development of James, p. 205).

5 A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales (Boston, 1875), pp.5-124. The title story at this time was in two parts, corresponding to the earlier magazine installments; for the three later appearances James used a more logical four-part division. The other tales were "The Madonna of the Future" (1873), "The Last of the Valerii" (1874), "Eugene Pickering" (1874), "The Romance of Certain Old Clothes" (1868), "Madame de Mauves" (1874). (1874 was a productive year for James: twenty-nine articles, reviews, and stories by him were published in American magazines.)

revision).[6] Already well-known as a writer,[7] James had behind him a larger body of work, much of it reviews or travel sketches,[8] than is generally recognized today.

Ford Madox Ford incorrectly placed some of these tales: "Mr. James's bibliography is a little difficult to follow, but, as far as I can make it out, Madame de Mauves, A Passionate Pilgrim and The Madonna of the Future were written immediately after Roderick Hudson [January, 1875, first magazine instalment] and immediately before The American [June, 1876, first magazine instalment]" (Henry James: A Critical Study, New York, 1916, p. 128).

6 On January 14, 1873, when James was in Rome, his father wrote him about "your volume—which Howells says ought to be published forthwith....He was clear that you ought to publish a volume under the title of Romances....I can help you if you are disposed to publish a selection of your tales. I think it would be a good thing for you to do, and Willy also is clear about it. You have a large number of admirers, that is evident; and I suspect the volume might be remunerative..." (F. O. Matthiessen, The James Family: Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, Henry, and Alice James, New York, 1948, p. 122). Later in the same winter, after conferring with James R. Osgood the publisher, the father wrote again: "I shall be willing (in case you would like to publish, and I think it is time for you to do so) to bear the expense of stereotyping, and if you will pick out what you would like to be included, we shall set to work at once, and have the book ready by next autumn" (ibid., p.123).

On March 24, 1873, the younger James wrote to express his gratitude. But he demurred: "Briefly, I don't care to do it just now. I value none of my early tales enough to bring them forth again, and if I did, should absolutely need to give them an amount of verbal retouching which it would be very difficult out here [Rome] to effect" (ibid., p. 126).

7 See Richard Nicholas Foley, Criticism in American Periodicals of the Work of Henry James from 1866 to 1916 (Washington, D.C., 1944), pp.4-8. A dissertation announced in 1952 should supplement Foley: William T. Stafford (Kentucky), "The Jamesian Criticism in America from 1875 to the Present."

8 "During the first ten years of his creative life, James established himself as a literary critic, a writer of travel pieces, a master of the short story and, at the end of the decade, as a novelist. From 1865, when his critical articles began to appear in ever-increasing numbers, to the end of 1875, the year in which he took up permanent residence abroad, he wrote 26 short stories, 132 book reviews, 43 travel articles, 10 papers devoted to art criticism,

The tale, as it appeared in the pages of the Atlantic, showed markedly both the influence of Hawthorne [9] and the thrill that James himself had experienced while in England shortly before

---

seven articles on the drama, three dramatic sketches or comediettas and two novels in serial form. Much of the material for this work was the fruit of his absorption of American life in Boston and New York; most of it stemmed from two trips abroad during 1869-70 and 1872-74; all of it went back to roots deeply buried during the years of his 'sensuous' education" (Leon Edel ed., The Complete Plays of Henry James, Philadelphia and New York, 1949, p. 32). See also Phillips, Bibliography, pp. 131-167. Lyon N. Richardson calls the 1875 collection of tales "the revised work of one who had been painstakingly employed for several years" (Henry James: Representative Selections: with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, American Writers Series, New York, 1941, p.xxxii).

9 For a discussion of the influence of Hawthorne on James, see F. O. Matthiessen, American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman (New York, 1941), pp.292-305. Also I. W. Finch, "A Study of the Relationship between Hawthorne and James" (Harvard, 1939).

Hawthorne's Our Old Home (1863) was apparently read appreciatively by the twenty-year old James, for James's 1877 essay "In Warwickshire" makes reference to Hawthorne's "account of [Leycester's Hospital] which has left no touch of charming taste to be added to any reference to it" (Portraits of Places, ed. George Alvin Finch, New York, 1948, p. 285). In April, 1870, the month of James's return to America, Mrs. Hawthorne, in Dresden, wrote the Preface to Passages from the English Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne. An entry (April 12, 1855) which James could have read a few months before writing the Pilgrim is as follows: "...the original emigrant to America may have carried away with him a family secret, whereby it was in his power... to have brought about the ruin of the family. This secret he transmits to his American progeny....At last, the hero of the Romance comes to England, and finds, that, by means of this secret, he still has it in his power to procure the downfall of the family" (English Note-Books, Boston, 1870, I, 155-156). I am indebted to Professor Randall Stewart of Brown University for asking me, in connection with the Pilgrim, if I had ever read Hawthorne's Ancestral Footstep. William Bysshe Stein has shown that Richard H. Barham's "The Spectre of Tappington," in his The Ingoldsby Legends (1855) seemed to provide Hawthorne with the ideas of the missing heir and the bloody footprints ("A Possible Source of Hawthorne's 'English Romance,'" Modern Language Notes, LXVII, 52-55, January, 1952).

The fragmentary The Ancestral Footstep (untitled by Hawthorne) did not appear until 1883 (Complete Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. George Parsons Lathrop, Riverside Edition, Boston and New York, 1883, XI). Whether or not James ever saw it in manuscript

its composition (although he should not be identified with the "pilgrim," Clement Searle).[10] In his revisions of 1875[11] James did not try to alter the romantic conception of the story, but he did delete or tone down many of the romantic excesses, by

---

is problematical; there are in the Pilgrim resemblances to points in the "English Romance" not mentioned in the brief Note-Book entry. In the Footstep actual scenes alternate with synopses and self-queries by the author. One learns that the second of three Middleton brothers killed his elder brother, and, with this brother's bride of a few hours, fled to America, where he buried himself in the Western wilderness, never fully explaining his past. The youngest brother took over the estate, which passed (some fifty years before the story takes place) into the female line; the present "owner," Eldredge, knows that there may be an heir with a stronger claim than his own, and has apprehensively, and fruitlessly, made search for him.

The American Middleton appears, with a "document" that would piece together the mystery of the early history; he also has a key to an old cabinet in which are "documents" that, together with his own, would prove his greater right to the estate. But in response to the appeal of Alice Hammond, a transplanted American, he resigns his claim and "retires, arm in arm with Alice" (Works of Hawthorne, XI, 490).

Alice and Miss Searle bear little resemblance; Eldredge rather than Middleton (in James's story, Searle) has taints of insanity; Eldredge kills himself in trying to dispose of Middleton—but Richard Searle successfully drives away Clement, who dies. But there are points of resemblance in the earlier emigration to America, the Englishman's opposition to the American's claim, and the latter's voluntary relinquishing of it.

10 See Kelley, Early Development of James, pp.117-120. The dissertation of Robert C. LeClair should be of interest: "Three American Travellers in England: James Russell Lowell, Henry James, and Henry Adams" (Pennsylvania, 1944 [privately printed, Philadelphia, 1945]).

11 Even before this time, critical opinion was divided concerning James's stories. Before 1870 he had been praised for the grace and finished quality of his work, for his skill in character analysis and in describing complexities of feeling, and for his economy. Early in 1868 the Nation had called him ("within the somewhat narrow limits to which he confines himself") "the best

eliminating, compressing, or modifying in tone much of the "travel description," and by making both Searle and the narrator less obviously moved emotionally by the English scene and less responsive to its sense of the past.

---

writer of short stories in America" (quoted in Foley, Criticism of James, p. 5).

Other critics felt that he overly-dissected and overly-analyzed his characters, making them unreal. In 1869 the critic for the Nation wrote that his women were "greatly inferior to the men"; James lacked "the delicacy of touch to paint the fine lines of female character and motive" (quoted in Foley, p. 7). Other objections were to the unsatisfactory endings and the overattention to detail. (We shall see James by 1875 eliminating some of the detail, and later, improving the characterisation of Miss Searle.)

Perhaps the most intelligent of James's early critics was his brother William. In 1868, three years before the first appearance of "A Passionate Pilgrim," William in a letter echoed the professionals in praising Henry's grace and finish, and his keenness of analysis and thoroughness of treatment, in pointing out his debt to Balzac, and in objecting to the lack of action (the "thinness" of material and "want of blood" in the stories) and the lack of an obvious moral (Matthiessen, The James Family, p. 316).

A few weeks later William anticipated the critics by many years. Now he felt that perhaps he had "misunderstood your aim heretofore, and that one of [your] objects [was] to give an impression like that we often get of people in life: Their orbits come out of space and lay themselves for a short time along of ours, and then off they whirl again into the unknown, leaving us with little more than an impression of their reality and a feeling of baffled curiosity as to the mystery of the beginning and end of their being, and of the intimate character of that segment of it which we have seen" (ibid., p. 317). Or, as Henry himself put it years later, in the Preface to Roderick Hudson: "Really, universally, relations stop nowhere, and the exquisite problem of the artist is...to draw...the circle within which they shall happily appear to do so..." (The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur, New York, 1934, p. 5). William felt, further, that Henry knew the impossibility of exhausting "any character's feelings or thoughts by an articulate displaying of them," and therefore limited himself to "showing a few external acts and speeches, and by the magic of your art making the reader feel back of these the existence of a body of being of which these are casual features." This William called "a very legitimate method," with "a great effect when it succeeds....Only it must succeed. The gushing system is better to fail in, since that admits of a warmth of feeling that may reconcile the reader..." (The James Family, p. 318).

I

At Hampton Court, the narrator made the acquaintance of Clement Searle; originally James wrote that "After we had dined we lounged along into the huge central avenue. As far as the eye can follow it, between the double borders of its great horse-chestnuts, broad of base and round of summit, it prolongs the hurfy hollow of its mist-shrouded vista. Fallen from its ancient privacy, common, open to idle starers, the great park is yet delightfully noble and English. We followed the retreating mist along its grassy channel, as if, within some curtained shrine in the deep greenwood, we should find some plaintive genius of the past."[12] In a letter to his brother William, May 19, 1873, Henry confided that "The keen love and observation of the picturesque is ebbing away from me as I grow older, and I doubt whether a year or two hence I shall have it in me to describe houses and mountains, or even cathedrals and pictures."[13] Since James published ten travel sketches that year and eighteen the next (1874),[14] one entertains the suspicion that rather than any "ebbing away" of his "keen love of the picturesque," it was artistic discipline that

12 p.359. See note 3 for full citation.

13 The James Family, p. 322. Henry was in Perugia at the time. He wrote: "Just at present I shall write a few more notes of travel, for two reasons: first, that a few more joined with those already published and written will make a decent little volume; and second, that now or never (I think) is my time. The keen love....I don't know whether I shall do anything better, but I have been spoiled for this."

14 In 1871 he had published four, and in 1872, six. See Phillips, Bibliography, pp. 144-156.

prompted him in the first revision of A Passionate Pilgrim to report only that "After we had dined we lounged along into the hazy vista of the great avenue of horse chestnuts"[15] (and later—1884, 1885, 1908—simply "into the celebrated avenue of horse chestnuts"). It is reasonable to assume that by 1875 James was attempting more consciously than before to make every detail have direct bearing on the narrative and the revelation of character.

After three days together in London, Searle and the narrator were emboldened to visit Lockley Park, home of Searle's distant English cousin. Although they continued to admire the nearby countryside in 1875, James, taking pains to remove some of his conscientious (and over-written) description of what they saw and how they reacted, no longer reported that the "coated twigs of the black trees were multiplied a thousand fold,"[16] or that from Worcester's and Hereford's "meadows and orchards and farmsteads and parks, from that dense and definite detail which makes even the landscape of Italy seem vacant and vague, there rises a magnificent emanation of composite color."[17]

Not only the landscape but what he was wont to call "the English heaven" or the "ineffable English light" prompted in the young writer inspired descriptive passages, which he rendered into

15 p. 26. See note 5 for full citation.

16 pp.363-41. The first number refers to the earlier of the editions cited. For simplicity and neater appearance, instead of parentheses around the second number, a dash will be used to separate page references to the two editions. If three editions are being compared, semicolons will be used to separate page references. Normally, dates will not be given in notes if supplied in the text.

17 Ibid.

less emotional prose for succeeding editions. Searle and the narrator (1871) watched with awe the clouds as they "compacted and shifted, in innumerable phases of power. Here they blot the great brightness with sullen purposes of rain; here they stretch, breeze-fretted, into dappled fields of grey; at a dozen points the confined and arrested sun bursts out in a storm of light or escapes in a drizzle of silver." The Americans' enjoyment of England, while important to the story, could be shown with a better sense of proportion (and the reader's attention not be diverted from the story by the setting) by having them see the clouds (1875) as they "compacted and shifted, blotting the azure with sullen rain spots, stretching, breeze-fretted, into dappled fields of grey, bursting into a storm of light or melting into a drizzle of silver."[18]

Looking earthward, the appreciative American tourists admired (probably near Malvern) "a superb old farmhouse," but for the second edition James red-penciled the narrator's reverent "'Poor sacred super-annuated home!'"[19] as well as the picture of it, "above all so densely and cunningly ornate, with its close-wrought vestment of detail,—the mildew of climate, the deposit of history."[20] James

18 pp. 364-41. In 1884, "compacted" was changed to "condensed," "azure" to "blue," and "a storm" to "an explosion" (p.226). See note 26 for full citation of this edition.

James compressed another description of the English sky. He had written of the beauty of the day, one in which it seemed that the brightness (1871) had been "meted out to us by the cubic foot; tempered, refined, recorded, islanded in months of gloom, inestimably precious and rare." In 1875 the sentence ends, "tempered, refined, recorded" (pp.365-46). Further compression in 1884 made the brightness seem to have "been distilled from alchemists' crucibles" (p. 230).

19 pp. 364-42.

20 pp. 364-43.

himself continued to be less "densely and cunningly ornate" in his first revised description of the interior of the mansion at Lockley Park, making of the "most antique and picturesque little corridor" simply a "low, narrow" one[21](and transforming [in 1884] the "bits of carving and a hundred lurking architectural treasures" into mere "carvings and cornices");[22] as for his own "close-wrought vestment of detail," the revisionist in 1875 struck out the information that "The great intervals [between old masterpieces] were peopled with various breaths of mellow gloom,—landscapes of late Italian fabric, poorish as masterpieces, but admirable as furniture."[23]

(Although the descriptions of the streets and gardens of Oxford and the woods of Nuneham were rather extensively revised for the [1908] New York Edition, James by the time of the 1885 version had nearly arrived at his definitive [much compressed and toned down] treatments of the rooms at Hampton Court, Bushey Park and the nearby village, the countryside surrounding Lockley Park, and the interior of the mansion.)

Frequently in revising the Pilgrim, James (1875, and later) either modified or deleted the narrator's imaginative musings—his excited response to the "deposit of history," his eager search for the "plaintive genius of the past." Having already excised (1875) the narrator's impression, at Hampton Court, that "the great degenerate privacy of the antique close seemed to make it an excellent hiding-place for patrician ghosts,"[24]James, in re-reading

21 pp. 478-64.
22 pp. 78-256.
23 pp. 366-48.
24 pp. 359-27.

the Lockley Park section, came across another passage that struck him as overly-romantic. Touring the mansion, the narrator had mentally pictured (in 1871) an older Searle who had travelled "to Italy and had bargained with a pale, persuasive Roman for these treasures of his musty shop, or had taken the bright things in payment for a gaming debt from some debased inheritor of a ransacked Venetian palace," but in the first revision he saw in his mind only an earlier Searle who had gone "to Italy and been waited on by persuasive toymen."[25]

p. 366-49.

II

The 1875 version of the Pilgrim was painstakingly gone over for the tale's third appearance, in 1884[26] (an important edition, but one inexplicably and inexcusably overlooked by a recent student of the revisions).[27] James, now in his middle years both as a man and an author,[28] found (probably to his extreme irritation) that there were still many passages either too long or too heartfelt. Again the revisionist read disapprovingly the Hampton Court section, pausing when he reached this intense reflection (1875) of the narrator's: "I seemed to be the only visitor. I held ungrudged communion with the formal genius of the spot. Poor mortalized kings!

26 The Siege of London, The Point of View, A Passionate Pilgrim, in Collection of British Authors, Volume 2234 (Leipsig, 1884), pp. 199-294.

There was another appearance of A Passionate Pilgrim the following year: Stories Revived: Georgina's Reasons, A Passionate Pilgrim, A Landscape Painter (London, 1885), II, 96-199. (Besides this three-volume set of Stories Revived, Macmillan brought out, the same year, a two-volume set). This 1885 edition is—for James—only slightly revised; there were more changes made for the 1875 "Pilgrim." The 1884 Tauchnitz version, a very careful reworking of the last previous edition of nine years before, is quite naturally the source of nearly all of the "1885 revisions" that one would uncover were he to collate the 1875 with the 1885 version.

27 In a recent study by Albert Frank Gegenheimer no cognisance is taken of the 1884 Tauchnitz edition ("Early and Late Revisions in Henry James's 'A Passionate Pilgrim,'" American Literature, XXIII, 233-242, May, 1951). He writes of the "four versions and three revisions" (p. 234). There are five versions (1871, 1875, 1884, 1885, 1908), the last four of them revised ones. Of the sixteen "1885 revisions" (to the 1875 version) cited by Gegenheimer, thirteen first appeared in 1884; of the ten "1885" passages quoted to show final (1908) revisions, seven appear in the 1884 edition (Gegenheimer, pp. 237-241). By not using the Tauchnitz volume, Gegenheimer was unaware of James's use, in 1884 only, of the fictional name "Slantshire." (In 1885, "Slopeshire." See notes 53, 54, and 55.) Although James used the 1885 rather than the 1884 edition in making the final revision, there is so little difference between the two that I have felt it would be simpler for the reader if I mention the 1885 edition only when it differs from that of 1884.

28 James was forty years old in 1884, and the author of Roderick Hudson, The American, Daisy Miller, Hawthorne, Washington Square, and The Portrait of a Lady.

ineffective lure of royalty! This, or something like it, was the murmured burden of my musings. They were interrupted suddenly by my coming upon" Searle. By now one feels sure that James will remove these "musings," and the question occurs, how will he "cover his tracks"? Will he make a smooth transition so that the reader of the 1884 edition will be unaware of the deletion? In this instance, the answer is yes, for with considerable art James wrote that "It was still early in the day and in the season, and I flattered myself that I was the only visitor. This idea, however, was dispelled suddenly by my coming upon"[29]Searle.

James did not always exert so much care. Even for the New York Edition, in his zeal to deny entry to those relics of an earlier day, "picturesque" and "local color," he wrote (compressing the passage), "Feeling these things together made us quickly, made us extraordinarily, intimate."[30]But he overlooked the fact that the reader would not know what "these things" were. Since this slip occurred in the definitive edition, it is not surprising to find a similar one in that of 1884, when, in removing speeches

29 pp. 23-213.

30 The passage reads, in 1875, "There are few sensations so exquisite in life as to stand with a companion in a foreign land and inhale to the depths of your consciousness the alien savor of the air and the tonic picturesqueness of things. This common relish of local color makes comrades of strangers. My companion seemed oppressed with vague amazement. He stared and lingered and scanned the scene with a gentle scowl" (pp. 25-26).

In 1884, a few changes (indicated by asterisks) were made, but "picturesqueness" and "local color" remained: "There are few sensations in life so exquisite* as to...inhale the alien quality* of the air and the tonic picturesqueness of things. This common appreciation* of local color....My companion seemed oppressed with enjoyment.* He scowled gently, as if it gave him pain"* (p. 214).

In 1908, James wrote: "Feeling these things together made us quickly, made us extraordinarily, intimate. My companion seemed to ache with his impression; he scowled, all gently, as if it gave him pain" (p. 351).

in which both Americans were almost oppressively thrilled at being in a country of such rich associations, James did not notice that the context failed to mention "these reflections."

1875

"Well," I said to my friend, "I think there is no mistake about this being England. We may like it or not, it's positive! No more dense and stubborn fact ever settled down on an expectant tourist. It brings my heart into my throat."

Searle was silent. I looked at him; he was looking up at the sky, as if he were watching some visible descent of the elements. "On me too," he said, "it's settling down!" Then with a forced smile: "Heaven give me strength to bear it!"

"O mighty world," I cried, "to hold at once so rare an Italy and so brave an England!"

"To say nothing of America," added Searle.

"O," I answered, "America has a world to herself!"

1884

These reflections came in some form or other from my lips, as I gather, remembering it, from a remark of my companion's. [31]

It was only infrequently that James, for his second revision, compressed so sharply that he had to worry about "covering his tracks." But he still rather frequently saw the need to make his nature descriptions more concise and less fraught with emotion. (Apparently from the Malvern Hills) the Americans were looking off into the distance at two cathedral towers which (1875) rose sharply, "taking the light, from the settled shadow of their circling towns,— the light, the ineffable English light! 'Out of England,' cried

31 pp. 27-28--216. The "these reflections" sentence was preceded in 1884 merely by "I seemed to feel the buried generations in the dense and elastic sod." For the New York Edition, James rectified his oversight by writing, "and that I must have testified in some form or other to what I have called my thrill I gather..." (p. 352). Edward Stone's dissertation, "Henry James and His Sense of the Past" (Duke, 1949), should prove of interest. Likewise Donald Emerson's, "Henry James and the Life of the Imagination" (Wisconsin, 1950).

Searle, 'It's but a garish world!'" In 1884 the "ineffable" light is merely "mild," and no inkling is given of Searle's outburst: the towers rose sharply "out of a reddish blur of houses, taking the mild English light." Continuing, grandiloquently in 1875, "The whole vast sweep of our surrounding prospect lay answering in a myriad fleeting shades the cloudy process of the tremendous sky. The English heaven is a fit antithesis to the complex English earth. We possess in America the infinite beauty of the blue; England possesses the splendor of combined and animated clouds." Calmly and more simply, and with no reference to the English earth or to his American origin, the narrator in 1884 recalled that "We took an immense deal of notice of this same solar reserve, and found in it only a refinement of art. The sky never was empty and never idle; the clouds were continually at play for our benefit."[32]

The "travel-writing" quality of the Pilgrim in its early editions has been, thus far, attributed to the youthfulness of James and the emotional receptivity with which he had viewed England shortly before the tale was written. In this first decade of his career, he was turning out many travel pieces (forty-three by 1875),[33] and at this time he would probably have experienced a warm glow of satisfaction could he have read the praise later to

32 pp. 41-226. In 1871, the "English heaven" had been called a fit antithesis "to the English earth,—as rich, as highly wrought, as densely peopled with effects" (p. 364). Two changes were to be made in 1908: the word "houses" became "habitation," and the "immense deal" phrase was removed—"We gave an irrepressible attention to this same solar reserve..." (p. 363).

33 See notes 8 and 14.

come from the pen of Ford Madox Ford. James, he felt, had in 1875 just "served an apprenticeship of a full ten years, to what is called descriptive writing. For A Passionate Pilgrim is the apotheosis of the turf, the deer, the oak trees, the terraces of manor houses. It had never been so 'done' before and never again will it be so done."[34] So interested was James in travel writing that he seems even in his correspondence to have been (consciously or not—consciously, one feels) working at the technique. A few weeks before the end of a thirteen-month visit to England,[35] James wrote (March 19, 1870) to his father from Great Malvern. The passage that appears below has been quoted by a recent editor to show "the rapid progress [James] had been making in clothing his notations with a style adaptable to, indeed quite worthy of full-length travel pieces";[36] but it has been overlooked that James[37] elaborated upon his letter and put it to good use in the tale of the following year.

Letter (1870)

As I neared the good old town [Worcester] I saw the great Cathedral tower, high and square, rise far into the cloud-dappled blue. And as I came nearer still I stopped on the bridge and viewed the

A PASSIONATE PILGRIM (1871)

As we neared the provincial city, we saw the steepled mass of the cathedral, long and high, rise far into the cloud-freckled blue. And as we came nearer still, we stopped on the bridge and viewed

34 Henry James, p. 110. It had of course been "done" even more thoroughly in the 1871 Pilgrim, which Ford seems not to have read (see note 5). James by his revisions saw to it that it was never again so done.

35 See note 2. James was at Great Malvern as early as February (The James Family, p. 319).

36 Portraits of Places, ed. Finch, p. 20.

37 James used the same New England thrift that Hawthorne had employed when he lifted from his Italian Note-Books descriptive passages suitable for use in The Marble Faun.

great ecclesiastical pile cast downward into the yellow Severn. And going further yet I entered the town and lounged about the close and gazed my fill at that most soul-sustaining sight—the waning afternoon, far aloft on the broad perpendicular field of the Cathedral spire—tasted too, as deeply, of the peculiar stillness and repose of the close—saw a ruddy English lad come out and lock the door of the old foundation school which marries its heavy gothic walls to the basement of the church, and carry the vast big key into one of the still canonical houses—and stood wondering as to the effect on a man's mind of having in one's boyhood haunted the Cathedral shade as a King's scholar and yet kept ruddy with much cricket in misty meadows by the Severn. 38

the calm minster reflected in the yellow Severn. And going farther yet we entered the town...[20 words omitted] we lounged about the gentle Close and gazed insatiably at that most soul-soothing sight, the waning, wasting afternoon light...[10 words omitted] far aloft on the broad perpendicular field of the cathedral tower...[26 words omitted] tasted, too, as deeply of the peculiar stillness of this clerical precinct; saw a rosy English lad come forth and lock the door of the old foundation school, which marries its hoary basement to the soaring Gothic of the church, and carry his big responsible key into one of the quiet canonical houses; and then stood musing together on the effect on one's mind of having in one's boyhood haunted such cathedral shades as a King's scholar, and yet kept ruddy with much cricket in misty meadows by the Severn. 39

38 The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock (New York, 1920), I, 28-29.

39 1871, p. 365. The 4½-page long descriptive passage in the 1875 edition of the tale follows, except for six omissions, almost without change the earlier, 1871 edition, quoted in text above and note 40 below.

It is perhaps in the realm of possibility that the tale was completed first, and the letter copied from it. But it seems unlikely that James referred to a manuscript copy of the tale (published in the March and April, 1871, issues of the Atlantic) when composing the letter, since the letter precededby a year the Pilgrim's appearance, and since the passage in the letter is considerably the briefer of the two. (A letter, or note-book entry, would be polished and amplified if suitable for use in a fiction, but an excerpt from fiction would scarcely be compressed for use in a letter.)

Whether James, having seen the possibilities offered by the (March) letter, borrowed it from his father upon his return in April, or whether he had kept a copy of it, is perhaps unimportant. Or, a note-book entry might well have served as the source for both letter and tale (James's notebooks, as recently printed, begin with the year 1878).

Besides this passage, the tale contains many striking similarities to the letter; the transposition of these echoes is particularly interesting.[40]

40

Letter	Tale
"...The other afternoon I trudged over to Worcester [about 8 miles from Malvern]—through a region so thick-sown with good old English 'effects'—with elm-scattered meadows and sheep-cropped commons and the ivy-smothered dwellings of small gentility, and high-gabled, heavy-timbered, broken-plastered farmhouses, and stiles leading to delicious meadow footpaths and lodge-gates leading to far-off manors—with all things suggestive of the opening chapters of half-remembered novels, devoured in infancy—that I felt as if I were pressing all England to my soul" (Letters, I, 28).	"We walked over to Worcester, through a region so thick-sown with native features and incidents that I felt like one of Smollett's pedestrian heroes"...(p.365). "the common browsing-patch, the 'village green'" (p. 364). "[A farmhouse's] bended beams and joists, beneath the great burdens of its many gables" (ibid.) "[This house was] propped and patched [and had] oaken vertebrations" (ibid.) [See below, "Beyond the stile...."]
[The extract from the letter that was quoted in text above appeared here.] [Two sentences omitted.]	"We greeted these things as children greet the loved pictures in a story-book, lost and mourned and found again. It was marvellous how well we knew them" (ibid.) "[A farmhouse] stands in stubborn picturesqueness, at the receipt of sad-eyed contemplation and the sufference of 'sketches'" (ibid.)
"[At Colwell Green] each square yard of ground lies verdantly brimming with the deepest British picturesque, and half begging, half deprecating a sketch. You should see how a certain stile-broken footpath here winds through the meadows to a little grey rook-haunted church. Another region fertile in walks is the great line of2 hills. Half an hour's climb will bring you to the top of the Beacon—the highest of the range—and here is a breezy world of bounding turf with twenty centuries at your feet—and when the mist is thick (sic,with?) something immensely English in the situation (as if you were wandering on some mighty seaward cliffs or downs, haunted by vague traditions of an early battle). You may wander for hours—delighting in the great green landscape as it responds forever to the cloudy movements of heaven..." (Letters, I, 29).	"Beyond the stile, across the level velvet of a meadow, a footpath lay, like a thread of darker woof. We followed it from field to field and from stile to stile. It was the way to church. At the church we finally arrived, lost in its rook-haunted churchyard..." (ibid.). "We went forth without loss of time for a long walk on the hills. Reaching their summits, you find half England unrolled at your feet" (p.363). "those well-grazed heights,—mild, breezy inland downs" (p.364) [See footnotes 18 and 32 and related sections in the text, for illustration of how James, in his fiction, expanded such a passage as this one.]

To summarize thus far, James, having written the Pilgrim in his twenties and while still flushed from his recent year-long visit to England, found when revising five years later a great many romantic excesses (often in the form of overwritten and unduly long passages of "travel description," some of which had been transcribed almost verbatim from his English letters); these excesses had to be compressed, toned down, or entirely excised, in order that the two Americans exhibit less flagrant emotionalism than originally, and so that the reader enjoy a relatively untrammeled narrative.

Entries in his notebook bear witness to James's lifelong interest in proper names for his fictional creations; the frequency with which he changed (often only very slightly)[41] these names might prompt one to write on the lintels of James's doorpost, Whim, but there is no caprice where his reference is to actual figures in the world of literature— "Miss Austen's heroines," "Smollett's pedestrian heroes," Dickens, Boswell, even Artemus Ward;[42] were all spared the revisionist's pencil in each succeeding edition. (Only Fanny Burney

41 Most of the stories to be studied in this dissertation will provide at least one such change. Lawyer "John" Simmons has the given name of "Abijah" in 1864 (pp.14-205). One wonders if James changed (in 1875) his reference to Adelina Patti, whose singing he had heard as a boy, to "Madame Bosio" (pp.356-20), so as to render the story more timeless by use of the fictitious name.

42 By 1908 James might have come to feel that the name of Ward would help make the tale seem dated.

disappeared, when "a potential heroine of Miss Burney" became [in 1884] "the heroine of a last-century novel.")[43] As for place names of such well-known cities as London and Oxford, and forthright references to England and America,[44] they were changed only in so far as they frequently (in revision) were avoided, for variety and to prevent annoying repetition,[45] for, as Mr. Joseph Warren Beach has pointed out, the young author had taken such pride in displaying his knowledge of the old world that "Names of places are scattered through the story with lavish profusion."[46]

43 pp.56-236. Jane Austen and Fanny Burney and their heroines came easily to James's mind. In an 1877 essay, "Abbeys and Castles," James in describing Ludlow wrote that "Miss Burney's and Miss Austen's heroines might perfectly well have had their first love-affairs there; a journey to Ludlow would certainly have been a great event to Fanny Price or Emma Woodhouse, or even to those more exalted young ladies, Evelina and Cecilia" (Portraits of Places, p. 314). James could envision the provincial society of a century before, coming to Ludlow "in rumbling coaches and heavy curricles" (ibid.) In A Passionate Pilgrim, James, writing of Worcester, describes "the town,—where surely Miss Austen's heroines, in chariots and phaeton ["curricles" in 1875, p. 44], must often have come a shopping..."(1871, p.365). (This was the first omitted passage, Pilgrim column, p. 52 in text above.)

44 Specific naming of London was avoided three times in the final edition, "London" once becoming "the dusky Babylon." In 1884, "England" was changed to "the motherland"; for the final edition James eliminated his earlier use of the term "English" twice in seven words--on the following page both "English" and "British" were replaced. Open reference to Oxford was avoided in 1884 by the substitution of "the whole place" and "such a place" (and, in 1908, "the whole thing" and two similar terms). (pp. 211-348, 255-360, ibid.; 7-199; 277-417, 278-418; 105-278, ibid.; 267-415, 278-418.)

Several times for the 1884 edition James removed the term "American," and for the New York Edition wrote of Searle not as "a true American" but as one "quite to the manner born—to ours." In the final edition, too, Searle called Simmons "a legal practitioner in our courts," and the narrator referred to "the country we had left," calling it Searle's "real home," and locating it as "over there"—in each case, James was replacing the term "America" (pp.213-350, 222-358, 249-388, 239-377, 250-388).

45 Wadham College was too frequently named in the early editions: in four pages of the 1884 edition, James wholly deleted

The place names that James came to remove most carefully, however, were not those that would annoy the reader through wearisome repetition. They were, instead, those that had enabled him to pin-point the location of Lockley Park. In order that the Searle estate be not identified too specifically, geographically, "flats of hedgy Worcestershire" and "slopes of rolling Hereford" became in 1884 "hedgy flats" and "slopes"[47] (just as in 1908, "Worcester" was to be "the nearer of the two neighboring seats"; and "the Severn" and meadows "by the Severn," "a yellow stream" and "river meadows").[48] In the pages of the 1871 Atlantic, the narrator had located Lockley as "just within the confines of Herefordshire";[49] so early as 1875 James began, in a tentative way, to impose his veil of secrecy, for while continuing to mention by name the Malvern Hills, Worcester, and Hereford (and although he had designated Herefordshire in each of the two preceding pages), the narrator feigned having forgotten "in which county" Lockley was located: "Between the fair boundaries of the counties of Hereford and Worcester rise in a long

---

two references and made five others less definite by employing such terms as "one of the colleges," "my college," and (for "Wadham gardens") "the most delicious corner of the ancient world" (pp. 110-115--283-286).

46 The Method of Henry James (New Haven, 1918), p. 106.

47 pp. 41-226. Earlier in the story, the "misty glades of Bushey Park" had become the "misty park" (pp. 23-212).

48 pp. 228-365, 229-365, 229-366.

49 p. 363.

undulation the sloping pastures of the Malvern Hills.[50] Consulting a big red book[51] on the castles and manors of England, we found Lockley Park to be seated near the base of this grassy range,—though in which county I forget. In the pages of this genial volume, Lockley Park and its appurtenances made a very handsome figure."[52] With great brevity and considerable worldly-wise sophistication (compared to the wide-eyed enthusiasm of nine years earlier), and with no authentic place references, the narrator recollected in 1884 that "We looked up the topography of Slantshire in a country-guide, which spoke highly, as the phrase is, of Lockley Park." James had indeed come a long way from the self-conscious, painstakingly long travel notations of thirteen years before. A bit amusingly, just as the authentic "Herefordshire" of 1871 and 1875[54] had failed to please, so did the imaginary "Slantshire" of 1884; it became successively "Slopeshire" (1885) and "Middleshire" (1908).[55]

50 Interestingly enough, for the New York Edition, James once added description that might help localize the setting: "the hills" became "the great grassy hills, smooth arrest central billows of some primitive upheaval" (pp. 226-362).

51 Gegenheimer interprets James's change (1871-1875) of "a select publication on the castles and manors of England" to "a big red book" on the same subject as being an instance of the author's "search for the right word," his attempt to be "more concise and more precise" than before ("Early and Late Revisions," p. 235). One can also, it seems to me, detect a certain loss of wide-eyed enthusiasm and a certain growth of sophistication on the part of the narrator. (Gegenheimer does make this point elsewhere in his study.)

52 p. 40.

53 p. 225.

54 In 1875, pp. 38 and 39.

55 pp. 225, ibid.; 123, 124; 361, 362. And "Lockley Park" became "Lackley Park" in 1908, perhaps (?) due to Tennyson's "Locksley Hall."

In the New York Edition Preface to Roderick Hudson (written only slightly later than A Passionate Pilgrim)[56] James accounts for his early over-use of place names, and while his remarks apply directly to the novel, they are equally pertinent to the "blest nouvelle" under consideration here. "To name a place, in fiction [James wrote], is to pretend in some degree to represent it—and I speak here of course but of the use of existing names, the only ones that carry weight." The author, James felt, "embarks, rash adventurer, under the star of 'representation,' and is pledged thereby to remember that the art of interesting us in things—once these things are the right ones for his case—can only be the art of representing them." But James felt that he had not "done," had not represented Northampton very well: "It was a peaceful, rural New England community quelconque—it was not, it was under no necessity of being, Northampton, Mass." (Just as, in the Pilgrim, Lockley Park was under no necessity of being in Herefordshire.) James had tried to emulate Balzac, but without his seriousness, and without the actuality of a place being an effective, essential part of the story: "But one nestled, technically, in those days, and with yearning, in the great shadow of Balzac; his august example, little as the secret might ever be guessed, towered for me over the scene; so that what was clearer than anything else was how, if it was a question of Saumur...he 'did' Saumur....I remember how, in my feebler fashion, I yearned over the preliminary presentation of my small square patch of the American scene, and yet was not sufficiently on my guard, to see how easily his high practice might be delusive

56 Roderick Hudson began to appear in the January, 1875, issue of the Atlantic.

for my case." Due to Balzac's influence, James "'named'... when I was really most conscious of not being held to it...."[57]

One recalls the narrator's urbane reference to the "country guide, which spoke highly, as the phrase is, of Lockley Park"; his sophistication, more noticeable with each successive edition of the Pilgrim,[58] is one of the means that James used to tone down the original romantic excesses. It is amusing to watch him, beginning in 1875, dissociate the narrator from the emotion being described. (The italics will be mine.) Being in a foreign land in 1871 "stirs the innermost depths of your being," but in the first revision it "has an extraordinary poignancy."[58] London was to the narrator in 1875 "the mighty mother-city of our mighty race, the great distributing heart of our traditional life"; in the second revision, from heights somewhat more olympian he regarded "those pilgrims from the west who feel it to be the mother-city of their race, the distributing heart of their traditional life";[59] this hellenistic detachment of the narrator's prevails elsewhere in the 1884 edition, for there is no longer the admission that he had (with Searle) "glanced at" the London landmarks "with an equal attentive piety."[60]

57 Critical Prefaces, ed. Blackmur, pp.8-10. Ruth F. Priddy (New York) has announced a dissertation on "The Influence of Balzac on Henry James."

58 pp. 358-40.

59 pp. 39-225.

60 Ibid.

Finally, the "mighty charm of London" was seen in 1884 as the "intellectual pressure"[61] it exerts on Americans. James was to feel that here he had de-emotionalized too far, and in 1908 one reads of London's "deeper mystic appeal."[62] (But there are two New York Edition revisions that heighten the urbanity of the narrator. Where he had noted that the influence of London on Searle was "deep and singular," he now remarked that this influence "it charmed me to note." The manor house at Lockley had in 1884 a "rich grey front of the Tudor-time, above its blooming parterres and terraces"; in 1908 this "rich grey front of the Tudor time [was, amusingly] developed and terraced and gardened to some later loss, as we were afterwards to know, of type."[64]

61 Ibid.

62 p. 361.

63 pp. 225-361.

64 pp. 230-367. See note 118. Incidentally, succeeding descriptions of the house show James eliminating details and modifiers in 1875, replacing details and adding some figurative language in 1884, but, in 1908, again compressing, and relying on modifiers. The house is described as being:

1871

"a huge brick pile, in which the picturesque irregularities of the style, the gables and porches, the oriels and turrets, the screens of ivy and the pinnacles of slate, were clustered and multiplied in delightful fulness" (p. 366).

1875

"a multitudinous cluster of gables and porches, oriels and turrets, screens of ivy and pinnacles of slate" (p. 47).

1884

"a multitudinous cluster of gables and porches, projections and recesses, brown old surfaces nestling under their ivy, and mottled roofs that testified not to seasons but to centuries" (p. 231).

1908

"a multitudinous cluster of fair gables and intricate chimneys, brave projections and quiet recesses" (p. 368).

The reader has seen ample proof of Mr. Beach's comment that A Passionate Pilgrim was "written in the youthful glow of first discovery,"[65] and he has watched how James the revisionist eliminated much of the over-emotionalism and over-writing of the young author-tourist. To erase any chance of the reader's thinking that the toning-down was directed only at nature description, here is a sampling designed to show the variety of the "toning-down revisions." (The editions are those of 1875 and 1884—the latter often is in parenthesis.)

The American mind, the narrator felt, is prepared for the most "delectable (characteristic) features of English life" and the American's grounding in English tradition makes his enjoyment of England "an emotion more fatal and sacred (more intimate)[66] than his enjoyment...of Italy or Spain." Impressed by the age of an inn, the narrator pictured how domestics "must have watched the great entrances and exits of the posting and coaching drama" but in 1884 merely how they "must have leaned on their elbows for many a year." He decided to visit Hampton Court because his "impatient heart began to babble of green fields," but later he calmly "became conscious of a wish to see something green."[67] After arriving at the Court, he enjoyed gazing at the "great painted" bedchambers and "vast" beds ("painted" bedchambers and "big" beds), and then went on to inspect "the rest of the palace" and, finally, a "spacious level" ("the other compartments" and a "quiet terrace"). Here he

65 Method of James, p. 187.

66 But see note 85.

67 But see note 86.

"strolled upon that ancient terrace and felt the great protecting quietude of the solemn palace"; less excitedly in 1884 he "strolled in front of it [the palace] and felt the protection and security of the place" [italics mine]. It seemed to this appreciative tourist an exquisite sensation to "inhale to the depths of your consciousness the alien savor of the air" (to inhale the alien quality of the air).[68] At dinner he and Searle drank some "excellent (tolerable) Burgundy," before returning to the palace to admire again "the deep hued bloom (the ripeness) of its ordered gardens" (gardens). The "palace (residence)...seemed to tell of a proud and splendid past" (seemed to make the past definite and massive), and the nearby village also moved the narrator profoundly, for with "its ivy-towered church, its parsonage (its mossy roofs), [it] retained to my modernized fancy (looked like) the lurking semblance of a feudal hamlet" (the property of a feudal lord). Searle and his friend, after passing a few days in London, set out for Lockley Park; they were charmed by the friendliness of the scenery around Malvern, for "the magical familiarity of multitudinous details appealed to us at every step and at every glance. Deep in our souls a natural affection answered." In 1884, there is no reference to their souls' affection, for "the way we scarcely knew whether we were looking at it for the first or the last time made it appeal to us at every step." At Lockley Park, as he admires "the vastness and mystery (the variety) of the ancient house" the narrator thinks of the "stately (dull) dinners" that have been held there. Oxford was the final destination of the Americans; here

68 See note 30.

they saw a "great (quiet) cloister," a "vast (green old English garden," not to mention "the mighty lads (belle jeunesse)[69] of England," lads who are "immense" in 1875 but in 1884 merely "muscular."[70]

Other passages from his 1875 and 1884 descriptions of Oxford help us in a study of James's early development, for they reveal (1) occasional lapses grammatically;[71] (2) the youthful tendency to write unnaturally and grandiloquently when dealing with noble subjects,[72] (3) emotional excesses;[73] (4) James's improvement as a descriptive writer;[74] (5) another tendency of the youthful author—repetition to insure that a point is made.[75]

---

69 The passage that includes these phrases was often retouched and toned down, the "belle jeunesse of England," for instance, becoming "the young, the happy generation" in 1885 (pp. 276-180). Their rowing, described in 1884 as "all this beautiful physical strength," was in 1906 "the exhibition of so much of the clearest joy of wind and limb" (pp.276-417).

70 Citation for the entire paragraph: pp.8-199, 8-200, 21-210, 22-212, ibid., 23-212, 25-214, ibid., ibid., 26-214, 27-215, ibid., ibid., 28-215-216, 40-226, 78-256, 68-248, 102-275, 104-277, 103-276, ibid.

71 James corrected one instance of faulty agreement in 1875 and one in 1884: the "longitude of the hoary college walls seem [sic] ..."; the "Gothic" of the long street-fronts...irritate [sic] the fancy..." (pp. 499-100; 101-274).

72 One reads in 1875 not of "the streets innumerable" but of "the various streets" (in 1884, p. 274, of "the small, oblique streets"), and in 1884 not of "the obverse longitude of the hoary college walls" but of "the long, grey, battered public face of the colleges" (pp. 491-100; 100-274).
The stilted "The seat of the humanities is stronger in the admonitory shadow of her great name than in a marshalled host of wardens and beadles." was simplified (1884) to "...is stronger in her own good manners than..." (pp.101-275).

73 The excited parentheses in this passage (italics mine) was removed in 1875: "We took an afternoon walk through Christ-Church Meadow,—worthy of its sounding name!—, and at the river-bank procured a boat, which I pulled up the stream ["down" in 1884] to Iffley, to 'Iffly church, the church that crowns the hill,' and to the slanting

woods at Runcham..." (pp. 492-103).

This interesting and rather poetic blending of "sound and sense" appeared only in the first (1871) version: "The perfect weather continued, securely transmitted from hour to hour, hushing them [college gardens] each into a golden silence of gratitude, fitfully broken by a breezy murmur of disbelief" (p. 492).

74 One can see in this comparative passage James's increased detachment, his avoidance of nonrestrictive elements and of stiff or rhetorical diction, and his growing use of figurative, concrete language.

1875	1884
"We entered the little monkish doorway and stood in that dim, fantastic outer court, made narrow by the dominant presence of the great tower, in which the heart beats faster, and the swallows niche more lovingly in the tangled ivy, I fancied, than elsewhere in Oxford. We passed thence into the great cloister, and studied the little sculptured monsters along the entablature of the arcade" (pp.101-102).	"We entered the low, monkish doorway and stood in the dim little court that nestles beneath the tower, where the swallows niche more lovingly in the tangled ivy than elsewhere in Oxford, and passed into the quiet cloister, and studied the small sculptured monsters on the entablature of the arcade" (p. 275).

75 James wrote the following passage for the original Pilgrim, and after improving it in 1875, deleted it entirely in 1884, realizing that all the ideas it contained had been adequately expressed elsewhere: "[Oxford] seems to embody with an undreamed completeness and overwhelming massiveness* a dim and sacred ideal of the Western intellect,—a scholastic city, an appointed home of contemplation. Truly,* no other spot in Europe, I imagine, extorts from our barbarous hearts so passionate an admiration. A braver pen* than mine must enumerate the splendid devices by which it performs this great office. I can bear testimony only to the dominant tone of its effect."*--In 1875 "ovewhelming massiveness" and "Truly" were omitted, and "braver" became "finer" (pp.491-100).

In "English Vignettes," an essay written in 1879, James expressed much the same sentiment: "To the barbaric mind, ambitious of culture, Oxford is the usual image of the happy reconciliation between research and acceptance. It typifies, to an American, the union of science and sense—of aspiration and ease" (Portraits of Places, pp. 344-345).

It has been shown that although by 1875 (when the Pilgrim first appeared in a collection) James had improved considerably as a teller of romantic tales, there remained too much melodramatic phrase and circumstances, and too much use of the superlative degree in the rendering of feeling and expression.[76] Steadily and consistently James came to rule out the "crude, the pathetic, the sentimental, in character and situation...together with the atmosphere they carry with them."[77] We shall continue to see James doing this, but at the same time we shall now see him making revisions designed actually to heighten the responsiveness of both the Americans to England.[78] It cannot be stated too strongly that although James in his revisions modified the romantic excesses of the Pilgrim, he in no way modified the romantic conception of the tale. And so it is that while eliminating or softening the florid and occasionally trite phrasing and the somewhat shrill tone, he retained and even tried to strengthen—but subtly and unobtrusively—the feeling of excitement experienced by Searle and the narrator at being in England--in short, their sensitivity and appreciation. The impact of the story depends in some measure upon James's success in picturing their emotional and esthetic reactions to England—Searle's so that his eventual breakdown (physical and mental) and death will be credible and inevitable, the narrator's so that his sympathetic

76 See Method of James, pp. 183-184.

77 Ibid., p. 111.

78 Gegenheimer illustrates James's "growing sense of sophistication and of worldly wisdom" and his "elimination of the superfluous" ("Early and Late Revisions," pp. 237, 235). (See note 51.) He makes no reference, however, to James's heightening the responsiveness of the Americans to England.

attitude towards Searle will be plausible and communicate itself to the reader, and be shared by him. Often with light brush strokes, James did, in revision, make stronger the receptivity of both Americans to England.

In order to increase the sense of the narrator's appreciation, James frequently adopted an obvious technique—he simply strengthened the earlier statement (italics mine). In London the narrator felt that one could catch (1875) "many a vivid impression of its huge metropolitan interests," that one could "detect the colors of association"; in 1884 he felt that one could catch there "all kinds of romantic impressions," that the city "often flushes with the tints of association."[79] (In 1908, by the use of the same technique, there seemed to him "no tint of association" with which the face of London did not flush.)[80] Reaching the Lockley Park section, James "so beautifully kept it up." The narrator could not help (1884, and 1885) being more impressed than before, for instead of "the great terrace," "the footman," and a Gainsborough, he saw "a great terrace," "a footman," and two Gainsboroughs.[81] And instead of "a smaller and more convenient" apartment for use as a drawing room, there were in 1885 "others" for this purpose.[82] (As for the park itself, in 1908 the narrator would find himself "within the range of these numerous acres" rather than "within its enclosures.")[83]

79 pp. 21-22—211.

80 p. 348.

81 pp. 54-237, 92-267, 48-232. The original one Gainsborough had at first (1871) been a Mulready (pp. 364-43).

82 pp. 232-132.

83 pp. 229-366. Incidentally, on their way to Lockley in the 1908 edition, the pair had stopped to look at a wayside inn, no longer for "simple admiration" but now for "mere gaping joy" (pp. 224-362).

The revisions in the New York Edition illustrate the care with which James improved his diction in order to increase the sense of the narrator's appreciation of England. The coffee-room at the Red Lion was now a "retreat" where there were romantic "essences," whereas formerly it had been an "apartment" full of romantic "meanings";[84] an American's enjoyment of England, once "intimate," was now "searching";[85] Hampton Court, no longer merely "something green," became a site "gracefully classic."[86] It is rather difficult for the reader in 1884 to visualize the beautiful furnishings at Lockley when they are described as "the constituent properties of a great house," but not when he reads of "a hundred ornaments and treasures."[87] And the reader senses the aura of age not so much when he reads of an old piece of majolica having "stood for a hundred years, keeping its clear, firm hues in this aristocratic twilight" as when he reads of its having kept its hues in the "quiet light that has never sought to advertise it."[88] Later, enjoying not "the pure image of Oxford" but the "element of finer romance,"[89] the narrator, who had (1884) inquired of old Rawson, "'You can wander without losing your way?'" now asked, "'You know all these wonderful ins and outs?'"[90]

---

84 pp. 335-199.

85 pp. 336-200. See note 66.

86 pp. 212-349. See note 67.

87 pp. 232-369.

88 pp. 233-370.

89 pp. 281-421.

90 pp. 283-423.

Whereas a great many of the changes that heightened the narrator's appreciation occurred in the New York Edition, James worked most carefully to make stronger and more appealing Searle's sensitivity to England in the revision of 1884. Although there had been, in 1875, the necessary deletion of a passage in which Searle had been too sensitive a vessel (the mere sight of the English scene being a "racking act of vision" so strong as to endanger his already precarious grip on life),[91] and although there was, in 1884, an ambitious enlargement of his expression of life-long homesickness for the older civilisations,[92] the revisions that James made in his effort to improve his earlier treatment of Searle's esthetic nature were generally, in the 1884 edition, subtle and unobtrusive. Once instead of stressing Searle's "helpless, ineffective delicacy," James emphasized "the fine grain of his nature,"[93] a much more charitable description, to be sure, and one designed to make the reader regard Searle with more sympathetic tolerance. Since

91 The Atlantic version of the Pilgrim also failed to prepare for the deleted sentence: "Searle fell into unceasing talk and exhaled his swarming impressions with a tender felicity and an odd union of wisdom and folly which I can but partly reproduce. My friend's whole being, indeed, seemed now more and more to tremble with the racking act of vision; and if I had been asked on what sole condition his life might be prolonged, I would have said on that of sudden blindness" (pp.492-104).

92 Searle remarked, in 1875, "'So I was [homesick] for a morning. But haven't I been all my life long sick for Europe? And now that I've got it, am I to cast it off again?'" More fully, in 1884, he said, "'I meant I was sick for a home. Don't I belong here? Haven't I longed to get here all my life? Haven't I counted the months and the years till I should be able to go to Europe, as they say? And now that I have got here, must I just back out? No, no, I'll move on'" (pp. 19-209). Making for both emphasis and a smile on the part of the reader, Searle (1908) asked if he had not counted the years till he should be able "'to 'go' as we say? And now that I've 'gone,' that is that I've come, must I just back out?'" (p. 345).

the "pilgrim" had an American background, of course his opinions were only "gross" (more kindly in 1906, "rather primitive").[94] There was about Searle, though, an "appealing native grace" (called, more specifically, in 1884, "a natural love of pleasant things"),[95] and to his self-analysis were added (1884) the traits of "'nice tastes...and fine sympathies and sentiments,'"[96] all of which he demonstrated in his ecstatic response to the sense of the past with which Lockley Park was redolent. (His "early excitement" there had become in 1875 his "rhapsodies";[97] his inability to understand why others had not "enjoyed" it was to be, in the definitive edition, his wonder at why they had not "hugged" it.)[98] As he looked around him, where once he had espied a "'shady stretch of turf!'" and a "'moated grange'" he now (1884) with enthusiastic imagination saw "'turf of the middle-ages!'" and an "'old hall, or grange or court— what in the name of enchantment do you call it?'"[99]

93 pp. 21-211.

94 pp. 24-213.

95 Ibid.

96 pp. 33-220.

97 pp. 478-64.

98 pp. 230-367.

99 pp. 46-231.

This sensitive nature of Clement Searle was of course closely related to (indeed, at time almost a part of) his highly nervous—almost mentally unsound—condition. Especially in 1884 James made deletions, compressions or revisions that aimed to soften—even to the point of euphemism—earlier references to Searle's instability.[100] The narrator came to look upon his illness not as a matter of "mind and spirits" but one of "low spirits"[101] and enjoined Miss Searle to help restore him not to "soundness and serenity" but to "all that he ought to be."[102] And at Oxford,[103]

100 Yet there were a few instances of such references becoming blunter. Searle's first reaction to Lockley Park made the narrator (1884) fearful, not that he was becoming "over-excited" but that he was "really losing his head." The violent rudeness of Richard Searle caused in Clement not "almost hysterical" but "hysterical" emotion (pp.61-242, 103-276).

There is, however, an instance of James's returning to his original effect: while asleep (late in the afternoon of their visit to Lockley Park) Searle seemed to the narrator to be nearer (1871) to "brightness and peace" than before; the 1875 change of nearer to "mental soundness" (retained in 1884) was recanted (1885), when James used the term "spiritual repose" (pp.478-65; 245-146).

101 pp. 37-223.

102 pp. 79-257.

103 After their experiences at Lockley Park, but before going on to Oxford, the Americans spent a night at a village inn. It was here that Searle "saw" the family ghost (see note 138); in all editions the narrator felt that "sanity" had passed out of Searle's voice, and he prepared himself for the "worst." But the 1884 passage that immediately followed this statement was more kindly, in its brevity and its indirectness, than those of the two earlier editions: "There were in my friend, however, such old habits of gentle behavior" that I did not fear he would prove unmanageable" (p.273). (In 1885, Searle had "such confirmed habits of mildness," p.176.) In 1875 this had read: "There was in my friend, however, such an essential gentleness and conservative patience, that to persons surrounding him the worst was likely to come without hurry or violence. He had so confirmed a habit of good manners that, at the core of reason, the process of disorder might have been long at work, without finding an issue" (p.99). Unbelievably, in 1871, the disorder had been at work, "without finding a faithless servant to transmit its messages or subverting these serried and investing sentinels" (p.490).

instead of fearing that the "influence of the place would prove too potent for his unbalanced imagination," he was apprehensive that Searle "would take Oxford too hard, as he took everything."[104]

By the use of affecting dialogue, which he made more natural and (through better imagery) more concrete, James tried to cause the reader to respond kindly to Searle's excited and imaginative nature. Having just gotten the idea that he was a reincarnation of an earlier English namesake, Searle exclaimed in 1875: "'He perished at sea. His spirit came ashore and wandered forlorn till it got lodgment again in my poor body. In my poor body it has lived, homesick, these forty years, shaking its rickety cage, urging me, stupid, to carry it back to the scenes of its youth....Let me exhale my spirit here!'" In the improved 1884 version, the dramatic quality of the tapping of his chest, and the new beating-of-the-wings image[105](reminiscent of the late novel) show James's increase of skill: "'...His spirit...wandered about in misery till it got another incarnation—in this poor trunk!' And he tapped his hollow chest. 'Here it has rattled about these forty years, beating its wings against its rickety cage, begging to be taken home again....Now, at last, the poor spirit can escape!'"[106]

104 pp. 102-275. Here at Oxford the narrator realized that Searle's "strength had begun to ebb...." More correctly and poignantly he saw (1884) that Searle "had lost the little that remained of his strength..." (pp.103-276). Gegenheimer can see in this change only an avoidance "of the cliché or of any phrase that might be thought trite" ("Early and Late Revisions," p. 237).

105 It is interesting to watch this image develop. In 1871 the spirit had been "racking its wretched casing" (p. 367). Then, as noted above, it was "shaking its rickety cage," and later, "beating its wings against" the cage. (The "poor spirit" of 1884 was a "bruised" one in 1908, p. 372.)

106 pp. 51-234.

One is constantly being reminded that James (in his own interpretation of the terms) was not "rewriting" but was "revising" this story. For despite all the changes so painstakingly made over a period of more than thirty years, James could not by revision make of Searle a truly sympathetic character: as originally pictured, he is too whining, too querulous, even too cowardly.[107] If James had at first presented him as the "ineffectual angel" type, the revisions that elicited greater reader sympathy for both his sensitiveness and his unsoundness would have had added poignancy. But James the revisionist had to contend with a Searle who petulantly refused well-meant offers of help, who was the extremest sort of hypochrondiac, and who threatened suicide. Since to have blotted out these sides of Searle's nature would have been what James considered "re-writing" rather than "revision," he could not do it, but he did compress (and incidentally, make more clear) the suicide threat.[108] And, after trying by

107 All of which is in itself reason enough for Van Wyck Brooks and others not to have identified the young James with the "pilgrim." See note 10.

108 Searle (1875) tells Simmons he shall die:

"'O, are you sure of that?'

'One can always be sure of that.'

Mr. Simmons stared and stared: his mild cynic had turned grim stoic. 'Upon my soul,' he said, 'one would think that Death had named the day!'

'We have named it, between us.'

This was too much even for Mr. Simmons's easy morality ["as yet uncorrupted piety," 1871, p. 356]. 'I say, Searle,' he cried, 'I'm not more of a stickler than the next man, but if you are going to blaspheme, I shall wash my hands of you'" (pp. 18-19).

In 1884, James made entirely clear that Searle had been talking about suicide, but otherwise compressed the passage: "Mr. Simmons was silent a moment. 'Well, you are sick!' he exclaimed presently. 'All I can say is that if you are going to talk about prussic acid and that sort of thing, we cease to occupy common ground. You can't get a dose of prussic acid for nothing, you know'" (p. 209).

revision to improve this passage in which Searle perversely rejected Lawyer Simmons' well-meant invitation to return with him to America (Simmons having come to the realization that establishing the claim to the English estate was hopeless), James finally (for the New York Edition) drastically compressed (rewrote?) it:

1884

"You said just now I don't know you. Possibly! There's, perhaps, no such tremendous difference between knowing you and not knowing you. At any rate, you don't know me. I expect you to go home."

"I won't go home! I have crossed that beastly ocean for the last time."

"What's the matter? Are you afraid?"

"Yes, I'm afraid! 'I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word!'" 109

"You're more afraid to go than to stay?"

"I shall not stay. I shall leave for another place."

"O, are you sure of that?"

"One can always be sure of that."

1908

"You said just now I don't know you," Mr. Simmons went on. "Possibly. Come back with me then," he said kindly enough, "and let's improve our acquaintance."

"I won't go back. I shall never go back."

"Never?"

"Never."110

Lawyer Simmons was not the only one to whom Searle morbidly and insistently spoke of leaving "for another place"; the narrator, too, had to listen to this "intolerable flavor of mortality." Once again James, for his definitive edition, seems justified in resorting to a bit of "rewriting," if such one would call his de-

---

No change was made in 1885, but in 1908 the passage was retouched: "Mr. Simmons thought it shrewdly over.'...if you're working out a plan for cold poison, or for any other act of desperation, you had better give it right up. You can't get a dose of the commonest kind of cold poison for nothing, you know'" (p.345).

109 Echoing Gratian (The Merchant of Venice, IV, 1, 322-323): "A Daniel, still say I, a second Daniel! I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word."

110 pp.208-209--344-345.

letion of a whining speech by Searle, and the narrator's probing accusation that he lived too much within himself.

1884	1908
"I promise you to leave you only at your own request," I said. "But it must be on condition of your omitting from your conversation this intolerable flavor of mortality. The end! Perhaps it's the beginning."	"I...promise to leave you only when you kick me downstairs." But I suggested my terms. "It must be on condition of your omitting from your conversation this intolerable flavor of mortality. I know nothing of 'ends'. I'm all for beginnings.' [111]
He shook his head. "You don't know me. It's a long story. I am incurably ill."	
"I know you a little. I have a strong suspicion that your illness is in great measure a matter of low spirits. All that you have told me is but another way of saying that you have lived hitherto in yourself. The tenement's haunted! Live abroad—take an interest!"	

Succeeding versions of the unduly long passage (half of it omitted here) of self-revelation made by Searle to the narrator at Hampton Court are instructive in tracing James's development. A confirmed Jacobite who had read only the later James or the James of the New York Edition would probably never suspect that the Master once borrowed such stock clichés as the "volume of verses" (retained in 1884) or the tragic marriage to the "young girl... poor and obscure, but beautiful and proud." It would seem not only excusable, but mandatory, for James to rewrite this passage, adding transitional material to hide the extended excisions of parts that are unbearably hackneyed, cheaply melodramatic, and—above all—disgustingly maudlin and querulous (certainly the Edwardian Searle was ingratiating in his candor, the Victorian Searle, never).

111 pp. 223-359. See note 101.

(It is interesting to consider that changing styles in fiction are illustrated here, and to speculate on the extent to which each passage reflects the age in which it was written.) Searle tells the narrator:

1875

"I had a little money; it went the way of my little wit. Here in my pocket I have forty pounds of it left. The only thing I have to show for my money and my wit is a little volume of verses, printed at my own expense, in which fifteen years ago I made bold to sing the charms of love and idleness.

Six months since I got hold of the volume; it reads like the poetry of fifty years ago. The form is incredible. I hadn't seen Hampton Court then. When I was thirty I married. It was a sad mistake, but a generous one. The young girl was poor and obscure, but beautiful and proud. I fancied she would make an incomparable woman. It was a sad mistake! She died at the end of three years, leaving no children.

Since then I have idled long. I have had bad habits. To this impalpable thread of existence the current of my life has shrunk. Tomorrow I shall be high and dry.

Was I meant to come to this? Upon my soul I wasn't! If I say what I feel, you'll fancy my vanity quite equal to my folly, and set me

1884

"I had a little money; it went the way of my little wit. Here in my pocket I have forty pounds of it left. The only thing I have to show for my early wealth is a little volume of verses, printed at my own expense, in which fifteen years ago I made bold to sing the charms of love and idleness.

Six months since, I got hold of the volume; it reads like the poetry of fifty years ago. The form is incredible—upon my word. I hadn't seen these old places then. I hadn't seen any form. I should tell you I used to be an awful fool. At present I am not even a fool—I am nothing at all, as I have told you. Was I meant to come to this? Upon my soul I wasn't. If I say what I feel, you'll fancy my vanity quite equal to my folly, and set me down as one of those fatuous theorizers after the the fact, who draw any moral from their misfortunes butthe right one, because that looks bad for them. Take it for what it's worth. I have always fancied that I was meant for a world arranged on different lines. Before heaven, sir—whoever you are—I'm in practice so absurdly tender-hearted

1908

"I had a little money; it went the way of my little wit. Here in my pocket I have the scant dregs of it. I should tell you I was the biggest kind of ass. Just now that description would flatter me; it would assume there's something left of me. But the ghost of a donkey—what's that? I think," he went on with a charming turn and as if striking off his real explanation, "I should have been all right in a world arranged on different lines."

112

down as one of those dreary theorisers after the fact, who draw any moral from their misfortunes but the damning moral that vice is vice and that's an end of it. Take it for what it's worth. I have always fancied that I was meant for a gentler world. I came into the world an aristocrat I was born with a soul for the picturesque. It condemns me, I confess; but, in a measure, too, it absolves me. I found it nowhere."

that I can afford to say it—I came into the world an aristocrat. I was born with a passion for old forms. It condemns me, I confess; but in a measure, too, it absolves me."

In revising the Pilgrim, especially in 1884, James, prompted by artistic discipline, removed authentic place names of the Lockley Park area, since he had not (in the manner of Balzac) "done" the places so openly designated. Akin to this restraint was the new detachment and sophistication of the narrator, who tended now to observe (where formerly he had shared) Searle's emotions, and who explored historic England with more detachment. Yet—and this is only a seeming paradox—James in no way modified the romantic conception of the Pilgrim; on the contrary, his revisions even strengthened the Americans' appreciation of their mother country, but for his original shrillness James was now able to substitute subtlety. Finally, and not withstanding the disclaimers of James the revisionist, he might judiciously be said to have rewritten some of the passages that pictured in an unfavorable light the character of Searle, in the attempt to make him more nearly a sympathetic character.

---

112 pp. 34; 220-221; 357.

When he first revised A Passionate Pilgrim (1875) James seemed satisfied with his original picture of Miss Searle[113] but not with that of her brother Richard: he altered somewhat his physical appearance[114] and—chiefly by improving his dialogue—made much stronger his love for Lockley Park.[115]

113 Except for her "heavy" throat, which became "rounded" (pp.480-60). Likewise, in 1884, "the lady's heavy cheek" was changed to the more complimentary "the heroine's cheek" (pp.84-261).

114 Richard was made older—sixty instead of fifty—in 1875 (pp. 480-69). As a young writer, James tended to "over-write" (and with obvious effort) both in length and in detail when describing the physiognomies of his characters; throughout his career he seemed unable to resist changing his earlier descriptions of mustaches. Naturally, then, the original picture of Richard's hair and beard was altered and sharply compressed in the first revision:

1871	1875
"The former [hair], fine as silk apparently in texture, scarlet almost in hue, and densely abundant, surrounded his head like a huge lurid nimbus. His beard sprang fan-like from lips and cheek and chin, as like to his amazing locks as if it had been the downward image of them reflected in water" (p.479).	"They [hair and beard] intermingled over his ears and surrounded his head like a huge lurid nimbus" (p. 67).

James rather liked the nimbus imagery, or variations of it; a reference (1875) to the "bushy brightness" in which Richard's face was "encased" was changed (1884) to a bushy brightness which "made a sort of frame" for it (pp. 67-247). The color of the hair of this hot-tempered man was variously (1871, 1875, 1884) "radiant red," "flamboyant," and "strange red" (pp. 466; 67; 263). James tried to catch Richard's fiery nature in the descriptions of his large and deep-set eyes: they had (1884) "a kind of auburn glow, a vulpine keenness and redness"; this imagery was changed (1908) to "...auburn glow, the suggestion of a keen metal red-hot" (pp.247-385).

The facial features of Clement Searle, old Rawson, and Lawyer Simmons all were retouched by James the revisionist. Searle's "soft, horizontal moustache" (1884) "reposed" beneath his nose, but later (1908) it "languished much rather than bristled" there (pp. 201--337-338). Rawson's unkempt beard was "sandy" in 1884 but "reddish" in 1885; in 1884 "his handsome nose had turned to purple"; in 1885 it "had assumed a tinge"; in 1908 "his bold nose was sadly compromised"

For the 1884 edition, however, James made a great many changes to his earlier treatments of both English Searles. Although he may have been seeking more exact and less trite diction when he made some of the slight alterations to the physical appearance of Miss Searle,[116] in most of the 1884 revisions dealing with her James seems to have been trying to describe her more flatteringly than before;[117] she was no longer stout--the "rounded amplitude of her shape" was now "a kind of slim robustness"[118]--and instead of being "plain" she was "not obtrusively fair,"[119] a woman not with "small beauty and scanty grace" but one with "no

(pp. 282-186; Ibid.; 186-422). Lawyer Simmons (1875) delivered a malicious remark "with an unhandsome grin, as if Mephistopheles were playing at malice," a clever enough description, it would seem, but one made more detailed by James (1884) when Simmons spoke "with a grin that made his upper lip look more than ever glazed with the razor, and jerked the ugly ornament of his chin into the air" (pp. 20-210).

115 He asked in 1871 if he should "'concede a round fraction'" of it to a "'beggarly foreigner,'" but (more colloquially) in 1875 if he should "'make a great hole in it'" for such a person (pp. 485-86).

At Clement himself Richard (1871) shouted, "'Forsooth, I shall break my diamond! Prove your infernal claim!'" This became (1875) the simpler "'Forsooth I shall share my land with you? Prove your infernal claim!'" (pp. 487-90). In 1884 "my land" was changed to "my property" and the "infernal" claim became "preposterous" (pp.90-226).

116 Her mouth, "at once broad and comely" was seen in 1884 as "smiling" and "well-formed"; her "blue" eyes became "grey" and her "yellow" hair,"very light-brown" (pp. 53-236).

117 Typical of his changes is the one that made her hands not "great" but "large" (pp.53-236).

118 Ibid. In 1908 James somewhat amusingly described her as "taller than then was common and perhaps stouter than is now enjoined" (pp.236-373). See note 64.

119 pp. 53-236.

brilliancy of expression or manner."[120] She was granted a measure more of dignity when a epithet for her, "simple, too simple," was changed to "very shy and simple," and again when she was allowed to speak with "rambling eagerness" rather than with "a rambling, earnest vapidity."[121] But James paid most attention, when revising, to her shyness; even if, to avoid annoying repetition, he eliminated the word itself, the effect remained (or was strengthened), as when "shy" became (1884) "hesitating"[122](and "silent and shy"and "shy and simple" became in 1908 "dumb and abashed" and "[with]all sorts of deep diffidences").[123] A long passage in the first two editions of the story illustrated her lack of guile, her naive interest in those strange creatures—Americans—and the sheltered life which (together with her brother's domination) had made her so shy. James in 1884 excised this passage beyond recognition without

120 pp. 54-237. James in 1908, however, made this description less kind than in 1884, giving her "no arts, no impulses, nor graces—scarce even any manners" (pp.237-374). Similarly, the summary of her dress was made less unfavorable in 1884 than in 1875 ("out of taste and out of reason" to "...something infelicitous and unexpected in her dress"), but more unfavorable in 1908 than in 1884: "she was queerly, almost frowsily dressed..." (pp. 55; 237; 374). In the 1875 edition Miss Searle was described as being dressed for dinner "in the faded splendor of a beautiful tissue of combined and blended silk and crape of a tender sea-green color, festooned and garnished and puffed into a massive bouillonnement,..." The comparable, compressed 1884 passage pictures the dress only as "some faded splendor of sea-green crape and silk..." (pp.68-248).

121 pp. 53-236, 56-238.

122 pp. 53-236. (The word "shy" had been used twice within half a page.)

123 pp. 237-374, 236-373. James did not always prefer "diffident" to "shy," writing (again, 1908) not that Miss Searle had "the aspect of a thoroughly diffident woman; She was evidently embarrassed at having to make advances without help." but that (more strongly) she "had the air of the shyest of women, for whom it was almost anguish to make an advance without help" (pp.235-372-373).

however--for the careful reader--any loss in characterisation.

1875

"We...were to our hostess objects of no light scrutiny. The best possible English breeding still marvels visibly at the native American. Miss Searle's wonderment was guileless enough to have been more overt and yet inoffensive; there was no taint of offence indeed in her utterance of the unvarying amenity that she had met an American family on the Lake of Como whom[124] she would have almost taken to be English.

"If I lived here," I said, "I think I should hardly need to go away, even to the Lake of Como."

"You might perhaps get tired of it. And then the Lake of Como! If I could only go abroad again!"

"You have been but once?"

1884

"We...were to our hostess objects of a curiosity that was not artfully veiled.

"I should like so to go abroad!" she exclaimed suddenly, as if she meant us to take the speech for an expression of interest in ourselves.

"Have you never been?" I inquired.

"Only once."[125]

The shyness and timidity of Miss Searle make move moving her love for Clement, especially since the dictatorial brother objected to it. Just as the narrator was encouraging her to open her heart to her American cousin,[126] she saw Richard watching them--and probably divining the message. Fear of Richard's wrath caused her to give "a tearful sideleng glance"; more of her timidity is felt by the reader when she looked at the narrator (1884) with "a long shuddering sidelong glance."[127]

124 This misplaced modifier, it is to be noted, survived two editions. Originally a comma followed "Como."

125 pp. 55-237.

126 When the narrator made this appeal, she blushed (1875) "as with a sudden sense of my meaning." This became "...as if I had been reproaching her with her insignificance" (pp.60-258).

127 pp. 81-259.

The near-rebelliousness of Miss Searle, to be seen presently, becomes increasingly justified as the revisions treating Richard make him more unattractive, especially in so far as his defense of his property is concerned. He no longer received the unwelcome visitors with a "bow"— instead he gave them (1884) only a "curious little sharp stare,"[128] and was "grotesquely" rather than "almost grotesquely" solemn;[129] while showing them his house he became no more than "almost agreeable" (rather than "agreeable"),[130] and his sarcasm toward America was more open than formerly.[131]

128 pp. 66-247.

129 pp. 67-247. In keeping with his added urbanity, however, Searle told amusing stories (about earlier Searles) not with "almost reverential gravity" but with "remarkable art" (pp. 78-257). This urbanity makes Richard less and less likeable. In 1871 it was "poised and projected amenity"; in 1875, "finely adjusted urbanity"; in 1884, "exaggerated urbanity" (pp. 480; 70; 244).

130 pp. 78-256.

131 Instead of surmising that the earlier Clement Searle (so much did the present one resemble his portrait) had reached America and had "'lived along till now'" he quipped that the earlier Clement had been kept alive by "'one of those beastly processes— I think you have 'em over there: what do you call it, "putting up" things?'" (pp. 71-250). For the New York Edition, James allowed Richard a more complete knowledge of the Americas than formerly. In 1884, Richard recalled a college chum who "'afterwards went to America; to the Argentine Republic, I believe. Do you know the Argentine Republic? What an extraordinary name, by the way!'" In 1908 he "'afterwards went to the Middle States. They'll be, I suppose, about the Mississippi?'" (pp. 250-388).

Richard serves as a foil in the characterization of Clement, for whereas the American had the good taste never to mention his "pretended right" (despite its rise in value from $85,000 to $130,000, and the decline of his income, in the New York Edition, from 4,000 to 1,000 pounds),[132] the host became downright violent, and, as if an uneasy conscience were prompting him, challenged Clement more tauntingly (1885) than before. Earlier (1875) he had "whispered," but now he "shouted,"[133] in 1884, "'A valid claim! Let him try it!'" and in 1885 "'A valid claim! Let him try it—let him bring it into court.'"[134] The presumption of Clement (in 1884 no mere "'stranger'" but a "'pretender'")[135] was so great that Richard from a "furious little man" became (1884) an "insane" one[136] who (where formerly he had screamed) now (1885) "spouted" imprecations[137] at him.

132 pp. 38-224; 276-416. Richard knew that an "imposter" had been making inquiries (really, at the instigation of the uncouth American, Lawyer Simmons)--he was en route home from his solicitors when the visitors arrived.

133 pp. 87-263.

134 pp. 263-166.

135 pp. 86-263. James kept changing his outburst. In 1875 he exclaimed, "'I love my estate; it's my passion, my life, myself! Am I to make a great hole in it for a beggarly foreigner, a man without means, without proof, a stranger, an adventurer, a Bohemian?'" In 1884 the estate which he loved was Searle's "'passion, my life, my heaven! Am I to divide it up at this time of day with a beggarly foreigner, a man without means, without proof, a pretender, an adventurer, a Bohemian?'" In 1885 the estate was Searle's "'passion, my conscience, my life!'" and Clement was "'a man without means, without appearance, without proof, a pretender, a mountebank, a Bohemian!'" (pp. 86; 263; 165).

136 pp. 91-267.

137 pp. 268-171. "'I shall drag you into court [Searle screamed, in 1871], and you shall be beaten—beaten—beaten!'

Realizing the dramatic value of his "triangle" of Searles, James had Richard direct an increasingly jaundiced eye at his sister (twenty-five years his junior, and the only other surviving Searle) and the attention she lavished upon her designing distant cousin. He told with more point (1884) the legend of the earlier Margaret Searle, who had ruined herself by marrying a beggarly foreigner,[138] yet he must have felt that his recital had been mere wasted effort when he saw the butler prepare to deliver his sister's note to Clement.[139] Instantly Richard started to intercept it, but the narrator was too quick for him; then the suspicious host rushed at his sister, seized her by the wrist, and demanded (1908,

---

And this gentle verb continued to ring in our ears as we drove away" (p. 488). "This gentle verb" became (1875) "this soft vocable," then (1884) "this grim participle." Finally (1908) James admitted defeat and wrote "which grim reiteration followed us on our course" (pp. 488; 93; 269; 408).

138 She married not an American but "a paltry Frenchman, a penniless fiddler, in the teeth of her whole family" (1884, p. 260). Richard had found a letter in which she appealed to her irate family for money—she had just had a baby, she was starving, and "neglected by her husband"; this became (1884) "dreadfully neglected" (pp. 83-260). Richard concluded that "'This was the first...and the last of the family who has been so d ---d un-English!'" James changed this (1884) to "'...the only lady of the family who ever looked at an adventurer'" and (1885) to the only one "'who ever was taken in by an adventurer'" (pp. 83; 261; 163).

The other family legend is closer to Hawthorne's Ancestral Footstep: an earlier Clement Searle, unable to marry the girl he loved, and unwilling to marry his mother's choice, fled. (The middle brother in Hawthorne's story fled with his brother's wife. See note 9.) Two weeks later, on Christmas Eve, a "'young woman, soaked and chilled by [the terrible snowstorm], gained entrance to the house and...poured out her tale. ...Clement Searle had loved her; loved her all to well. She had been turned out in wrath from her father's house; his mother...might pity her...for the child she was soon to bring forth.'" But the mother and the mother's choice "'in scorn, in horror, with blows, possibly, turned her forth again into the storm. In the storm she wandered, and in the deep snow she died'" (1884, pp. 252-253). In the New York Edition, the girl was "battered" by the storm, and the women "drove her" forth again (p. 391). One may be reminded of George Eliot's Silas Marner (1861).

"quite hissed at her")[140] to know what the note had contained. "But [1884] there was something even in her patience which seemed to mock him."[141] In 1875 he "flushed crimson with rage and the sense of his unhandsomeness, and flung her away. 'You're a child!' he cried, 'Go to bed.'" But in 1884 he was more full of spite and his tongue more ungovernable than ever for now he "flushed crimson with rage and spite and flung her away. 'You always were an idiot!' he cried. 'Go to bed.'"[142] A moment later he accused Searle not of practicing "against" his sister but of "intriguing with" her.[143]

---

139 The butler, questioned by Richard about the note, told whom it was for, but stared (1884) straight head "as if to discredit a suspicion of his having read the direction." James in 1908 showed more graphically the butler's disgust at his master's exhibition: he stared straight ahead, "dissociating himself from everything" (pp. 264-403). Next, the master of the house ordered that the note be brought to him. Instead of (1884) writing that "The butler obeyed," James (1908) wrote—still showing the butler's disgust—"On which Tottenham stiffly moved to obey" (ibid.).

140 pp. 265-403. The note had been a warning to Clement, advising him (Richard's attitude being what it was) to leave. The narrator tore the note to pieces, making it impossible for Richard to read it.

141 p. 89.

142 pp. 89-90--265-266. James's use of the word "blighted" in picturing (1885) Searle's reaction to this scene calls to mind the scene in which Mrs. Walker rudely cut Daisy Miller (see Chapter V, note 150 and Chapter III, note 84). In Searle's face (1875, 1884) "the gathered serenity was twisted into a sickened frown...." This serenity (1885) was "blighted and distorted into a sickened frown..." (pp. 90; 266; 168).

143 pp. 90-266.

James seemed, in the 1884 edition, to have a new-found assurance as an author—to be writing with added poise and confidence. Dialogue came from his pen rhythmically and naturally,[144] and he no longer appeared to grow tense and nervous when handling strong emotion. The emotional speech of his characters was now more realistic, and their actions during moments of stress more nearly convincing. Finally, his spurning of hackneyed melodramatic effects helped make the story ring true.

At the inn where the Americans spent the night after leaving Lockley Park, Clement, his nerves shattered, was "visited" by the figure of the wronged sweetheart of his namesake. James in the second and third (1884) editions did what he could to improve (chiefly by deletion) Searle's outburst, since this rather impossible emotional speech had appeared in the first (1871) edition: "'Write it down!' he went on. 'There, take your pen. Put it into dreadful words. Make it of all ghost stories the ghastliest, the truest! How do I look? Am I human? Am I pale? Am I red? Am I speaking English? A woman! A ghost! What was I born for? What have I lived for? To see a ghost!'" For the 1875 Pilgrim, the conclusion of the speech was trimmed, to its betterment: "'....Am I speaking English? A ghost, sir! Do you understand?'" The "ghost stories" sentence was omitted in the 1884 (and final) revision, so that by now Searle's ejaculations were much more convincing than originally: "'Write it down!' he went on. 'There, take your pen. Put it into

144 Miss Searle, instead of telling the Americans "'Here I was born!'" told them (1884) "'I was born in this house'" (pp. 55-237). And later, instead of learning that she had "'bespoken their lodging'" they learned that she had "'told them to see about a room for you'" (pp.64-245).

dreadful words. How do I look? Am I human? Am I pale? Am I red? Am I speaking English? A ghost, sir! Do you understand?'"[145]

The new assurance that James seemed to feel in 1884[146] is to be seen in the actions of his characters during moments of emotional tension--heretofore they had laughed at the wrong moment sufficiently often for the reader to sense that James, the author, was the one really nervous. Until this third (1884) edition of the story, Richard Searle had burst "into resounding laughter" at the narrator's intended pleasantry about Clement's taking "'as keen an interest in your annals and possessions as yourself!'"[147] Properly enough, since Richard was made even more angry and suspicious at the Americans' intrusion, James deleted this show of mirth by the host. And later in the story, as he screamed at Clement and taunted him about giving up both the claim and his designs on Miss Searle,[148] Richard incongruously burst into laughter.[149] This too was deleted. Normally one claps

145 pp. 489; 96; 270-271. See note 103.

146 James's later more honest treatment of emotional tension may be seen again in a slight change made not until the New York Edition. During dinner everyone had been ill at ease, except perhaps Richard, and he had become convinced that Clement was a barbaric and crazed American. After dinner, as they toured the candle-lit mansion, the narrator wondered apprehensively what Clement might do or say next; yet of the tour he wrote, perfunctorily, "We had a delightful hour of it." In 1908 James changed this to "We had thus, in spite of everything, a wonderful hour of it" (pp.256-394-395).

147 pp. 84-261. James (also, 1884) had the narrator laugh as he told Richard, "'You've found a cousin with a vengeance'" (ibid.). Perhaps this addition was meant to make the narrator more gracious and urbane than the host.

148 Clement's retort (his last words to the "host") to such shocking rudeness was constantly improved by James: "'O foolish man!'";

his hands to show joy, even glee, but Clement, at Oxford, did so in a moment of the utmost seriousness[150]—when he found out how similar old Rawson's pathetic lot was to his own.[151] James changed this false gesture, but not until the New York Edition.

"'O ridiculous man!'"; "'Oh, you ridiculous man!'"; "'You very impossible man!'" (1871, 1875, 1884, 1908: pp. 488; 93; 268; 407). Until 1908 Searle "cried" this, but in the final edition he "cried in his face" (p. 407).

149 pp. 91-267. Retention of the laughter would have been carelessness by James, for he had added that Richard went on "in the same infuriated tone" (pp.90-266).

150 "'That's me, that's me!' cried Searle, clapping his hands." In 1908 he cried this "with all his seriousness" (pp.284-424).

151 Both were failures; neither had been all that he was meant to be in life. Searle commiserated with Rawson, but insisted that he too was a "poor devil." Rawson, for his part, maintained stubbornly that he was the poorer devil of the two, and did so (1884) "with a little emphatic nod of the head." Both his normal meekness and this momentary flash of spirit are seen better in 1908, when he spoke "with an assurance at once presumptuous" (pp. 284-424).

Likewise for the final edition, James made slight revisions to increase the poignancy and the irony of Rawson's situation. Searle was told not that the old Wadham man had "'a wife and three children, starving sir,'" but "'...and all starving, sir.'" The elder brother became a "bloated" one, now only one year older rather than two; his sporadic help to our Rawson dropped from a twenty-pound to a five-pound note (pp. 285-425, 286-426, ibid., ibid.).

When Miss Searle's timidity was under discussion, reference was made to the "long shuddering sidelong glance" elicited by Richard's eavesdropping. The passage that followed gives amusing evidence that in 1875 James was not yet averse to borrowing from tried and true melodrama (James had, one suspects, an incipient streak of the melodramatist in him—witness the fire in The Spoils of Poynton, 1897).

1875	1864
I [narrator] looked at him. He was standing with his back to us, holding a large Venetian hand-mirror framed in rococo silver, which he had taken from a shelf of antiquities, in just such a position that he caught the reflection of his sister's person. Shall I confess it? Something in this performance so tickled my sense of the picturesque, that it was with a sort of blunted anger that I muttered, "The sneak!" Yet I felt passion enough to urge me forward. It seemed to me that by implication I, too, was being covertly watched.	I looked at him. He was standing with his back to us, holding a large Venetian hand-mirror, framed in chiselled silver, which he had taken from a shelf of antiquities, in just such a position that he caught the reflection of his sister's person. It was evident that I too was being overlooked....[152]

Although Richard of course made it impossible that the affair should end happily, he failed to prevent his sister's falling in love with Clement. James was careful to make her more strongly drawn to the American cousin from the very start. When she first saw

152 pp. 81-82--259. A few changes were made, in 1908, to the 1884 passage. He was "placed with" his back to them; he held the mirror "just at such an angle" that he could see their reflections; the ambiguity of "overlooked" was avoided, when the narrator knew he was "under his attention" (p.397).

As for "picturesque," and "tickled" in this context—the former, James came to use with the utmost care, and a "broad terrace" which had in 1871 "tickled cunningly" the narrator's "innate taste...for all deserted promenades" in 1875 "flattered" that taste (pp.370-59). See note 174. Most interesting of all, the "sneak" of 1875 had been in 1871 "'The villain!'" (pp.484-82).

Clement, instead of looking at him "with a certain tender wonder in her eye" she looked (1908) "as if she vaguely yearned over him."[153] And following the afternoon stroll of the couple (before Richard arrived from London), the narrator guessed they were (1884) "very intimate" rather than "intimate."[154] But it was not until the two Americans had left Lockley Park that the narrator learned what had transpired at the last meeting alone of the lovers. All but one of James's revisions to this speech of Searle's were made in 1884; all of them illustrate either fresher diction or slightly more passionate lovers' speeches. As they talked the "'sheeted moonlight seemed to close about'" them and they "'stood in a dream, in a solitude, in a romance'"; this became "'in a dream, in a world quite detached.'" Instead of seeming to him "'younger, fairer, more gracious,'" Miss Searle grew "'younger, prettier, more attractive,'" so that Searle felt himself going "'far,'" taking her hand and calling her "'"Margaret"'"; by revision he went "'very far'" and (added) talked "'all kinds of nonsense,'" as he took her hand while calling her (1908) "'"Margaret, dear Margaret!"'"[155] But she told him sorrowfully that she "'could do nothing; that she was a fool, a child, a slave'"; summoning his final appeal, Searle related how he had given up his claim, and begged her, "'"Be generous! Pay it from your heart!"'" which became "'"Be generous! Pay

153 pp. 239-377. James had earlier (1884) changed Searle's initial reaction: instead of "gazing" at her, "marvelling," he had "stared at her as if one of the pictures had stepped out of its frame" (pp. 52-235). Also in 1884, James made her glad to "see him," Clement, rather than to "receive it," his calling card (ibid.).

154 pp. 65-246.

155 pp. 269—408-409.

me for my sacrifice.'" At his assurance that their marriage would make the difficulty melt away like a raindrop in the ocean she looked at him, her face radiant. But as she repeated the word "marriage"

1875

"the deep, deep ring of her voice seemed to shatter the crystal walls of our illusion. 'I must think, I must think!' she said; and she hurried away with her face in her hands."

1884

"the deep ring of her voice seemed to wake us up and show us our folly. 'I love you, but I shall never see you again,' she cried...."[196]

196 pp. 94-95--269-270.

III

The love of Miss Searle for Clement is most obvious and poignant of all in the New York Edition. Here James underscored her feeling (until the advent of Clement) of aloneness in the world; it had seemed to her strange "'to call him my cousin after thinking these many years'" that (1884) "'I had no cousin!'" but in 1908 "'no one in the world but my brother.'"[157] More poignantly than before, from wishing that she "'had known him a long time ago'" she yearned to have known him "'sooner—and better.'"[158] And as for Richard, he is even less companionable than before, for whereas earlier he had cared for "'little else but riding and books,'" now (1908) he cared for "'nothing'" but them.[159] To the narrator her love of Clement is more obvious, for when he thanked her for the note, her eyes (1884) "for an instant communed brightly with his own," but now they "communicated with his own as I think they have never, never communicated with any other source of meaning.. ..."[160] Made more defiant towards Richard by this stronger love for Clement, she went a moment later to his side, where instead of "murmuring" her belief that he had done nothing wrong, she "brought [it] bravely out."[161]

157 pp. 257-395.

158 pp. 257--395-396.

159 pp. 238-375.

160 pp. 265-404.

161 pp. 267-405. Kneeling at Clement's side, she apologized for the scene Richard had made: "'Dear cousin, it's cruel that you are to have to think of us so!'" His retort had been improved in 1884; in 1875 he had answered, "'O, I shall think of you!'" which became "'Oh, I shall think of <u>you</u> as you would like'" (pp.91-267).

James in the final edition created more reader sympathy for Searle, especially in the Oxford scenes.[162] Just before entering his chambers for the last time, Searle no longer relapsed into "his feeble stupor"; rather, he sank again into his "apathy."[163] And instead of lying in his room in "a half-somnolent state" he lay "beyond reach of any appeal"[164](presumably, the narrator's included).[165] The final meeting of the two lovers was made more touching: when Miss Searle arrived shortly before Clement's death,[166] her weakness was more pronounced—rather than take the arm of the narrator, she "accepted my support"[167]as he was about to speak his last words to her, Searle (until 1908) looked "steadily a moment" into her eyes, but in the New York Edition he <u>kept</u> his gaze on her--he "looked steadily into her eyes."[168]

---

162 Never emotionally or mentally stable, Searle was now identifying himself with the earlier Clement. "'This was my college, you know,' he said, 'the noblest in the whole place.'" The 1908 version is more poignant: "'<u>This</u> was my college, you know,' he would almost anywhere break out, applying the words wherever we stood—'the sweetest and noblest in the whole place'" (pp.275-415). See note 165.

163 pp. 259-429.

164 <u>Ibid</u>.

165 Once Searle was forced to take to his bed, he was called "my patient" or "my charge" (pp. 281-421, 292-433). The increased reader sympathy that was just mentioned in the text came about in part by the narrator's more frequent shows of sympathy. At least six times he refers to Searle as his "friend," as well as his "poor gentleman," or his "poor picked up friend" (pp. 202-338, 203-339, 208-344, <u>ibid</u>., 232-368, 266-405, 209-345,248-386). Overhearing Simmons cruelly taunt Searle, the narrator (1908) was "harrowed" by the conversation (pp. 210-346).

166 Seeing her in mourning, the narrator—sensing the irony of the situation—instead of "demanding" to know about her brother, "panted" to know (pp.293-433). Richard, one learns, had been killed by a fall from a horse; now that Miss Searle was free to marry Clement, he was dying.

It is a commonplace that James worked tirelessly to eliminate trite or stilted diction. To cite only a few instances, in 1875 he replaced such words as "importunities" and "avow";[169] in 1884, avoided use of "descried," "attested," "obviate," "'Nay'" "with my heart in my throat," and "methought";[170] in 1885, "apprehended" and "with a twinkle in his eye."[171] Yet over-formal terms did remain until 1908[172] (when they gave way to diction less literary), among them "deeming," "denominate," "discern," "disembark," "encountered," "perused," "signal" (change), "quoth," "wanting" (i.e., missing), "feeble ray," and "interstices."[173] By the time of the New York Edition, James had removed nearly all traces of his early fondness for "tickled" and "picturesque,"[174] but the ubiquitous terms "perceive"[175] and "fancy" (especially "fancy") were still to be found. (James replaced "fancy" eighteen times in 1884, three times in 1885, and five times in 1908.)

---

167 pp. 293-434.

168 pp. 294-434. In revising his descriptions of the death of Theobald ("The Madonna of the Future"), the suicide of M. de Mauves, and the funeral of Daisy Miller, James showed the same restraint that he did in his earlier work—he achieved more pathos, while always avoiding sentimentality.

169 Replaced by "urgency" and "claim" (pp. 481-72, 368-53).

170 Replaced by "made out," "symbolized," "prevent," "'Hoi'" and "very curious for what he would say" (pp. 21-210, 23-213, 97-272, 120 and 122-291 and 292, 96-271). No replacement was made for "methought" (pp. 58-239). An excited "'Here I be'" in dialogue became "'Here I am,'" while the awkward "the five finger nails of his left hand" became "the long" ones (pp.97-272, 71-251).

171 Replaced by "entered into" (thoughts), and "in an inscrutable, humorous manner" (pp. 248-149, 255-157). The latter became (1908) "in his whimsical way" (pp.157-394).

172 It was not until the New York Edition that the narrator's "confusion increased as we became aware of another presence"—heretofore his confusion "was not allayed when I suddenly perceived...the figure of a lady"; similarly it was only in the final revision that the

James's revised "stage directions"[176] have been regarded as mere evasions of the obvious,[177] but they generally are more than that. They show his constant concern for economy, for they

---

terrace at Lockley Park was thought of by the narrator as a place "where people may have sat"—earlier it had been to him a place "to which people may have adjourned from formal dinners"; and the twilight, which once "abode" in the drawing room there now "was still" in it (pp. 235-372, 241-378, 246-384).

173 Replaced by "considering," "figure as," "make out," "land," "met," "read," "marked," "introduced," "absent," "glimmer" (pp. 199-335, 1944, 200-336, 219-352, 255-396, 215-352, 248-386, 234-370-372, 227-364, 264-340). The village which beckoned "from the interstices of the hedges" later (more figuratively and less Johnsonesquely) beckoned "from the heart of the maze in which the hedges wrapped it up" (pp. 227-363).

174 In 1864 "vastly tickled" and "hugely tickled" became "much amused" and "immensely gratified" (pp. 74-259, 74-253. See note 152.) "Picturesque" was removed once in 1883, and once in 1908 (pp. 246-149; 242-380).

175 Removed four times in 1908.

176 The term used by Professor F. O. Matthiessen. Some scholars prefer to speak of "the 'he said—she said' problem."

177 The interpretation usually made by John D. Lucas in his unpublished dissertation "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948). Lucas refers to the way James varied "his conversational clues and crutches," to the "changes of the way in which conversation is reported," or the "additional introductions to conversations," or to James's "insistence upon adding explanatory comments to his...conversations," or (again) to the "conversational crutches" (pp. 119, 151, 154, 161, 163).

Lucas once went so far as to admit that the introductions to conversations do affect the characterizations, adding quickly that this was "of only the slightest importance" (p. 218).

were deleted when possible,[178] and when retained,[179] were either shortened[180] or made more informative[181] than formerly. Often, too, they illustrate James's desire for greater accuracy,[182] or, by their more subjective quality,[183] his penchant for awareness and analysis.[184]

178 In 1884, James deleted four hackneyed stage directions, three of which used "said" or "cried"; in 1908 he deleted twenty-five trite ones, nine of which used "said." Of the twenty-five, only four had shown the manner of speaking.

179 Trite stage directions when not deleted were habitually changed: nine times in 1884 and fourteen times in 1908 "cried" or "asked" or "said" was replaced. (Incidentally, James came to use the stage direction as a summary rather than an introduction to a speech: in 1908, twenty-two of them were placed at the end of the sentence.)

180 Often by the use of the pronoun rather than the proper noun ("she" for "Miss Searle," "he" for "Mr. Searle" [pp. 257-395, 262-400]). In revising some of his later stories, James at times expanded his stage directions.

181 "Abijah Simmons " (1884) was changed to (1908) "his cold counsellor," "Miss Searle" to "the amiable creature," and "Mr. Searle" to "our host," "his kinsman," and "the master of the house," to cite but a few examples (pp. 207-34], 248-386, 249-387, 266-405, 263-402). At least thirty-five such changes occur in the New York Edition.

"He added" (1875) became (1884) "he added artlessly" (pp. 92-268). The 1884 edition reads "'O dear, O dear!' said Miss Searle" whereas the New York Edition reads "'Oh dear...!' she almost wailed while I turned away" (pp. 243-380).

182 If seen in context James's changes (1875-1884) of "said" to "cried" and (elsewhere) "cried" to "murmured" are justified (pp. 92-268, 44-228). In 1884 James had Miss Searle make a speech "with much emotion." In 1908 he told the reader what the emotion was: she "mournfully murmured" (pp. 253-391).

183 The narrator (1884-1908) tells more fully his own feelings: "I interposed" became "I interposed in the hope of some greater ease" (pp. 254-393). And he likewise renders his own judgments more fully: "said his cousin simply" became "she answered with more presence of mind" (ibid.).

184 The narrator seems rather proud of his sensitivity. Instead of writing (1875) that he "distinctly perceived [Searle] place himself, morally speaking, on the defensive" he wrote (1884) that he "became aware, without his giving me the least sign, that he was placing himself..." (pp. 68-248).

James came more and more studiously to avoid anything even remotely "vulgar," and, it would seem, the term itself, for the narrator's earlier statement that "To speak vulgarly, he rubbed it in." was changed to "He spared us no thrill—I had almost said no pang—of that experience."[185] Occasionally the collator feels embarrassment as he records the disappearance of early forthright references to money,[186] to violent laughter[187] or tears,[188] to seasickness, to illness, to death. Searle's angry "'another fortnight of seasickness'" appeared definitively as "'six more days of purgatory.'"[189] By 1884 James was trying to avoid such terms as "ill," or "unwell," or "invalid," preferring the more euphemistic "out of health,"[190] while the narrator's cheery "'You're a well man!'" (spoken to Searle) almost invariably became "'You're all right!'"[191]

185 pp. 256-395. Searle's 1875 reference to his own "'vulgar idleness'" was changed (1884) to "'crude dissipation'" and (1908) to "'makeshift distinctions'" (pp. 35; 221; 357).

186 Richard, embarrassed by Clement's self-revelations concerning his poverty, but unable to change the subject, is (1875) forced to ask him and later the narrator: "'You're a—you're in limited circumstances?'" and "'...how about your circumstances?'" In 1884 one reads "'You are reduced—you are—a—straitened?'" and "'...how about <u>your</u> wardrobe?'" (pp. 76-255, 77-255).

187 Searle's "violent, nervous laugh" (1884) was (1908) a "fine shrill" one (pp. 255-393).

188 In 1884 Miss Searle "burst into a torrent of sobs" but in 1908, into "loud weeping" (pp. 268-407).

189 pp. 222-223--359. The way that James brought up to date the time spent in an Atlantic crossing is typical of the cognizance he took, in revision, of material progress and change.

190 pp. 10-202, 35-221, 26-215.

191 pp. 65-246, and others.

Death was likewise treated euphemistically in 1884, when such clichés as "give up the ghost," "leave for another place," and "moving on" appeared, along with "sinking" as a replacement for "dying."[192] (All of these changes by James need not be regarded as self-revelatory, for people do use euphemisms; therefore their value for realism of dialogue should be considered.)

For the New York Edition James eliminated the word "seductive" as descriptive of Searle's claim.[193] Similar changes had been made in 1884: until that time, the narrator had been "ravished" by the Red Lion coffee-room, and one had read of the "blighted" maid of Searle legend.[194] Clement, beginning in 1884, no longer spoke of Pleasure as an "'arrant strumpet,'" whom men "'enjoyed...for the hour'"[195]—good taste, Jamesian or otherwise, justifies this last change, although perhaps not the others.

192 pp. 13-204, 18-206, 20-210, 120-290. The narrator (1875) recalled Simmons' advice to Searle: "'Instead of dying you'd better marry.'" This advice became (1884) "words" which "in a very crude form, had reference to his making a match with" Miss Searle (pp.58-240).

193 In 1884 Simmons called it "a rather seductive case," in 1908 "a neat little case" (pp. 206-342). In 1875 it had been "a very pretty one" (p. 15). Perhaps the 1884 change was designed to increase the vulgarity of Simmons.

194 The narrator felt (1875) that the Red Lion coffee-room had been waiting for him to "come and gaze, ravished but unamazed"; in 1884, to "come and discover romantic meanings in it" (pp.8-199). And the "blighted maid" became the "little woman with the muff" (pp. 98-272). It should be noted however that the other female in Searle legend instead of being "confined," "had a baby" (pp. 83-260).

195 Searle told the narrator (1875) that he believed "'in eating your cake and having it. I respected Pleasure, and she made a fool of me. Other men, treating her like the arrant strumpet she is, enjoyed her for the hour, but kept their good manners for plain-

Slang if retained[196] was generally labelled as such by the use of quotes;[197] such expletives as "In Heaven's name," "Heaven knows," "great heaven," and "Great God" disappeared,[198] and such vulgar epithets as "awful fool" and "vulgar fool" were Bowdlerized.[199]

---

faced Business, with the larger dowry, to whom they are lawfully married.'" In 1884 he said that he believed "'in it [pleasure here below] still, but as I believe in the immortality of the soul. The soul is immortal, certainly, if you have got one; but most people haven't'" (pp. 33-220).

196 Apparently James felt that his efforts to use slang to describe Rawson had been ill-advised. In 1875 he wrote that Rawson "imparted an original force to the term 'seedy'"; in 1884 that to "describe him in the slang of our native-land, he was a 'dead-beat'"; in 1908, he deleted this bit of description entirely (pp. 110; 282; 422).

197 James at times reminds one of old Rawson (italics mine):

1884	1908
"'I'd change chances with him!' And Mr. Rawson gave a passionate slap to his knee" (p.287).	"'I'd 'swap'—do you call it?—chances with him!' And Mr. Rawson looked quaintly rueful over his freedom of speech (p., 427).

198 "In Heaven's name" was changed (1875) to "In the name of decency," and (1908) to "For mercy's sake" (pp. 487-89; 233-370). "Heaven knows" and "Great heaven" became (1908) "Goodness knows" and "Gracious goodness" (pp. 246-384, 262-401). And in 1884 "Great God" became the somewhat milder "Lord have mercy!" (pp. 121-291). (Incidentally, in 1884 and 1885 James modernized many "O's" to "Oh's.")

199 In 1884 Simmons called Searle not a "'blasted fool'" but a "'wandering maniac,'" and later (1908) a "'confirmed crank'" (pp. 14; 205; 341). Searle continued (1884) to tell the narrator that Simmons had branded him a "'blasted fool'" but in 1908 James had Searle speak of having been told he had not a leg to stand on (pp.222-358). In another passage "awful" fool had (1885) become "'precious'" fool (pp. 220-119).

The terms "monstrous disagreeable" and "immense deal" were taken from the vocabulary of the narrator (pp.261-400, 226-363).

It has been said by some critics that James made all of his characters talk like Henry James.[200] Granted that the parentheses and figures of speech eventually to be found in his dialogue are at times exotic, and inappropriate to the speaker,[201] still it is incontestable that the dialogue of the 1880's is more natural and racy, less stilted, and more suited to the speaker than that of the 1870's. The narrator overheard Lawyer Simmons tell Searbe (italics mine for the stilted, unnatural expressions):

1875	1884	1908
"I have been to no small amount of trouble for you. I have consulted by main force three first-rate men. They smile at the idea. I should like you to see the smile negative of one of these London bigwigs. If your title were written in letters of fire, it wouldn't stand being sniffed at in that fashion. I sounded in person the solicitor of your distinguished kinsman. He seemed to have been in a manner forewarned and forearmed.	"[First three sentences unchanged.] I should like you to see the way they smile, these bigwigs in the Inns of Court— that's what they call 'em— when they want to let you know there's no help for you. I guess it would take it out of you to be simpered at that way. I sounded in person the solicitor of your usurping cousin, and he evidently knew there was something in the wind."	"I've been to no small amount of personal inconvenience for you. I've pushed my way right up to the headspring. I've got the best opinion that's to be had. The best opinion that's to be had just gives you one leer over its spectacles. I guess that look will fix you if you ever get it straight. I've been able to tap indirectly," Mr. Simmons went on, "the solicitor of your usurping cousin and he evidently knows something to be in the wind."[203]

200 Clara F. McIntyre ("The Later Manner of Mr. Henry James," PMLA, XX, 354-371, March, 1912) levels this claim at the later work of James. In the revisions, she maintains, the speeches were "changed to more typical 'James dialect,'" regardless of the speaker (p.360), and slang was not always used appropriately (p.359). Writing to a French publisher, M. Auguste Monod, James

179234

It has also been said of the later James that he used foreign terms more frequently than he had done earlier.[204] This assertion is unwarranted,[205] for the fact is that James in revising often removed such expressions, thereby making both narration and dialogue seem to the general reader more natural. Especially for the second—1875—edition, James replaced French words by their English equivalents[206] (more often than for any later edition).[207] Only rarely were foreign expressions added in a later version.[208]

---

defended the English expressions in the dialogue of some of his characters (Nomod had questioned the exactness of James's diction): "C'est enfin, non pas une parole d'auteur, mais de personnage, et naturelle au personnage" (Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod, ed. E. F. Benson, London and New York, 1930, pp. 105-106).

201 Simmons (1908) told Searle, "'I wish...that...I could, for the charm of it put you through'" (p. 342).

202 In 1871, "it would expire in that baleful emanation" (P.355).

203 pp. 16; 206-207; 343.

204 Miss McIntyre professed to find that James's "actual use of foreign words and phrases is much more frequent in the later text" ("Later Manner of James," p. 359). She felt it "strange that a writer like Mr. James, who seeks not vulgar popularity but the following of a cultivated few, should have fallen into a practice which the cheaper class of novelists has always delighted in" (ibid.).

205 As is pointed out by Gegenheimer ("Early and Late Revisions," p. 235).

206 These terms were "Englished" for the second edition (quotation marks will be used only to indicate dialogue; terms within parentheses are from the 1875 edition): flaneur (loafer),* assamotage (poetic justice), demi-jour (twilight), graciousness (amenity), simpatico (sympathetic), "Je m'y perds!" ("I give it up!"), "impayables" ("really fabulous!") (pp. 493-107, 493-123, 367-49, 368-55, 479-68, 478-64, 495-112). *—"Loafer" became "dandy" in 1884 (pp. 107-260).

In a few cases—fineness, sicerone, rococo—italics were dropped in 1875 but the words unchanged (pp.360-31, 483 and 494-78 and 110, 484-81). The Belle au Bois Dormant also was not italicised in 1875 (pp. 368 and 371-54 and 62); in 1884 it was translated to the Sleeping Beauty in the Wood (pp.54-237) and the Sleeping Beauty (pp. 62-243). Searle spoke of his "Pyladee" in 1871, of his "fidus Achates" in 1875, and, in 1884, of his "bosom friend" (pp. 493; 107; 279).

Relatively unimportant are the typographical errors picked up by James in revision,[209] or the fresh mistakes caused by hasty revision.[210] More important is the fact that although

---

207 For the third (1884) edition these changes (or translations) were made: séance (little session), chinoiseries (foreign gimcrackes), chevelure (head), tout de noir habillé [deleted], Bouillonnement [deleted], a homely flavor of the sequestered chatelaine of feudal days (a homely fragrance of old traditions) (pp. 118-288, 49-233, 91-267, 47-231, 68-248, 54-237).

The fourth (1885) edition has only two changes: a mise en scène (the lack of decorations), bonhomie (the desire to fraternise) (pp. 278-182, 280-184). (For the final [1908] edition, se recueillit was removed [pp. 251-389].)

208 James used three new foreign terms in the editions of 1884 and 1885: "who did as she pleased" ("qui se passait ses fantaisies"); anecdotes (historiettes), "this poor ghost" ("this revenant") (pp.83-260; 257-159, 253-155).

The artistic discipline and restraint shown by James in adding only these foreign expressions, and in replacing so many, is commendable when one considers his excellent mastery of French and sees his constant reliance on its idioms in his private writing.

James felt himself qualified to judge the quality of a translation. For about a decade (roughly, 1905 to 1913) he was in frequent correspondence with a French publisher, M. Auguste Monod, often writing the latter wholly in French, to object (politely) to the infidelity with which certain works (especially The Siege of London, which appeared in Mercure de France, November 16-December 1, 1912) of his were being translated. So early as 1905 he explained to M. Monod that "I have had a very few disconcerting adventures in French with all my poor real little notes replaced by the most shameless clichés and failures to render" (Letters to Bunson and Monod, pp.97-98). At the time of this letter (1905), James had seen several of his works translated: A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales, Roderick Hudson, The American, Daisy Miller, An International Episode, "Four Meetings" (Phillips, Bibliography, pp. 3-4, 7-8, 9, 12-13, 15). James, it is to be noted, was something of a translator himself; in 1891 he had rendered into English Daudet's Port Tarascon (ibid., pp.103-104).

209 "Month's" was misprinted as "south's" in 1884, the correction made the following year (pp.110; 282; 121).

210 In 1875: "'He learned, probably,' I expounded, 'from his solicitor of the visit of your friend Simmons'" (p.63).

In 1884: "I answered that he had probably learned from his solicitor of the visit of your [sic]friend Simmons" (p.244).

In 1885: [Same as 1884] (p.145).

In 1875, James wrote of windows "where lead and glass combine in equal proportions to hint to the wandering stranger of the medieval gloom within...." In 1884 the lead and glass combined equally "to notify the scowling stranger the [sic] mediaeval gloom...." The "of" reappeared in 1885 (pp.42; 227; 126). The

clarifications were made and various types of mistakes rectified in each succeeding edition,[211] a few colorful and amusing samples of careless writing survived until 1908. Not until this final edition was "On reaching the street his strength again forsook him" made to read "On his reaching the street...."[212] In 1875 the reader was confused by "the way Rawson fiercely merged the attempt to touch the greasy rim of his antiquated hat into a rounded and sweeping bow, as from jaunty equal to equal." The 1884 change seems to offer no help: "...hat into such a bow as no man of the world might make to another." But finally, in 1908, James made matters clear:"...the way he substituted for the attempt to touch the greasy rim of his antiquated hat some such bow as one man of the world might make another."[213] One is amused to read (1884) that Searle "hastened forward, picked up the crop, and removing his

---

"scowling stranger" did not appear in 1908, when the lead and glass "combine equally to create an inward gloom..." (pp. 126-364).

211 In 1871 the narrator "went with her into dinner," in 1875 "with her in to dinner," and (1884) "in with her to dinner" (pp. 480; 69; 249).

In 1884 many more corrections and improvements were made than in 1875. The incorrect "I shrunk" became "I shrank," the indicative "was" three times was changed to subjunctive "were," and the displeasing "I felt for the hour the irresistible contagion of his own agitation" became "...the contagion of his excitement" (pp. 108-280, 85-261, ibid., ibid., 97-272). The narrator noticed (1875) that Searle's exhaustion was "so total" but (1884) that it was "so great" (pp. 120-290). See note 104.

Other changes made for greater clarity than before. "I gave him my arm, and crossed the threshold" became "I gave...and we crossed...." "It would bring a great trouble, and no power to face the trouble" became "It would bring her great trouble...." Finally, the narrator instead of adding "above my name, Mr. Clement Searle" added "above my name the words, Mr. Clement Searle" (pp.93-268, 120-290, 48-232).

In 1884 also one reads that "It was of course easy to descant on the beauties of park and mansion. Meanwhile I observed our hostess. In 1908 one is certain that the narrator did descant on the beauties of "park and mansion and as I did so I observed our hostess" (pp.237-374).

212 pp. 281-421 213 pp.110-111; 282; 422.

hat with an air of great civility, presented it to the young girl." In 1908 he picked up the crop and "with a particular courtesy that became him, handed it back to the rider."[214] Finally, a sentence which would likely have been again re-worked, had there been yet another edition:

1884	1908
But just as [Rawson] was about to propel him across the threshold of the court, he turned about, disengaged his hands, with his own hand, from the back of the chair, drew him alongside of him and turned to me.	...he turned about, disengaged his mercenary hands, with one of his own, from the back of the chair, drew their owner alongside and turned to me. 215

Certain other passages, instead of being overlooked by James until the time of the revisions for the New York Edition, were changed at least twice in the editions of 1875, 1884, and 1885. Early, James had tried too hard--he had over-written; attempting to be clever and impressive, too often he had succeeded only in being unnatural. Albert Frank Gegenheimer has correctly pointed this out. Unlike Gegenheimer, however, I feel that this self-conscious, ostentatious prose should easily be seen as the work of a young writer.[216] In writing (1871, retained in 1875) of "the several agents of a fourfold British hungriness "James was essaying the deft and witty touch— the result is, I feel, a bit heavy and labored. As changed in 1884—"no less than four pairs of active British

214 pp. 217-354.

215 pp. 283-423.

216 And that if Miss Harvitt and similar early critics of the revisions could not recognize the later manner that they so objected to, recognition of the worth of the recent studies of Matthiessen, and Gettmann, and Lucas (studies that pretty convincingly silence the Harvitt school) should deter one, in his article, from devoting so much attention to dated criticism.

Gegenheimer is undoubtedly correct in calling the early James an "ornate and self-conscious author," a writer guilty at

elbows"[217] the passage has some lightness, some whimsicality.

Ornately and breathlessly, James wrote in 1875 that "We took up our abode at a certain little wayside inn, at which in the days of leisure the coach must have stopped for lunch, and burnished pewters of rustic ale been tenderly exalted to 'outsides' athirst with breezy progression." But in 1884, more simply, the ale was "handed up as straight as possible to outsiders athirst with fast travelling." And in 1908 they were athirst (the effect of the alliteration is to be noted) with "the sense of speed."[218]

---

times of "elegant verbiage," and in maintaining that by revision "ornate and flowery language becomes considerably plainer and more precise" ("Early and Late Revisions," pp. 234, 236, 234). Lucas ("Revisions of Short Stories") consistently agrees with this view.

But Gegenheimer (pp. 241-242) quotes an original passage of description of the dining room at the Red Lion ("In each of the little dining-boxes thus immutably constituted was a small table, which in crowded seasons was expected to accommodate the several agents of a fourfold British hungriness" [1871, p. 352, and 1875, p. 60], and takes the view that this passage is "in what many critics would surely feel the height of the late James manner" (p. 242). (This despite the grandiloquent "thus immutably constituted," which is very unlike the late manner.) A revised version ("In each of these rigid receptacles was a narrow table—a table expected under stress to accommodate no less than four pairs of active British elbows" [1884, p. 200, and 1908, p. 336], Gegenheimer implies, would seem to many critics to be a product of "the simple, youthful period" (ibid.).

These comparative passages are presented by Gegenheimer as if thirty-seven years separated them (1871-1908). Actually, the 1871 passage was kept in 1875 and the 1908 one first appeared in 1884—a difference of nine years.

217 pp.6-200. It was at the Red Lion (see note 216) that the narrator overheard Simmons and Searle talking. In 1875 "The two voices were pitched in an unforgotten key, and equally native to our Cisatlantic air; they seemed to fall upon the muffled medium of surrounding parlance as the rattle of peas on the face of a drum." In 1884 James was content to write that "Their utterance was pitched in that key, which may, in English air, be called foreign, in spite of resemblances of orthography." More simply (and exactly—

By 1884 James's attempts at urbanity and allusiveness succeeded more frequently than had such earlier efforts as the "several agents of...hungriness" or the "tenderly exalted to 'outsides'" passages, for in the 1884 edition "a splendid peacock" was "the familiar fowl of gardens—a splendid specimen,"[219] and "shirt-buttons and scarf-pins" were "odds and ends of goldsmith's work."[220] And by 1908 a handkerchief had become "an indescribable fabric drawn from his pocket," as well as "what seemed his sole remnant of linen."[221] Too much can be made of such descriptions as these "handkerchief" ones (the Anti-Jacobites have done so); they should not be quoted as the only hallmark of the later James. Even so, they have a grace, a certain effortless quality that mark them as later productions than the "fourfold British hungriness" passage.

Some of James's early attempts at clever writing, then, were forced and heavy, and had to be made lighter and simpler, whereas his later distinctive touches were unique and graceful. The point to be stressed by students of James's revisions is that as he matured, his style became more distinctive and natural, as his diction became more concrete, more vivid and more exact.

---

see Gegenheimer, p. 239, n. 12) James for the 1908 version wrote that "Their speech was pitched in the key that may in English air be called alien in spite of a few coincidences" (pp.12; 203; 339).

218 pp.40; 225; 362.

219 pp. 59-241.

220 pp. 121-291.

221 pp. 284-424, 287-428. In the New York Edition one also learns that the Americans at Lockley Park, nervous but eager to visit the old mansion, "hastened slowly and approached the fine front." Their "appeal was answered by a butler who condescended to our weakness" (pp. 231-368).

As he improved in his craft, James used alliteration even more than before,[222] albeit (one suspects) less and less consciously, so easy and natural does his later use of it seem to be. In the 1884 version, several passages are alliterative, but without the direct juxtaposition that was to be effected for the New York Edition, for which "pursued, slowly and painfully" was changed to "slowly and painfully pursued,"[223] "listened with a pathetic little frown" to "fairly frowned for helplessness,"[224] and "conservative presence of the college-front" to "conservative college countenance."[225] Other terms that were made alliterative in 1908 did not, earlier, suggest the possibility so strongly:

1884	1908
regal monotony	persistent pomp
the mellow close	the grassed and gravelled precinct
this clerical precinct[226]	this place of priests
long face of the college	wide discreetly-windowed wall
boyish grossness	flagrant freshness
boisterous hospitality	rather rash hospitality
the two gentlemen	him and his host
shook his brilliant head	shook his shining head
a kind of irresistable sweetness	an irresponsible indescribable effect of beauty 227

---

222 In 1884, Rawson was described not as a "degenerate son of Wadham" but as a "perverted product of a liberal education" (pp. 111-283). And the "little dining stalls" at the Red Lion became the "little prandial pews" (pp. 21-211). In 1885 "dim horticultural closets" became "somewhat stuffy bowers" (pp. 214-112).
Dr. Lucas several times calls attention to the skill with which James the revisionist used alliteration ("Revisions of Short Stories," pp. 119-120, 131, 155, 170, 186, 197).

223 pp. 207-406. 224 pp. 258-396.

225 pp. 277-417. At Oxford, Searle (1884) opined that "'all is well in this weary world, all perfect and rounded, mellow and complete, in this sphere of the pitiful unachieved....'" In 1908 he

By 1884 James is to be seen replacing literal statements by metaphorical ones and improving earlier figurative language. Searle says in 1875 that '"there's a perfect similarity in our lot"' but in 1884 that he too is "'at the very bottom of the hole.'"[228] James wrote (in what may be considered slightly metaphorical language) in 1875, "Mr. Simmons seems to have staggered a moment under this outbreak of passion. But the next 'Don't cry, Searle,' I heard him say." This was put far more vividly in 1884 when "Mr. Simmons's brightness appeared to flicker a moment in this gust of despair; but the next it was burning steady again. 'Don't cry ...'."[229] Oxford (one learns in 1875) feels about its base "murmurs of the tide of time; there are things eliminated, things insinuated!" The "eliminated-insinuated" description does little to help the reader picture the image, since these terms frequently are used so abstractly. But in 1884, Oxford feels murmurs of the "tide of time; some of the foundation stones are loosened; some of the breaches will have to be repaired!"[230] Such words as

---

said that "'all's well in a world where so much is so damnable, all right and rounded, smooth and fair, in this sphere of the rough and ragged, the pitiful unachieved...'" (pp. 278-418).

226 The word "precinct" thus was removed in one place only to be inserted elsewhere—this is a practice often to be noted in James's revisions.

227 pp. 212-348, 229-365, 229-366, 277-417, 281-420, 280-420, 260-398, 267-406, 254-392.

228 pp. 113-285.

229 pp. 13-204.

230 pp. 102-276.

"verge" and "lapse" are anything but visual, and "beckoning" is not a very positive form of action: it was as if Miss Searle was standing (1875) "on the verge of some sudden lapse of familiar ground. [The narrator felt it] the greater kindness to beckon her forward." Miss Searle is actually seen as if standing (1884) "on the edge of a place where the ground had fallen away." Now the narrator, more committed to helping her, felt it "the greater kindness to assist her to jump."[231]

Some of James's most typical figurative language appeared in the 1884 edition, replacing images of which the author was not noticeably fond; Searle no longer speaks of the lives "'which a sterner mother-scene [than Oxford] has gathered into her massive history,'" but instead of lives which the "'general mother-scene has dropped into less bottomless traps.'"[232] Near Locksley Park the narrator saw that "the sodden verdure of lawn and meadow" was in 1875 "streaked with a ranker freshness" but, typically in 1884, that it "had been washed over with a lighter brush."[233] It is of some interest that James in 1884 sacrificed what was probably his favorite image, when he wrote not of Oxford being reflected to the Americans "as in the depths of a lucid lake" but "as in an old-fashioned mirror"[234]--probably the new image was an attempt to capture the sense of age at Oxford.

231 pp. 82-259.

232 pp. 106-279.

233 pp.40-41--226. Somewhat similarly, a footpath instead of lying "like a thread of darker woof," in 1884 "wandered like a streak drawn by a finger over the surface of the stuff" (pp.43-228).

234 pp. 103-276.

Frequently, statements were made completely in literal fashion (and figurative language not employed) until the definitive edition of the Pilgrim. (Such is the case of the next four images.) Searle, at the inn at Hampton Court, approached the narrator's "board as shyly as if it had been a cold bath";[235] a bit later, in Bushey Park, these new friends met a tramp whose face was "as base as a counterfeit coin; yet as modelled somehow as a tragic mask."[236] Nearing Lockley Park, the Americans recognised the colorful rural types "as one recognises the handwriting on letter-backs," and, at their destination, they agreed that the owners of such places did appreciate them—that "when you scratch the mere owner you find the perfect lover."[237]

Although the revisions made in 1884 had treated more figuratively than before the speech of Searle, and of Miss Searle, much more was done for the final (1908) edition. Miss Searle, as a conversationalist, had moved "from point to point" in 1884, but in 1908 she talked on and on, keeping "up her story as if it were a slow rather awkward old-time dance, a difficult pas-seul in which she would have been better with more practice, but of which she must complete the figure."[238] Searle's dialogue had been made more vivid in 1884 when the claim, once "'cherished'" by his family, now "'danced before'"[239] their eyes (and when he was unsure that he had "'mastered'"

235 pp. 215-351. Page references will be given to the literal statements of the edition of 1884, although they will not be quoted.

236 pp. 218-355. The second simile may have suggested itself by the comparison (a few lines before, and retained in 1908) of the tramp "to a great artist or actor."

237 pp. 228-364, 234-367.

238 pp. 238—375-376.

239 pp. 35-221.

its details, but later that he had "'got the hang of it'").[240] The New York Edition finds Searle (who earlier had requested the narrator not to demand that he "'trace our pedigree'") now begging not to be asked to "'climb the family tree,'" for he feared that he did not have "'the head for it'" (but added that he would "'try some day—if it will bear my weight; or yours added to mine'").[241]

A popular type of imagery with James was that of the theatre; the dramatic value of the scene at dinner at Lockley Park transmits itself to the reader partly by use of language from the theatre, the metaphor being expanded in 1908.[242] Imagery suggested by the stage was used again in the Oxford section, but with a change of figure being made in the final edition. Searle mournfully described our education in America, its "naked background...the dead white wall before which we played our meagre little parts," but in 1908, more violently, its "naked background...the deadly dry air in which we gasp for impressions and comparisons."[243]

240 pp. 35-222.

241 pp. 224-360. Occasionally, revisions to Searle's dialogue made it sound very British: in 1864, instead of thinking of England as a land he "'could have loved,'" he saw it as one he "'could have got on with beautifully'"; in 1908, instead of hoping the narrator would help him "'puzzle [the claim] out,'" he hoped they could "'have a go at it...together'" (pp. 36-37—223; 222-358).

242 As the dinner went on, the narrator felt (1864) that "a drama had begun to be played, in which the three persons before me were actors, each of a very difficult part. The part of my friend, however, seemed the most embarrassing.... I seemed to see him summon his shadowy faculties to obey his languid will." In the drama observed in 1908 each person was the actor "of a really arduous part. The character of my friend...was certainly the least easy to represent with effect....I seemed to see him [italics mine] urge his faded faculties <u>to take their cue and perform</u>" (pp. 249-387).

243 pp. 278-418.

In the foregoing illustrations, not alone the sharper, more concrete diction of the later James is to be seen, but also the simple,[244] unaffected—even colloquial—quality of this imagery of the "later manner." Considering the wealth of figurative language in the later work of James, the relatively slight amount of it, even in the final—1908—edition of this story, may come as a surprise. Such imagery as does appear, however, is typical of James, illustrating many of the subjects that were his favorities.[245]

The question remains, why such a relatively slight amount of imagery, even in the final edition? Part of the answer, I suspect, is that James in his "later period" used (compared to his earlier periods) proportionately much more figurative language than is realized. It was pointed out above that literal statement frequently was used through the third (1884) version, and imagery first employed in the 1908 New York Edition. It has been shown in a recent study that James improved (for the definitive edition) the

244 Sometimes the simplicity took the form of juxtaposition of the mundane and the poetic, with (to me) displeasing results. James changed his description of how the mind of the tourist reacts to England: In 1875 "with a great passionate throb, (it) achieves a magical synthesis of its impressions"; in 1884 the mind "seems to swallow the whole sum of its impressions at a gulp" (pp. 26-215). (James's greater urbanity may have elicited the change.)

Yet simplicity was generally an aid to improvement. In 1884 one reads that Searle's "huge, pale eyes, which had come to usurp the greatest place in his wasted visage, filled with wonder and pity." Simpler diction makes the 1908 version more effective—in it his eyes "now left nothing else worth mentioning in his wasted face" (pp.283-433).

245 Re-reading The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove, and The Golden Bowl, consciously noting the subjects of James's imagery, one is struck by the frequent references to objects in nature. Oceans, lakes, rivers (as well as tides and breaking waves), birds, flowers, and light (in that order) provided James with his most typical images.

figurative language of stories written nearly a generation later than the Pilgrim (1871). One would expect that "The Pupil," which first appeared in 1891, would be open to little improvement for the New York Edition, but "Here as elsewhere the most complex and stimulating revisions are those involving some sort of extension of an image or figure, or the introduction of one not present in any form in the original."[246]

At least twenty years elapsed between the last previous appearance of the Pilgrim (1889) and its revision (probably 1906) for the New York Edition. If the revisory history of "The Pupil" be borne in mind, one feels sure that James would have liked to revise extensively the tale's figurative language. The same might be said of Daisy Miller, which (relatively speaking) was scarcely revised at all between its first appearence in 1878 and its definitive one thirty-one years later;[247] despite the painstaking alterations that James made to it for the New York Edition, it contains only one elaborate extended metaphor. The most logical surmise is that James found in his early works (the Pilgrim is the earliest retained definitively) so many revisions that cried out to be made in matters of diction, dialogue, characterization, and dramatic scenes that he was left with too little time or energy to spend on figurative language.

---

[247] One would expect figurative language suggested by the stage and by museums, and especially paintings, to appear most frequently; yet history and mythology are alluded to more often than the stage, while images dealing with music, jewels, books and writing, clothing, or houses (and their windows, rooms, and walls) out-number images dealing with paintings or museums.

Frequently James created imagery suggested by such mundane objects as screws, springs, cups, keys, cards, tools, and trains. Nor should one fail to mention such various items as telescopes, chasms, markets and military maneuvers.

246 "Revisions of Short Stories," p. 198.

Finally, when one recalls that the three great novels of the "major phase," with their rich profusion of imagery, were dictated a few years before the early stories were revised by hand for the definitive edition, one might assume that the relative lack of imagery (particularly, extended metaphor) in these stories is accounted for by exigencies of space (and James's self-discipline), as well as the fact that dictation is faster and physically much less taxing than writing by hand.

The high quality of James's self-criticism and the speed with which he was eliminating an early tendency soon absent from his fiction are revealed by the type of revisions he made to A Passionate Pilgrim in 1875, only four years after its first appearance. Already he was at work modifying sharply the emotional tone so noticeable in the original version, even though to do so meant to delete several breathless passages that had obviously been a source of pride in 1871.[248]

For the second (1884) revision[249] James made more accurate and telling his earlier handling of emotions and dramatic scenes, and sharpened his characterizations of the Searles by rendering Richard even less likeable--and Miss Searle and Clement[250] more appealing--than before.

The revisions made for the appearance of A Passionate Pilgrim (1908) in the New York Edition are chiefly stylistic,[251] involving improvements to diction, dialogue, alliteration, and imagery--all hallmarks of the later manner of James.

---

247 See Chapter V.

248 By 1884 James knew how to picture--but subtly and unobtrusively--his two Americans reacting emotionally to England.

249 The revision of 1885 is--Ungenheimer notwithstanding--relatively unimportant, and was not treated separately in this paper.

250 Although it was not until the final edition that James took liberties with his own strict definition of the term "revision" by drastically compressing or deleting passages that showed Clemens to be a querulous coward.

251 The most serious false assumption made by those not acquainted with James's revisions is that since he was a great stylist, his revisions must have been purely stylistic.

CHAPTER III

THE REVISIONS OF "THE MADONNA OF THE FUTURE"

"The Madonna of the Future," which appeared originally in the Atlantic in 1873[1] and definitively in the New York Edition in 1908,[2] was reissued in 1875, 1879, 1880 (twice), 1883, 1896 (1897, and 1902).[3] On the whole, these interim editions are disappointing to one attempting to trace James's development by means of his revisions, since, except for matters of punctuation and mechanics, they were only slightly retouched (the 1883 edition has a single change in diction, and the 1880 versions are, word for word and comma for comma, the same as that of 1879).[4] Therefore, unless otherwise indicated, the passages compared will be from the editions of 1873 and 1908.[5]

1 Atlantic Monthly, XXXI (March 1873), 276-297.

2 The Novels and Tales of Henry James (New York, 1908), XIII, 435-492. The other tales are "The Reverberator" (1888), "Madame de Mauves" (1874), "A Passionate Pilgrim" (1871), and "Louisa Pallant" (1888)—these dates are of the first appearence, not the first book edition.

3 A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales (Boston, 1875), pp. 261-325. See Chapter II, note 5.
The Madonna of the Future and Other Tales (London, 1879), I, 1-73. The other tales are "Longstaff's Marriage" (1878) and "Madame de Mauves," and (Volume II) "Eugene Pickering" (1874), "The Diary of a Man of Fifty" (1879), and "Benvolio" (1875).
The Madonna of the Future and Other Tales (London, 1880), pp. 1-57—Macmillan's one-volume edition of its two-volume edition of the year before (the lines of type are the same, but there is less space between the lines, giving to the volume a different pagination). The Bernhard Tauchnitz (Leipsig) edition (Collection of British Authors, Vols. 1881 and 1882) of 1880 has ostensibly the same text as the 1879 edition (Le Roy Phillips, A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James, New York, 1930, p. 17). I have been unable to examine this edition.

In his early revisions (1875, 1879, 1883) James corrected misprints[6] and careless mechanics,[7] approached uniformity, correctness, and simplicity in the spelling and italicising of foreign terms,[8] and used the comma more consistently,[9] as well as less frequently[10] (when revising the 1879 edition, in 1883, he added thirteen commas, but omitted thirty-two).[11]

The Madonna of the Future, A Bundle of Letters, The Diary of a Man of Fifty, Eugene Pickering, in Collection of Novels and Tales by Henry James (London, 1883), pp. 3-46. "A Bundle of Letters" first appeared in 1879.

Library of the World's Best Literature, Ancient and Modern, ed. Charles Dudley Warner and others (New York, 1896), XX, 8075-8109--a limited edition (the Official Edition, printed for the International Society). The Memorial Edition (New York, 1902) is the same textually, although slightly different in other respects. Phillips (Bibliography, pp. 91-92) records the same pages, but a different volume number (XIV) and a different year (1897). I have been unable to examine this edition.

4 See note 3, paragraph 3. The 1896 edition, to be examined presently, was based on that of 1875. Theobald, described in 1873, 1875 and 1879 as the "quite poor, patient artist," was in 1883 the "quiet, poor" artist (pp. 279;273;12;10). In 1896, James changed his phrasing again, to "quite the poor" artist, which is the reading in the New York Edition in 1908 (pp. 8080-445).

5 This is the usual procedure followed in making a study of James's techniques of revision-- to collate the earliest with the definitive edition.

Not all scholars succeed in collating these two editions. Miss Hélène Harvitt ("How Henry James Revised Roderick Hudson," PMLA, XXXIX, 203-227, March, 1924) used for the definitive version the Macmillan edition of 1921 and for "the first edition...that of 1883" (p. 203). Raymond D. Havens ("The Revision of Roderick Hudson," PMLA, XL, 433-434, March, 1925) points out that "the text which she quotes throughout her article as from the first edition, comes in reality from a thoroughly revised later version [than the initial appearance in 1875]" (p.433). Miss Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley (The Early Development of Henry James, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XV, Nos. 1-2, Urbana, 1930, p. 192, n. 17) has shown that the earliest actual revision was made for Roderick Hudson's first appearance in book form (1876), the year after its appearance, serially, in the Atlantic. According to her, the second revision was made for the 1879 edition of London Macmillan. (There was also a Tauchnitz edition in 1879 and another Macmillan one in 1880).

As was pointed out in Chapter I, scholarship that ignores the intervening revisions is at times misleading. John S. Lucas, in his unpublished dissertation, "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948), treats the revisions of the "Madonna," using as his texts only the editions of 1873 and 1908, and, as it happens, little appreciable loss of scholarship resulted (except as shall be noted, pp.118-122). However, the painstakingly compiled four-page section on revisions of punctuation and mechanics (a section in which Dr. Lucas classifies the "445 changes...not rendered necessary by changes in structure" [p. 13]) does not show how soon many of these alterations were made—it assumes that they all were made in 1908, and not until 1908. And the study of the "Madonna" is rather brief (seventeen pages) when one considers that the "600 stylistic revisions" (p. 18), ranging from figurative language to "character reactions" (p. 25), are discussed in nine pages (pp. 18-26).

6 "Moning" (1875) changed (1879) to "morning" (pp.33-51). "Bran-new"(1873) changed (1875) to "brand-new" (pp.292-312). "Courtesy" (1875) changed (1879) to "curtsey" (pp. 294-37).

7 In 1875, a semicolon was properly placed outside a parenthesis (pp.261-278).—For the rest of this section, page references will not normally be given, since, added to dates (which are important for purposes of identification) they would cause unnecessary annoyance and difficulty to the reader.

8 As well as the use of accent marks: "forestiére" was first accented in 1879; in 1908 it became "forestière" (there is no accent mark in 1896, the 1875 version having been followed).

In 1875 "Venus di Medici" became "Venus de' Medici," and "beaux restes" became "de beaux restes," and was first italicised. In 1908 "Jaconde" and "Michael Angelo" were written "Gioconda" and "Michaelangelo."

For simplicity and up-to-datenese James as early as 1875 removed the italics from such loan words as "loggia," "berretta," "devoirs," "pendant," "liason," and "atelier." In 1879 italics were first removed from "prime donna" (but kept in 1896); in 1896, from "gaucherie," and "bourgeois"; in 1908, from "résumé." (Lucas ["Revisions of Short Stories," p. 12] implies that the removal of italics from foreign words first occurred in 1908.) On the other hand, the term "custode" was not italicised until 1908.

Musset's "Lorenzaccio" was first put within quotes in 1879, and first italicised in 1908; Michael Angelo's David was italicised, beginning in 1883; "Madonna della Seggiola" was first put within quotes in 1908.

In 1896, the speech from Lorenzaccio was not italicised.

9 In these succeeding editions, James seldom added a comma in one edition, only to omit it in the next and vice versa. For instance, in the 1879 edition, only two of the commas that were added could have been ones that had been omitted in 1875, and only three of

Although in a recent study of the revisions James's "increased reliance on hyphens" was commented upon,[12] my findings seem to show that with each edition he removed the hyphen far more often than he added it. Bearing in mind the part that the printer sometimes plays in such matters, and save for a few inconsistencies which invalidate themselves,[13] in the 1883 version[14] one finds the hyphen inserted (and later, removed)[15] only in "a nine-days' mass" and "a rarely-played work," but omitted from "New Yorker," "ill pleased," "holy water," and eight similar combinations.[16] James

---

those omitted could have been ones that had been added in 1875; in the 1883 edition, only five of the commas that were added could have been ones that had been omitted in 1879, and only three of those omitted could have been ones that had been added in 1879. (Rather than painstakingly collate four editions at once, I collated two at a time_1873-75, 1875-79, 1879-83_and kept lists of page references. Hence the "could have been" phraseology.)

10 The turning point seems to be around 1880. In 1875 James added fourteen commas while omitting eight; in 1879 he omitted twenty while adding eighteen (for 1883, see note 9, above). As time passed, then, he less frequently felt the necessity of adding commas for clarity and more frequently saw the possibility of omitting commas without causing ambiguity or error.

James simplified and modernized other punctuation; in the 1879 edition the comma dash became the dash alone in forty-seven instances. (And, comparing the editions of 1896 and 1908, one finds thirty-four semicolons changed to commas and sixteen colons changed to semicolons. But see note 30.)

11 And in 1896, James omitted over one hundred commas found in the 1875 edition. See note 30.

12 Lucas, "Revisions of Short Stories," p. 13. Lucas also implies, quite naturally, that all hyphen changes were late (p. 23).

13 The "church-facade" and "mantelshelf" of 1879 became in 1883 "church facade" and "mantel-shelf," which is how they had been written in 1875.

14 Only five changes (two of them given in preceding note) had occurred prior to this edition of 1883, the hyphen being dropped (1875) from "half joccosely," and (1879) added to "re-absorbed" and dropped from "mantelpiece."

15 In 1908 and 1896, respectively.

16 "Artist friend," "Arno side," "brain fever," "side altars," "side street," "south wind, "waistcoat pocket," "church feasts."

added the hyphen to three terms (later removing it from one)[17] for the edition of 1896, but dropped it from "hedge screen," "rose color," "mountain pine," "treasure chamber," and "lay member." In the final (1908) edition "tonight," "instead (of)," "someone," and "afterglow" were each printed as one word,[18] and fifteen words hitherto hyphenated were printed separately.[19]

In collating an 1878 or 1880 text of James with the final revision, one finds a great many late contractions of subject and verb (both in dialogue and in narrative), and a proportionately increased colloquial quality.[20] It is not generally known, I believe, that in the early 1870's James frequently used contracted forms, only—from about 1876-1881—to switch to the severe, uncontracted form,[21] thereby making his work (especially his dialogue) somewhat stiff and unnatural. More than eighty contractions of the "he'll," "he's," "you'd" variety that appear in the 1875 edition became the formal "he will," "he is," "you would," and the like, in the 1879 version. Shortly afterwards, however, in the early 1880's,[22] James resumed the use of contractions, and relied upon them increasingly—the 1896 "Madonna," for example, has at least fifty[23] more than the 1875 one on which it was based.[24]

17 "Dark-blue kerchief," "a five-minutes' frenzy," and "a black-velvet tunic" ("black velvet" in 1908).

18 Also "showroom," "nonappearance," "everyone."

19 "Color box," "half nestling," "serving maid," "chimney piece," "terra cotta," "half sister," "fever fit," "dining room," "drawing room," "small change," "bird notes," "palace rooms," "high priestess," "house tops," "bell tower."

20 See note 5. Dr. Lucas comments that "Attempting to give his language a more modern ring, James turned naturally to a general colloquialization, accomplished chiefly by...spelling contractions..." ("Revisions of Short Stories," p. 12).

The 1896 edition of the "Madonna" omits more than it tells a student of James's development. Occupying a position chronologically midway between the 1883 version and the New York Edition (1908) it might be expected to reveal a great deal about the evolution of the so-called "later manner." But it is, unfortunately, almost an exact reprint of the second—1875—edition,[25] even to the repetition of some of its mistakes[26] and the absence of some of the improvements made in the editions of 1879 and 1883.[27] Despite the fact, however, that the punctuation in general follows that of the 1875 edition, and fails to benefit from the modernising and simplifying changes of 1879 and 1883, the late date of this 1896 edition is indicated by the avoidance of the hyphen,[28] the free use of the contracted form,[29] and, especially, the less frequent use of the

---

21 Only one such change appears in the 1875 edition--"didn't" to "did not."

22 James's 1883 edition of the "Madonna" indicates little change in his policy, although my studies of other stories persuade me to feel that the 1876-1881 dates are fairly accurate.

Miss Kelley points out that in revising Roderick Hudson [Atlantic, January—December] (1875) for its first appearance in book form (1876) James, from having both Rowland and Roderick usually speak in the contracted form, made Rowland seldom do so, but had Roderick use the contracted form when excited and the full form when determined (Early Development of James, p. 192, n. 17). At times, then, James used the full or the contracted form for characterization or realistic dialogue. See notes 23 and 29.

23 (And the New York Edition [1908] has at least thirty contractions not found in 1896.) In the 1896 edition, one may see James trying in other ways to improve his dialogue. He toned down his characteristic early over-use of exclamation points, adding only four but dropping thirty-two—by way of contrast, in 1879 he had omitted two and added one (also in 1879, the exotic "'Delay?!'" had become merely "'Delay!'").

In 1896, in order more properly to show stress and intonation, James once removed italics from dialogue and in seven instances added it. Twice in 1875, twice in 1879, and once in 1896

comma—it was dropped at least twice as often in 1896 as it had been in both of these earlier editions combined.[30] Besides an

---

(the latter not repeated in 1908) James inserted the dash in dialogue as indication of a pause; once in 1879 and three times in 1896 James interjected the dash between sentences of dialogue, in order to indicate a pause and to increase the emphasis.

24 If one collated the 1879 edition with that of 1896, the figure would be misleading (since James used the earlier, 1875, edition in 1896), but would be much more impressive—perhaps, considering the eighty or more contractions that were formalized in 1879, as high as 130.

25 The acknowledgment recognizes the 1875 copyright of James R. Osgood and Company and that the story was reprinted by permission of Houghton, Mifflin and Company (Library of World's Best Literature, XX, 1896, p. 8075).

26 The misspelling of "curtesy" as "courtesy," and the use of "beside" when "besides" (in addition to) was meant.

27 Such as the division of the story into sections. However, "moning" (1875 and 1879) correctly appeared as "morning," the word "signore" consistently was printed in lower case, "O" was consistently modernized to "Oh" (one "O" had been overlooked in 1875), and the awkward "in memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini" became "in the memoirs" of Cellini.

28 See notes 15, 16, 17, and related text. At least fourteen terms hyphenated in 1875 were written as two words in 1896. The majority of these changes first occurred in 1883.

29 See note 24, and related text. In our eagerness to note the colloquial quality gained by contractions we should not overlook the emphasis that comes from the uncontracted form (especially if the subject-verb normally is contracted). One "'I'm'" of 1875 dialogue became "'I am'" in 1883 and 1896. (See note 22.) And, more in the rhythm of emphatic dialogue, the 1875 version was changed in 1896: "'they'll not'" to "'they won't,'" "'you've not'" to "'you haven't,'" "'you'll not'" to "'you won't.'" See notes 22 and 23.

30 See note 10 and related text for note 11. Roughly, James dropped 52 commas in the editions of 1879 and 1883, and 107 (from the 1875 edition) in 1896. The entire picture is, however, somewhat clouded by the fact that if one collates the 1896 with the 1908 edition, he seems to find 53 added and 55 omitted in 1908. But James did not use the 1896 edition when revising for the New York Edition—he used the edition of 1883.

improvement in phrasing in this 1896 edition,[31] dialogue in places becomes more natural through the use both of italics to show emphasis and dashes to indicate pauses,[32] and the paragraphing is perhaps the best of any of the versions. Five times (twice so that dialogue might more clearly be indicated)[33] in 1896 new paragraphs are made—each change improves the earlier (and is better than the later) failure to separate. (Other changes in paragraphing occur in various editions,[34] so that Dr. Lucas's reference to the one alteration in paragraphing[35] is misleading.)

31 See note 4.

32 See note 23.

33 The narrator's terse rebuke to Serafina for having shown no interest in the plight of Theobald ("'You might have sent this gentleman!'") and his parting words of encouragement to the ancient landlady before going to seek a doctor ("'Prove at least that one old woman can be faithful...and watch him well till I come back.'") were paragraphed separately only in 1896. (1875, 1896, 1908: pp. 311, 8101, 480; 321, 8107, 488).

Other changes found only in 1896 give a separate paragraph to the brief account of (1) the burial of Theobald ("Before a week was over...."), (2) the first walk that Theobald and the narrator took together ("What course we took...."), and (3) the narrator's second sight of Theobald ("I knew him by...") (1875, 1896, 1908: pp. 322, 8107, 489; 268, 8078, 442; 273, 8080, 445).

In the 1896 edition, however, as in that of 1875, there is no dividing of the story into sections.

34 In 1875, a new paragraph was indicated, beginning "I was more and more impressed with my companion's prodigious singleness of purpose." This change was adopted in succeeding editions (1875, 1896, 1908: pp. 283; 8086; 455).

In 1875 (and 1896) a short speech by Theobald was paragraphed separately: "'[Serafina's] beauty is my daily study.'" In 1908, this sentence was absorbed into the following paragraph (1875, 1896, 1908: pp. 293; 8091; 464).

The 1879 edition made a new paragraph of a long passage dealing with the narrator's first sight of Serafina, beginning "We went accordingly by appointment to a certain ancient house in the heart

James's concern for the average reader and his efforts at accuracy in things artistic may be seen in the 1896 revisions, where Raphael's "Madonna in the Chair" became his madonna "of" the chair and Theobald's fervent "'Anch' io son pittore!'" was given a footnote: "'I am a painter also,'—Correggio's famous remark on inspecting a collection of paintings."[36]

In order for "The Madonna of the Future" to be successful, James had to make the reader eagerly await his first sight of Theobald's "creation,"[37] while at the same time feeling dimly a sense of foreboding, a suspicion that the artist's ideals were so impossibly high that his "work" consisted solely of plans and conceptions

---

of Florence...." All succeeding editions except that of 1896 adopted this paragraphing (1875, 1879, 1896, 1908: pp. 293; 36; 8091; 464).

The 1879 edition, unlike that of 1875, gave no separate paragraphing to a speech by the narrator, although later editions did so: "'Why, my dear fellow, I suppose you don't take the woman for twenty?'" (1875, 1879, 1908: pp. 302; 46; 472).

35 "Revisions of Short Stories," p. 14.

36 1875, 1896, 1908: pp. 281; 8085; 452.

37 The reader's eagerness is in part caused by the generally sympathetic attitude of the narrator. Theobald's first long speech, in 1873 (p.277) a "fine [in 1875, p. 266, "brilliant"] tirade," became (1908, p. 439) a "discourse." (Unless otherwise indicated, page references will be to the editions of 1873 and 1908.) James also replaced "Everything was a pretext for some wild idealistic rhapsody or revery." with "Everything became a pretext for one of his high-flown excursions" (pp.283-455).

impossible of satisfactory transfer to canvas. These elements—suspense, foreboding, artistic idealism—while present in the first (1873) edition of the "Madonna," are more skillfully handled in the revised New York Edition (1908).

Almost from their very first moments together, the narrator has reason to see Theobald as a patient student and devoted lover of the old masters—[38] nothing is said that would make him regard Theobald as a practicing artist actively creating. In explaining to the narrator his reasons as an artist for having rejected his native America,[39] Theobald unwittingly paved the way for the narrator's retort (valuable in its foreboding and its irony): "'Nothing is so idle as to talk about our want of a nutritive soil, of opportunity, of inspiration, and all the rest of it. The worthy part is to do something fine! There's no law in our glorious constitution against that. Invent, create, achieve!'"[40] One feels that

38 So deep is the artist's love of the old times and the old masters that he feels the present age to be far inferior in ability and understanding. Still, he does hope for a revelation that would enable the contemporary artist to equal the old masters.

39 Except to give it a more emotional quality James made practically no change to Theobald's explanation for having become an expatriate: "'We are the disinherited of Art!* he cried.* 'We are condemned to be superficial! We are excluded from the magic circle* The soil of American perception is a poor little barren, artificial deposit* Yes! we are wedded to imperfection.* An American, to excel, has just ten times as much to learn as a European.* We lack the deeper sense.* We have neither taste nor tact nor force.* How should* we have them? Our crude and garish climate, our silent past, our deafening present, the constant pressure about us of unlovely circumstance,* are as void of all that nourishes and prompts and inspires the artist, as my sad heart is void of bitterness in saying so! We poor aspirants must live in perpetual exile'" (p.278). (*—In 1908, contractions were used, stage direction omitted, a few commas omitted, "should" italicized, "circumstance" changed to "conditions," and <u>six</u> exclamation points added [p.442].)

Generally the reader is more justified in identifying James with the narrator than with Theobald, but in this speech, we seem to hear the author as well. James's sketches of the early 1870's show him in agreement with Theobald's opinion of our "silent past" and our "deafening present." So do his letters: writing to his mother from Florence, October 15, 1869, James commented that "...we [Americans in Europe] seem a people of character, we seem to have energy, capacity, and intellectual stuff in ample measure." He added, "It's the absolute and incredible lack of culture that strikes you in common travelling-Americans" (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York, 1920, I, 22).

The reader might feel that this speech of Theobald's does not represent James's sentiments in 1908, for Hamlin Garland recollected that during the period of the revisions James remarked, "'If I were to live my life over again...I would be an American. I would steep myself in America, I would know no other land. I would study its beautiful side. The mixture of Europe and America which you see in me has proved disastrous. It has made of me a man who is neither American nor European. I have lost touch with my own people, and I live here alone. My neighbors are friendly, but they are not of my blood, except remotely. As a man grows old he feels these conditions more than when he is young. I shall never return to the United States, but I wish I could'" (Roadside Meetings, New York, 1930, p. 461). This un-Jamesian sounding quote was made some thirty-three years after the "Madonna's" appearance. At best, it represents James's opinion in 1906 rather than 1873. R. B. McElderry, Jr. ("Hamlin Garland and Henry James," American Literature, XXIII, 433-446, January, 1952) makes no claim to the contrary. And actually, this statement of James does not contradict what Theobald said. One might consider also that James made a revision (1908), referring to Theobald not as "an American" but as "one of...the famished race" (pp.277-441). It seems to me that both in 1873 and 1908 we may identify James with Theobald in the latter's complaint that America is not a propitious environment for the artist. The dissertation of Louise A. Roberts, "Henry James's Criticism of Nineteenth-Century America" (Chicago, 1946), should be of help on this question.

40 p. 278. Improved slightly in 1908: "'Nothing is so idle as to talk about our want of a nursing air, of a kindly soil, of opportunity, of inspiration, of the things that help. The only thing that helps is to do something fine'" (p.442).

Contemporary critics accused James's stories of having no obvious moral, and, in this instance, of being unfair to American character and scornful of his country. James's friend Howells argued that James was not contemptuous of his country, but was happier when able to confront his characters with situations impossible to find here. See Richard Nicholas Foley, Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866 to 1916 (Washington, D. C., 1944), pp.7-8.

Theobald has been similarly encouraged before,[41] so quickly does he answer and so strongly does he insist that he has "'undertaken a creation!'"[42] And what better atmosphere for creating than Florence? For here, says Theobald (italics mine),"'...I am always adding a thought to my conception!'"[43]

In response to the narrator's interested and sympathetic query, whether he has "'been very productive all this time [twenty years]?'"[44] Theobald confesses never to have sold a picture—after all, he has chosen not to manifest himself by imperfection.

Howells seems correct. James did share Theobald's view that an American background made it difficult for an artist to succeed, but James was not one to grieve and lament; the narrator, with his resolve to learn, no matter what the difficulty, was James. The idea that an artist, however barren his background, can learn and work and succeed, is an obvious enough moral. A dissertation announced by Ward S. Marden (Johns Hopkins) should throw new light on this question: "Sentimentality and Idealism: A Problem in the Early Development of Henry James."

41 Instantly he was on the defensive, begging not to be taken for a "'barren complainer'" or a "'querulous cynic.'" Although retaining the first term in 1879, while changing the second one to "'impotent cynic,'" James may have come to feel that the term "'impotent'" was too obvious even for foreboding—he changed it to "'one of the falsely fastidious'" (1875, 1879, 1908: pp. 270; 9;443). (He may have had good taste in mind. See Chapter II, notes 193, 194, 195.)

42 p. 278. Made stronger in 1908 by the insertion of "'believe me!'": "'I've undertaken, believe me, a creation'" (p.443).

43 p. 278. James gained credibility in writing (1908) "'This is one of my—shall I say inspired?—nights: I dream waking!'" to replace (1873) "'This is one of my nervous nights ...!'" (pp.278-443) (It might be added, parenthetically, that Theobald keeps a notebook.)

44 pp. 278 and 444. Since Theobald had spent twenty years in Florence, James was careful to make the city, in his descriptions, more appealing. Artistically it was inspiring and rewarding on more levels: instead of spending many of their hours "among those early paintings" the two spent them "in historic streets and consecrated nooks, in churches and convents and galleries" (pp.284-455). The intensity and seriousness of Theobald's appreciation is

increased: instead of having "strolled and lounged...through its streets" he had "studied [Florence] with so pious a patience" (pp.283-454). By writing with more freshness and naturalness, by alluding to the twenty years of love, and by using the affectionate term "her," James improved this early passage:

1873	1908
"He seemed deeply versed in local history and tradition, and he expatiated con amore on the charms of Florence. I gathered that he was an old resident, and that he had taken the lovely city into his heart" (p.278).	"He seemed really to know his Florence through and through and had no need to tell me he loved her. I saw he was an old devotee and had taken her even from the first to his heart" (p.443).

The narrator, as well as Theobald, is more appreciative in the New York Edition, where "Florence" and "the city" appear as "the so rich little city" and "such a city" (pp.279-444, 276-438). Instead of the "little treasure-city" having been "dropped" into the "hollow" of a "cup of mountains," "this choicest handful of the spoils of time" had been "stored" there for "keeping" (pp.291-463). Matthew Josephson (Portrait of the Artist as an American, New York, 1930) has gratuitously improved upon James, in this and other passages.

1875	1908	Josephson
"...you may glance... down to the full domes and slender towers of Florence and over to the blue sweep of the wide-mouthed cup of mountains into whose hollow the little treasure-city has been dropped" (p.291).	"...you may glance... down to the full domes and slender towers of Florence and over to the blue sweep of the wide-mouthed cup of mountains in whose hollow this choicest handful of the spoils of time has been stored away for keeping" (p.463).	"The full domes and slender towers of Florence, seen from this terrace, are held 'within the blue sweep of the cup of mountains... like the choicest handful of the spoils of time, stored away for keeping'" (p.96).
. . . . .		
[1875 edition (p.266) unchanged in New York Edition]	"'the last performance of Michael, of Benvenuto! [one sentence omitted] The plainest burgher of them, in his cap....'"	"'the last performance of Michael or Benvenuto'. The plainest burgher of them all, in his cap....'"
	"'The sun stood high in heaven....'"	"'The sun stood in his heaven....'"
	"'...the dim idea, and seeing nothing...'" (p.440).	"'...the dim idea and seeing nothing ...'" (pp.95-96).
. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .

Hastily he quotes Browning for support.[45] Some ten or twelve hours later, seeing Theobald's clothes by the harsh light of day, the narrator unquestionably is not sympathetic toward so uncommercial an attitude,[46] and he responds only slightly to Theobald's praises of Mantegna: "'He was not in a hurry. He knew nothing of 'raw Haste, half-sister to Delay'!'"[47] The reader strongly suspects that Theobald, in his fervent but blind dedication to thoughts, to conception, and in his cavalier rejection of raw Haste, had so rationalized about Delay as to be unaware that its inevitable result was artistic barrenness.

"'We are the disinherited of Art!' he cried."	"'We're the disinherited of Art!'"	"'We're the disinherited of art!'"
"'We have neither taste, nor tact, nor force'" (p.269).	"'We have neither taste nor tact nor force!'" (p.442).	"'We have neither taste nor force!'" (p.xvii).

Comparison of Josephson's James with the James of the editions other than 1875 and 1908 makes clear that this emulator of Van Wyck Brooks did not use any of them—his source was the New York Edition. It might have been hoped that Josephson, in writing of the early James and accepting his fictions as autobiographical, would at least have quoted from the early (rather than the New York Edition) James, in the interests of verisimilitude.

Like Brooks, Rebecca West, and Ford Madox Ford, Josephson identifies James with Clement Searle, for "he is, simply, the Passionate Pilgrim incarnate" (p.89). (For a rebuttal, see Kelley, Early Development of James, pp. 117-120.) In quoting from A Passionate Pilgrim, Josephson (p.93) wrenches from context James's reference to the wandering King's Scholar (1908, p. 366), transporting him from Worcester to Oxford, besides distorting (p.93) James's description (1908, p. 414) of the Magdalen tower.

45 "'At least no merchant traffics in my heart!'" More strongly Theobald (1908) calls it not "'the line in Browning'" but "'that divine line in Browning'" (pp.279-444).

46 The threadbare clothes of the artist make his never having sold a picture "more obvious than glorious"; the phrasing of the 1908 version, "more conceivable doubtless than commendable," carries with it stronger censure (pp.279-445).

47 pp.279-446.

At this point in the story (about one-sixth through) James, having caused enough doubt about the existence of the "Madonna," devoted his attention more frequently than before to making clear the inordinately high artistic ideals[48] of the "creator" of this madonna, ideals so high as to prevent his ever completing the "creation" he has undertaken. Theobald opposes automatic and unquestioning acceptance of the work even of Michael Angelo or

48 It would be misleading not to point out that Theobald's fervent devotion to the masterpieces hung in Florence was at times described as too uncritical, although the allusiveness of the revision softens this fact.

1875

"...I often thought it a flaw in his artistic character that he hadn't a harmless vice or two. It amused me vastly at times to think that he was of our shrewd Yankee race; but, after all, there could be no better token of his American origin than his high aesthetic fever ["this same fantastic fever," 1873, p. 283]. The very heat of his devotion was a sign of conversion; those born to European opportunity manage better to reconcile enthusiasm with comfort. He had, moreover, all our native mistrust for intellectual discretion and our native relish for sonorous superlatives. As a critic he was vastly more generous than just, and his mildest terms of approbation were 'stupendous,' 'transcendent,' and 'incomparable'" ["'glorious,' 'superb,' and 'magnificent,'" 1873,p.283] (p.284).

1908

"...I sometimes questioned the reality of an artistic virtue, an aesthetic purity, on which some profane experience hadn't rubbed off a little more. It was hard to have to accept him as of our own hard-headed stock; but after all there could be no better sign of his American star than the completeness of his reaction in favour of vague profits. The very heat of his worship was a mark of conversion; those born within sight of the temple take their opportunities more for granted.

He had moreover all our native mistrust for intellectual discretion and our native relish for sonorous superlatives. As a critic he XXXXrather ignored proportion and degree; his recognitions had a generous publicity, his discriminations were all discoveries" (p.456).

Yet in general it may be said that Theobald had a sound critical sense, a deep capacity for appreciation, and a serious, studious attitude, all of which were heightened by James in revision. To the list—Theobald's "opinions, theories, and sympathies"—James added "aversions"; the artist himself refers not merely to living "'intellectually,'" but to living "'intellectually and aesthetically'";

Raphael[49] (whose "Madonna of the Chair," which illustrated his ideal, was more fully appreciated by the narrator in later versions).[50] The perfect painter, he insists, must have not skill alone but insight and knowledge as well,[51] for the "ideal" will never be reached without "meditation"[52] (contrast with the narrator's "'Invent, create, achieve!'"). And faith is necessary—passionately Theobald

---

in his references to Art as "'her,'" italics were later used, and in the same vein, "the Beautiful" was capitalized; a "'portrait'" by Raphael became an "'inimitable'" one; Theobald, the narrator guessed, had spent many hours, not in "this worshipful company [statues]" but in "all such worshipful companies"; to clarify a reference to Theobald's love and study of the masters, "so devoted a culture of opportunity" was changed to "his systematic and exhaustive attack" (pp.279-446, 278-443, 279-444, 284-458, 281-450, 279-446, ibid.).

49 The "ideal" mood for one to adopt while visiting a gallery, according to Theobald, is one in which "'We'll not take Michael for granted, we'll not swallow Raphael whole!'" (pp.280 and 447). An announced dissertation that should prove of interest is Edwin T. Bowden (Yale) "Henry James and the Visual Arts: A Biographical and Critical Study."

50 "Of all the fine pictures in the world, it seemed [to the narrator] this is the one with which criticism has least to do." This became more positive by the change of "it seemed..." to "it was to strike me at once..."(pp.280-448). No other fine picture, the narrator felt (in both editions), showed so little effort or had so little of the "irrepressible discord between conception and result" (pp.276 and 448). An improvement in imagery helped also; instead of the earlier "The figure melts away the spectator's mind into a sort of passionate tenderness...." one reads (1908) that it "imposes on the spectator the spell of submission..." (pp.276-448).

The narrator's appreciation of other art objects was intensified by James in revision, and they were more graphically described. Thus Michael Angelo's "David" became his "famous David," and its "sinister strength" its "heroic sinister strength" (pp.276-438); it shone "through the dusky air" like (1873) "some young god of Defiance," like (1875) "some embodied Defiance," like (1879) "a sentinel who has taken the alarm," and like (1908) one "roused by some alarm" (pp.276; 284; 3; 438).

. . . . . .

The Perseus of Cellini, located nearby, at the base of the Palazzo Vecchio, was described, more accurately, not as "stationed" but as "poised" (pp.276-439). The fact that the David had been moved to a hall in the Academy of Fine Arts in 1882 was recognized by James in 1908 through the added remark that the Perseus "unlike the great David...still stands there" (p.439). Incidentally, one learns that by late 1948, following World War II, "Outside the Palazzo Vecchio, the Loggia with its great pieces of sculpture, such as Benvenuto Cellini's 'Perseus,' is uncovered again" (Brigadier

argues that, the much less strong maternal influence of the Church not withstanding, some contemporary artist with faith could paint another perfect madonna. The possibility of Theobald's being this artist excites the narrator.[53] But almost at once James resumes planting the hints that there is no madonna in Theobald's studio: [in 1873]"He blushed vividly and gave a heavy sigh, half of protest, half of resignation. 'I don't often mention my picture, in so many words. I detest this modern custom of premature publicity. A great work needs silence, privacy,[54] mystery even. And then,

---

General Edgar Erskine Hume, "Italy Smiles Again," National Geographic, XCV, June 1949, pp.700-701). The Santa Trinita Bridge, atop which was the gallery (connecting the Uffizi and the Pitti Museums) described in the "Madonna," was blown up by the Nazis, August 3, 1944. Of the six bridges across the Arno, only the Ponte Vecchio escaped destruction. In 1949 Italy was rebuilding the Santa Trinita. See N. L. Duffus, "Florence Rebuilds a Symbol," New York Times Magazine (July 17, 1949), pp. 12-13.

. . . . . .

By other slight changes James made the narrator more impressed by what he saw, and increased the freshness and alliterative quality of his diction: the "chambers" of the Pitti Palace were referred to as its "extent," and its "ducal" saloons became "grand-ducal" or "palatial" (pp.280-447). The "mellow canvas" there became "toned canvas"; its "luminous atmosphere," its "deep diffused lustre"; its "dusky gilding," its "gleaming gold" (pp.280-447-448). I have failed to note any annoying fondness for "dusky" but James, in a letter to Howells, January 31, 1880, wrote that "I overdo the epithet 'dusky'" (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York, 1920, I, 72).

51 Michael was in all versions regarded as a master but above all a seer, and his Madonna as not simply a model but also a muse.

James early over-used the term "flatter," and came to dislike it. Theobald's statement that "'No one so loves and respects the rich realities of nature as the artist whose imagination caresses and flatters them.'" was changed to "'...whose imagination intensifies them'" (pp.281-450).

52 In meditation, the artist felt, "'He may still woo the ideal; round it, smooth it, perfect it.'" The term "woo" is another (see note 51) one that James soon began to replace. As early as 1879 he substituted for it the word "'cultivate'" (1875, 1879:pp.279-19).

53 who begs to be notified when it is finished, so that, wherever he may be, he may return instantly and "'make my bow to [in 1908, "pay my respects to," p.452]-the Madonna of the future!'" (p.282). Thus the title first appeared in the story.

do you know, people are so cruel, so frivolous, so unable to imagine a man's wishing to paint a Madonna at this time of day, that I've been laughed at,—laughed at, sir!' And his blush deepened to crimson....'Whatever my talents may be, I'm honest!'"[55]

One wonders just when Theobald works at his masterpiece, for he is able to give hours of his time to his new friend,[56] discoursing the while on aesthetics;[57] when questioned about his "magnum opus," he answers bravely, but not convincingly.[58] Finally he defends his hours spent in the galleries: the paintings are "'suggestive,'" or full of "'incentives'"[59] but one wonders if he is "applying his notes" (he had exclaimed, 1873, "'If you but knew the rapture of

---

54 Theobald led a lonely life: "apparently" was dropped from "he led a lonely life—apparently" (pp.282-454).

55 p.281. The 1908 version has only a few changes of importance, besides the usual change of "blushed vividly" to "had a flush of consciousness." Better rhythm and emphasis was got by changing "'silence, privacy, mystery even'" to "'silence, privacy, mystery'" and "'laughed at,—laughed at, sir!'" to "'laughed at, positively laughed at, sir!'" Finally, more foreboding is got by changing "his blush" to "his poor guilty blush" (pp. 281-452-453).

56 Increasing the irony, yet dissipating any taint of sarcasm (see note 134) on the part of the narrator, James removed the parenthetical expression in the narrator's reference to Theobald's "generous sacrifice of precious hours, as they must have been, to my society" (pp.282-455).

57 The original analysis of his aesthetic idealism, while kind enough, was made more definite, and the narrator less emotional (see notes 48, 140).

1873	1908
"I was more and more impressed with my companion's prodigious singleness of purpose. Everything was a pretext for some wild ["wildly," 1875, p. 283] idealistic rhapsody or revery. Nothing could be seen or said that did not end sooner or later in a glowing discourse on the true, the beautiful, and the good"(p.283).	"...my companion's remarkable singleness....Everything became a pretext for one of his high-flown excursions. Nothing... didn't lead him sooner or later to a glowing discourse..." (pp.455-456).

observation!'" but, 1908, "'If you but knew—in connection with something to be done—of the rapture of observing and remembering, of applying one's notes'").[60] Now, nearly at the midway point in the story, James satisfies the reader's growing apprehension. Mrs. Coventry, the voice of the American colony in Florence, while no less fair,[61] is more cutting and emphatic in the later version, adding to the foreboding that Theobald's is likewise to be "terrible little tale":

1873	1908
"I fancy, myself, that if one were to get into his studio, one would find something very like the picture in that tale of Balzac's,—a mere mass of incoherent scratches and daubs, a jumble of dead paint!"	"I shouldn't myself be surprised if, when one runs him to earth, one finds scarce more than in that terrible little tale of Balzac's—a mere mass of incoherent scratches and daubs, a jumble of dead paint!"[62]

---

58 His reply, "'We're getting on, with the Lord's help. We're doing well.'" would be made "with a grave smile." Later he would say ("with a bravery that never languished"), "'We're getting on...I think we can't be said not to be doing well!'" (pp.283-457).

59 Theobald called them "'suggestive!'" until the final version, when he said, more fully, that they "'bring me in a harvest of incentives'" (pp.283-457).

60 pp. 283-457.

61 The 1875 description of her as "a clever woman, and presumably a generous one" was strengthened on both counts in 1908, when she was "satirical, but...neither unveracious nor vindictive" (pp.290-461).

62 pp. 285-461. Old Master Frenhofer in Balzac's "Le Chef d'oeuvre inconnu" ("The Unknown Masterpiece," in The Comédie Humaine, "The Quest of the Absolute" and Other Stories, tr. Ellen Marriage, Philadelphia, 1897, XXI, 223-254) prides himself on his ability to give his portraits a three-dimensional quality and the illusion of life. He has been at work on his "Belle Noiseuse" for ten years: "'For ten years I have lived with her; she is mine, mine alone; she loves me....She has a soul—the soul that I have given her....It is not a canvas, it is a woman—a woman with whom I talk....She is not a creature, but a creation'" (p.249). Porbus, court painter for Henry IV, warns Poussin, the neophyte artist, that "'for painters, practice and observation are everything; and when theories...begin to

quarrel with the brushes, the end is doubt, as has happened with our good friend, who is half-crack-brained enthusiast, half-painter...Do not you follow his example! Work! painters have no business to think, except with brush in hand'" (p.240).

But old Frenhofer has his theories: "'Nature's way is a complicated succession of curve within curve. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as drawing....A line is a method of expressing the effect of light upon an object; but there are no lines in nature, everything is solid....the distribution of the light alone gives to a body the appearance by which we know it. So I have not defined the outlines; I have suffused them with a haze of half-tints...you cannot lay your finger on the exact spot where background and contours meet. Seen from near, the picture looks a blur: it seems to lack definition; but step back two paces, and the whole thing becomes clear, distinct, and solid; the body stands out, the rounded form comes into relief; you feel that the air plays round it....Perhaps one ought not to draw a single line..."(p.237).

The old artist cannot be sure if his "Belle Noiseuse" is finished until he can compare her to the perfect living model, whom he has been unable to find, and whom he expects her to excel in beauty. Gillette, the sweetheart of the young artist, Poussin, is the perfect model—in return for seeing her undraped Frenhofer allows the young artist to "see" his masterpiece.

Mrs. Coventry's memory served her well—Poussin and Porbus could see "nothing there but confused masses of color and a multitude of fantastical lines that go to a dead wall of paint" (p.251). Finally they made out "a bare foot emerging from a chaos of color, half-tints and vague shadows that made up a dim formless fog" (ibid.); with coats of paint Frenhofer "had overlaid and concealed his work in the quest of perfection" (ibid.). In James's story the narrator brings Theobald to his senses by pointing out that Serafina is old for a madonna; in Balzac's, Poussin rather brutally says to Porbus, loudly enough for the old artist to hear, "'But sooner or later he will find out that there is nothing there!'" (p.252). This shocked Frenhofer into reality; during the night he died after burning his canvases.

In addition to showing Mrs. Coventry's suspicions to be well-founded, James had to bring out other ironies, which give the story greater richness of texture and stronger impact. The first such irony reveals itself when Theobald, out of gratitude for the sympathy and encouragement shown him by the narrator, takes him to meet the real-life "madonna."[63] She is shocking disappointment to his young friend, making Theobald's twenty years of planning—if that is all they have been—seem more wasted than ever.[64]

63 The narrator's sympathy is better seen when "Theobald" is "our friend," and "the poor man" is "the poor dear man" (pp. 268-469, 292-478, 284-460). The same technique was used in the revision of A Passionate Pilgrim.

When the narrator referred to the similarity between Theobald and the artist (Tebaldeo) in Alfred de Musset's Lorenaccio, the invitation was tendered immediately. Theobald spoke of his "Madonna," Tebaldeo of his "mistress" (The Complete Writings of Alfred de Musset, tr. Dr. Edmund Burke Thompson, Revised Ed., New York, 1907, IV). In a letter to Percy Lubbock, T. S. Perry wrote that James (before the time of the writing of "The Madonna") "set about translating...Musset's 'Lorenaccio,' and into this version he introduced some scenes of his own" (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York, 1920, I, 6). Miss Kelley (Early Development of James, p. 20) states that James sent his translation to New York magazines, which rejected them. For the interest of the reader, here is (what is apparently) James's translation of Tebaldeo's speech (same punctuation in 1873, 1875, 1879, 1883 versions), together with a professional translation published in 1907.

James

"I do no harm to anyone. I pass my days in my studio. On Sunday,[1] I go to the Annunziata[2] or to Santa Maria;[3] the monks think I have a voice; they dress me up in a white gown and a red cap, and I take a share in the choruses," sometimes I do a little solo: these are the only times I go into public. In the evening,[4] I visit my sweetheart; when the night is fine, we pass it on her balcony" (1873, pp.285-286).

Punctuation variations:
1--no comma, 1896, 1908.
2--comma, 1896
3--colon, 1896
4--semicolon, 1896, 1908
5--no comma, 1896

TM's P&Co.

"I injure nobody. I spend my days at the studio. On Sunday I go to the Annonciade or to Sainte-Marie; the monks find that I have a voice, they dress me in a white robe and a red cap, and I take part in the choruses, sometimes a little solo: these are the only times that I appear in public. In the evening I go to see my mistress, and when the night is fine I pass it upon her balcony" (p.50).

After a visit to Sarafina's, Theobald amazes his companion by vowing that he "'shall at last invite her to sit'"[65] for him. She has not, then, been sitting for him these twenty years! James by revision made more halting and more apologetic Theobald's confession.

1873	1908
"I've not really had—a—sitting," said Theobald, speaking very slowly. "I've taken notes, you know; I've got my grand fundamental impression. That's the great thing! But I've not actually had her as a model, posed and draped and lighted, before my easel."	"I've not really—since that first time—made her pose," he said with a shade of awkwardness. ... ... [NAPH] ... But I've not actually put her to the inconvenience—so to call it—to which I'd have put a common model."[66]

In their love for Florence, the two artists resemble each other—Tebaldeo even calls it his mother (p.48). And in their devotion to art and the old masters they are similar: Tebaldeo told Cardinal Valori, "My works have little merit; I know better how to love art than I know how to practise it. My entire youth has been spent in the churches. It seems to me that I can not admire Raphael and our divine Buonarotti anywhere else. So I spend whole days before their works, in unspeakable ecstasy. The strains of the organ reveal to me their thoughts and give me an insight into their minds. I look at the people in their paintings, so reverently kneeling, and I imagine that the songs of the choir emanate from their parted lips; that the clouds of aromatic incense pass between them and me in a light vapor. I believe that I see there the glory of the artist; it is therefore a sad and sweet perfume, which would be but empty did it not mount up to God" (p.45).

I could detect no similarities of plot or incident in the two stories, although, remembering Perry's statement, and noticing James's critical essay on Musset, one feels that he knew Lorenzaccio well, and admired it. He called it "the strongest, if not the most exquisite, of his dramatic attempts" (French Poets and Novelists, London [1878, 1884] 1893, p. 17), and gave high praise to the "sentimental fragrance" of Musset's dramas (p.28).

64 Yet one should not overlook the fact that she had served successfully as a model for Theobald. Years before, and when working under the pressure of time, he had done in ten minutes a commendable chalk drawing of her and her dying bambino. James revised his description of the drawing only slightly: "It was executed with singular freedom and power, and yet seemed vivid with the sacred blook of infancy. A sort of dimpled elegance and grace, in the midst of ["mingled with," 1875, p. 298] its boldness, recalled the touch of Correggio." In 1908 this read "It had been thrown off, with singular

Losing his "perception" and his "tact," the narrator blurts out that his friend had "'dawdled!'" and that Serafina is an "'old, old woman—for a Madonna!'"[67] It was as if Theobald had been brutally struck; after a few moments, however, his countryman tries to soften the blow and to encourage him. James carefully revised and expanded his originally too-cryptic, emotionally underdeveloped passage. The added word "But" (I broke down) reveals much more fully than before how cruelly the light of truth beats upon the blinking eyes of Theobald; and it reveals too the soul-searching of the sympathetic narrator who had ripped off the comforting, protecting bandage. The narrator's added reference to Serafina's age ("'the years have helped themselves!'")not only emphasizes this cardinal idea, but adds innuendo towards the Italian artist. Properly enough in such an important scene, each man in the revised passage has two speeches instead of one; Theobald's reactions to those of the narrator are shown more graphically and more poignantly—the shocked artist now "gaped" and something "rolled over him"—

---

freedom and directness, but was nonetheless vivid....A dimpled elegance and grace, which yet didn't weaken its expression, recalled ...Correggio" (pp.288-469).

To Theobald, the narrator praised the drawing more highly, assuring the artist that if it were hung and labelled with a "glorious name" it would not only "hold its own"—it would (1908) "bravely" do so. Originally he "looked at" it and "admired it vastly" (but perhaps not sincerely); in the final version he looked at it—"certainly it had a charm" (ibid.).

65 pp. 289 and 471.

66 pp. 289—471-472.

67 In 1908 she was an old woman for a "'maiden mother!" (pp.289-472).

numbed, he could only "stare." The conscience-stricken narrator tried to "smile" his encouragement. Finally, the very sound of "'Old—old!'" is much more affecting if it is "re-echoed" rather than "murmured." The comparative passage:

1873	1908
"Still, she has de beau restes? By all means make her sit for you!" I broke down; his face was too horribly reproachful. He took off his hat and stood passing his handkerchief mechanically over his forehead. "De beau restes? I thank you for sparing me the plain English. I must make up my Madonna out of de beau restes! What a masterpiece she'll be! Old—old! Old—old!" he murmured.	"Still, she has fine thing left. ... for you." But I broke down.... ... ... [same] ... "'Fine things left'?" he stared. "Do you speak as if other people had helped themselves—?" "Why, my dear man," I smiled, "the years have helped themselves! But she has what the French call—don't they?—de beaux restes!" Oh how he gaped and how something seemed to roll over him! "I must make my Madonna out of de beaux restes! What a masterpiece she'll be! Old—old! Old—old!" he re-echoed. [68]

The narrator does not see Theobald the next day, nor the next, nor the next. A week passes. Finally, thoroughly alarmed, he goes to Serafina's, hoping to learn the artist's address.[69] Here the other major irony is fully revealed, for at Serafina's he meets Theobald's foil, the Italian artist who is all that the American artist is not—cynical, productive, and quite realistic in his attitude toward Serafina, whom he knows far too well to idealise.

68 pp. 289-473.

69 In this scene at Serafina's the narrator's sympathy for Theobald is more clearly seen in the 1908 edition, where instead of being "'uneasy'" he was "'so uneasy'" at the artist's disappearance (pp.291-478). Instead of admitting to Serafina, anent Theobald, "'He's a mystery!'" the narrator loyally proclaimed, "'I can only esteem him—and I think I may say—love him'"(pp.292-478). And when he had learned Theobald's address, the narrator instead of saying that he "should immediately go in search of him" said, with more of a sense of urgency, that he "would at once go" (pp.292-480).

Now in possession of Theobald's address, the narrator hurries there. The old lady who admits him is glad at Theobald's "having at last a caller"— thus his having been alone and helpless for ten days is made more apparent than it had been by her earlier "expression of relief that the poor gentleman had a friend."[71] Slight revisions make the studio somewhat more pathetic than before,[72] but James made almost no change to his early description of the "Madonna": "I can hardly say that I was surprised at what I found,— a canvas that was a mere dead blank, cracked and discolored by time."[73] (Later the old woman calls it not "'that great canvas he keeps there'" but "'that great dirty'" one.)[74]

Theobald's last speech (revised only very slightly)[75] states explicitly enough the theme of the story, and ends by reminding the reader of the ironic contrasts between the deluded, unproductive

---

70 As he pocketed the card of the unnamed artist the narrator "glanced at Madonna Serafina, wondering whether she had an eye for contrasts" (p.294. In 1908, a "sense for contrasts," pp.483-484.)

71 pp. 294-484.

72 The narrator is of course more sympathetic in these revisions. "It [the studio] spoke most plaintively for itself." was changed to "It spoke, the poor place, all plaintively for itself" (pp.294-485). "The place savored horribly of poverty." became "The whole scene savoured horribly of indigence" (ibid.). The narrator instead of being "sickened by the vacant misery of the spot" was "sickened by my impression of vacant misery" (ibid.).

73 p. 294. In 1908, "'I can scarcely say I....'" and the commas omitted (p.485).

74 pp. 296-488.

75

1873	1908
'"I've been sitting here for a week, face to face with the truth, with the past, with my weakness and poverty and nullity"' (p.294).	'"... face to face with it, the terrible truth, face to face with the past..."' (pp.485-486).
'"I waited and waited to	'"...

artist and his (unknown) antithesis, the cynical creator of lascivious statuettes of cats and monkeys:

"I'm the half of a genius! Where in the wide world is my other half? Lodged perhaps in the vulgar soul, the cunning, ready fingers of some dull copyist or some trivial artisan who turns out by the dozen his easy prodigies of touch! But it's not for me to sneer at him; he at least does something. He's not a dawdler! Well for me if I had been vulgar and clever and reckless, if I could have shut my eyes and dealt my stroke!" 76

At this point Theobald's loyal friend feels that he must "remove him from the haunted atmosphere" of the little room; less formally and so more strongly (1908) he feels that he must "draw him out of [its] haunted air." 77 They soon reach (more poignantly) not "the open air" but "the warm light of day."78 Together they take a final walk through the Pitti Gallery, where the pictures (italics mine) "seemed, even to my own sympathetic vision, to glow with a sort of insolent renewal of strength and lustre." More positively, through the avoidance of the terms "seemed" and "sort of" (and note a favorite term, "stricken") they (1908) "glowed, to my stricken sight, with an insolent renewal...."79 In early editions (italics mine) the "eyes and lips of the great portraits seemed to smile in ineffable scorn of the dejected pretender who had dreamed

---

be worthier to begin, and wasted my life in preparation. While I fancied my creation was growing, it was dying" (p.295).

to begin—I wasted my life.... ... was growing it was only dying"' (p.487).

76 p. 295. The same in 1908, except for slight punctuation changes and, instead of "'dealt my stroke!'" "'taken my leap'" (p.487).

77 pp. 295-487.

78 Ibid.

79 pp. 295-487.

of competing with their glorious authors...." Again, more positively (the qualifying "seemed" having been dropped), as well as more personally (by the addition of "for me"), and without the questionable help of the weak term "ineffable," in the 1908 passage the eyes and lips "reflected for me a pitying scorn of the dejected pretender...."[80]

The concern of the narrator was not the only medium that James used to elicit reader sympathy for Theobald. In the New York Edition Mrs. Coventry when speaking of "'Florence'" qualifies her remarks by the addition of "'that is our own little colony here,'"[81] and instead of referring to "'poor, dear America'" speaks of "'our poor dear barbarous country.'"[82] James thus increased the provincialism and the snobbishness of the Americans who were unsympathetic toward Theobald[83] (the narrator, one recalls, had been made more sympathetic towards the artist),[84] and by indirection elicited more reader sympathy for the artist. (Yet the "compatriots" had been forced into scepticism where Theobald's "Madonna" was concerned, as Mrs. Coventry volubly explains.)[85] In making the reader

80 pp.295-487. In 1875, "triumphant" authors (p.320).

81 pp. 283-459.

82 Ibid. In 1879, she spoke of "'the poor dear United States'" (p.25).

83 Instead of "the foreign residents" the members of the colony were "strangers of supposed distinction" (pp.283-458).

84 Another instance of his sympathy is seen in his asking Mrs. Coventry not "whether she knew that remarkable man, Mr. Theobald" but "whether she knew among our compatriots in the place a certain eccentric but charming Mr. Theobald" (pp. 284-458). The contrast of attitudes is heightened by the change of the stage direction for her answer: replacing "she exclaimed" James wrote, "her answer was as public as if I had owed it to the bell-crier" (pp. 284-458).

The loyalties of these two are contrasted again towards the close of the story. After the funeral, they met at the cemetery. When she asks the inevitable question, loyalty to Theobald impels him to say that he has seen the Madonna, but will never show it to her. Insistently, she wants to know why. In early editions he answers, "'My dear Mrs. Coventry, you'd not understand her!'" and, after her rebuke and his apology for his rudeness, he marches off. In the final edition, his sharpness is indicated by the omission of her name ("'Because you wouldn't understand her!'") and by the added information that "She rather glared at me" (pp.296-490).

The similarity to the final scene of Daisy Miller is interesting (although in the later story Giovanelli is, unlike Mrs. Coventry, a participant and not a mere observer, and his remark adds an ironic twist)—the meeting at the grave, after the funeral, of the two people most interested, and the final comments.

Another point of comparision with Daisy Miller (and with A Passionate Pilgrim) is James's liking for the word "blighted." In "The Madonna," the narrator's desire to leave Florence was at first explained by the fact that Theobald's "dark spirit seemed diffused through all things" but (1908) because his "blighted spirit met my eyes in all aspects" (pp.296-490). See Chapter II, note 142.

85 The revision and expansion of this passage is interesting not simply for the removal of the inexact term, "mysterious," the greater clarity of the second sentence, and the emphasis on Theobald as a talker, but also for the adoption of the present perfect tense—after all, the story is not over until after the narrator has seen the "Madonna."

1873

"'We decied that his manner was a good deal like Leonardo's—mysterious and inscrutable and fascinating. Mysterious it certainly was; mystery was the beginning and the end of it. The months passed by, and the miracle hung fire; our master never produced his masterpiece. He passed hours in the galleries and churches, posturing and musing, and gazing; he talked more than ever about the beautiful, but never put brush to canvas'" (p.284).

1908

"'We decided that his manner was a good deal like Leonardo's—'esoteric' and indescribable and fascinating. Well, it has remained esoteric, and nobody can describe what nobody has ever seen. The months, the years have passed and the miracle has hung fire; our master has never produced his masterpiece. He has passed hours in the galleries and churches, posturing, musing, and gazing; he has talked more about his subject—about every subject—than any human being before has ever talked about anything, but he has never put brush to canvas'" (p.459).

feel added scorn for Mrs. Coventry and hence stronger sympathy for Theobald, James by revision had the narrator refer to her with greater asperity.[86] The artist himself was much more scornful of her than before: she was not "'foolish'" and "'frivolous and heartless'" but "'most vain'" and "'empty and scheming.'"[87] And her "'mendacious'" parlor became a "'humbugging'" one.[88] Finally (according to Theobald) she was one of that low variety of art patrons—the crass egotist; if an artist did not furnish her every three days with a picture she could show her guests, she told the guests "'in plain English you're an impostor!'" More strongly in the revision, she told them "'you're a low fraud and that they must have nothing to do with you.'"[89]

Not the least of the many ironies in "The Madonna of the Future" (and one that makes for reader sympathy towards the artist) is the contrast between the true character of Serafina and Theobald's idealization of her—he actually looked upon her with reverence and spoke of her in religious terms, especially of course in the revised (1908) edition, where the artist, describing how he had met her, said

86 She became a "social high-priestess of the arts," with the earlier qualifying "a sort of" dropped in 1908 (pp.284-458). Instead of being "backed by these treasures [" early masters' by the dozen"]" she was "surrounded" by them. Her "little worm-eaten diptychs," instead of "showing angular saints on gilded panels" were "covered" by them. These last two revisions were made in 1879 (pp. 284-26).

87 pp. 289-462. When the artist learned that the narrator had made the acquaintance of Mrs. Coventry, originally "He laid his hand on my arm and gave me a sad smile." but later "He laid his hand on my arm with a sadder, though perhaps sharper, look than had ever yet come into his face" (pp.285-462). (Reminiscent somehow of a passage in the 1908 Pilgrim: "Her eyes, for an instant, communicated with his own as I think they had never, never communicated with any other source of meaning..." [p.404].)

not "'She asked for a little money'" but "'She asked for a little money and received what I gave her with the holy sweetness with which the Santissima Vergine receives the offerings of the faithful.'"[90] By the mere substitution of "but" for "and," James made clearer the fact that Theobald had in mind both Serafina and the mother of Jesus when he said "'She, too, was a maiden mother and she had been turned out into the world in her shame.'"[91] Seeing Serafina gave Theobald not simply a "'vision'" but a "'miraculous vision.'"[92] The bambino who had been the cause of her having been "turned out into the world" (where Theobald met her) soon afterwards died, "'as if to deepen and consecrate the pathos of it all.'"[93] "'Holy sweetness,'" "'offerings of the faithful,'" "'a miraculous vision,'" "'consecrate,'" "'sanctify'"[94]—and there are still other religious terms used by Theobald in speaking of Serafina; her beauty, for example, seemed to him not a "'lesson'" but a "'revelation.'"[95]

---

88 pp.285-462. See note 86, for objects in her parlor.

89 Ibid.

90 pp. 288-470.

91 Ibid.

92 pp. 288-471.

93 James liked to achieve pathos without begging for it by use of the term itself. In 1908 he wrote (using characteristic alliteration) that the child died "'as if to deepen and sanctify the sadness and sweetness of it all'" (pp. 288-471). When Serafina knew the child was dying she (1873) "'held him up to me for ten minutes, and I made that sketch,'" but (1908), with more pathos, she "'held him up to me for ten minutes—so as not to lose him all—and I made that sketch'" (ibid.)

94 See note 93 for "sanctify."

95 pp. 286-464.

The sarcasm with which the narrator and Mrs. Coventry refer to Serafina gives added irony to Theobald's misdirected reverence, especially since they frequently echo him. Almost without fail, James in revision increased their mockery: if she had been, to these unbelievers, "'Signora Serafina'" she became "'Madonna Serafina'" or "'the sublime Serafina'"; if "'his Madonna,'" "'his womdrous Madonna'"; if "'divine'" or "'stately,'" "'sublime'"; and if "'the great Madonna,'" "'the greatest of Madonnas.'"[96] The narrator wryly noted (1908) not "I thought she blushed" but "she had, I thought, a perfectly human change of colour."[97] Such delicious bits of sarcasm as this are of course infrequent, but the narrator throughout was analytical and discerning towards Serafina. The "soul" (later the "beautiful soul")[98] which Theobald promised to show his young friend struck him (at first) as "no deeper mystery than a sort of matronly mildness of lip and brow," but (later) as "no deeper principle than some accident of quiet ude, some matronly mildness...."[99] Theobald was charmed by the sanctified bend of Serafina's head, but not so her more detached critic; to him it seemed "nothing more than the trick of a person constantly working at embroidery," and later, "nothing more inward" than such a "trick."[100] In a few instances James was, in one

96 "'Signora Serafina'" to "'Madonna Serafina'" as early as 1875 (pp.296-323), and twice in 1908 (pp.292-480, 296-489). Once (1908) she became "'wondrous'" (pp.286-459), twice "'sublime'" (pp. 283-470, 291-477), and once "'the greatest'" (pp.296-489). As for her sublimity, besides the two references above she twice (1908) became "'the sublime Serafina'" (pp.286-465, 290-476).

97 pp. 286-465. Somewhat less cutting, but worth mentioning, was the change of her "candid brow" to her "noble blankness" (pp.292-479).

98 pp. 287-467.

99 Ibid. 100. Ibid.

version, or both, downright blunt: Serafina was, to the narrator, not "simply coarse" but "thick and coarse"[101] and, to the old woman at Theobald's, not "'the Serafina'" but "'quella cattiva donna.'"[102] And her "beauty" was less frequently acknowledged in the New York Edition: it became her "appearance,"[103] while her "type of beauty" became her "complexion and form."[104] But Theobald, he of the "grand fundamental impression," of the "thoughts" added to his "conception," Theobald, who "observed" and "remembered" (but did not, in his "silence" and "privacy," apply his "notes"), Theobald was more struck by her beauty[105] and more studiously appreciative of it.[106]

---

101 Ibid.

102 pp. 296-488.

103 pp. 287-466.

104 pp. 287-467. And her beauty's "essential charm" became its "greater merit" (pp.287-466).

105 Instead of making no secret of his adoration he made no secret of what he thought of her beauty (pp.289-471).

106 Instead of having "'always contemplated her beauty'" he has "'always studied and admired her'" (pp.286-464--italics mine). And, to his "'I've absorbed her little by little'" was added "'I've made her my own'" (pp.289-471).

Serafina quite naturally regarded Theobald with mixed emotions, being grateful for his devotion,[107] while at the same time frequently considering him to be tedious,[108] a fault she apparently did not find with the Italian artist who serves as a foil for the American one. The narrator wondered if Theobald "maintained" Serafina "in comfortable leisure"[109] and whether he was "the most ardent of friends or the most reverent of lovers."[110] His questions were answered when, in quest of Theobald's address, he unexpectedly dropped in on Serafina, surprising her at late breakfast with "a gentleman,—an individual, at least, of the male sex."[111] It was, quite obviously, this "male individual" who maintained her, and was her ardent friend and irreverent lover. She was "at his elbow, in friendly proximity," but later "in intimate nearness";[112] at once the narrator guessed that her "secret" was "better worth knowing than I had supposed, and that the

107 She calls him her "benefactor" but later her "great benefactor" and says of the drawing of her bambino that "'The Signor Teobaldo gave it me as a gift,'" but later that Theobald, "'a generous person if there ever was one,'" gave it to her (pp.291-477, 288-469). The reader assumes that she was sincere and not sarcastic, for while she could twice (for the benefit of the narrator, and unseen by Theobald) tap her forehead significantly to indicate her opinion of the artist's mentality (pp.287-288 and 468-469), the narrator could not repeat the gesture—she became very angry when he tapped his forehead, smiling the while at the seriousness with which she proclaimed Theobald's genius (pp.288 and 469).

And yet her interest in Theobald was largely selfish and feminine. When she chanced upon the narrator, a few days after the funeral, her most buring question was if Theobald, dying, had asked for her (pp.297 and 491). Earlier she had remarked with complacency that "'One must take what comes and keep what one gets'" (pp.292 and 480).

108 As she told the narrator (1873) during her second meeting with him, "'And he's not always amusing, poor man!* He sits sometimes for an hour without speaking a word, or else he talks away, without stopping, on*art and nature, and beauty and duty, and*fifty fine things that are all so much Latin to me'" (p.292).*—The only important changes in 1908 were "poor man" to "poveretto," "on" and "and" to "about" (p.479).

109 pp. 287 and 468.

way to learn it was to take it for granted."[113] Serafina's reference to Theobald as "'a friend who's less than a lover'"[114] of course gave the American the opportunity to wonder of the Italian artist,"Was he less than a lover?"[115] Meanwhile in early editions this "individual of the male sex" "preserved an impenetrable smile," but in the New York Edition he "continued to smirk in a mystifying manner."[116] And to his remark, later, that Theobald "'admires the Signora Serafina, but he wouldn't admire me'" was added, "'whom he doesn't take for Saint Joseph!'"[117]

---

110 1873, pp. 287. In 1908, the most "discreet" of lovers (p.468). Two slight changes in the scene in which the narrator first saw Serafina made Theobald, without any impropriety, seem both more intimate and more reverential towards Serafina. "Theobald stepped forward, took her hand and kissed it." was changed to "He stepped nearer...." And a reference to his "bending towards her" became "bending to her" (pp.286-465, ibid.).

111 pp. 290 and 476.

112 pp. 290-476. To make the meaning more clear, and to show more strongly her momentary loss of poise at being thus surprised, James changed "I had recalled her prudence," first to "had stimulated" it, later to "had made her prudent" (1873, 1875, 1908: pp. 291;307;476). And in introducing the two men she at first gave "a smile which was almost amiable" but later "a smile that had turned to the gracious" (pp.291-476). There may be some innuendo in her being called, instead of a "mysterious" hostess, an "ambiguous" one (pp.291-476).

113 pp. 291 and 476. And yet Serafina is not wholly unversacious in her protest (1873) to the narrator: "'I never deceived him. Who put it into his head that I was made to live on holy thoughts and fine phrases? It was his own fancy,*and it pleased him to think so '" (pp.296-297).(*- Unchanged in 1908, except for the replacement of "fancy" by "imagination," p.491.)

114 Perhaps to avoid a cliché James changed the rest of it—"'and more than a friend— '" to "'yet more than a brother'" (pp.292-480).

115 pp. 292 and 480.

116 pp. 292-480.

117 Ibid.

The Italian artist—the "jaunty Juvenal of the chimney-piece," James calls him—[118] was put into more striking contrast with Theobald in the New York Edition, where his cynicism and vulgarity—unrelieved by euphemistic diction—are shown with added clarity and force. His "little groups" (italics mine)

1872	1908
consisted each of a cat and a monkey, fantastically draped, in some preposterously sentimental conjunction. They...illustrated...gallantry and coquetry...they...were at once very perfect cats and monkeys and very natural men and women.	consisted each, with a vengeance, of a cat and monkey, occasionally draped, in some preposterously sentimental conjunction. They...illustrated...the amorous advance and the amorous alarm...they ...were at once very dreadful little beasts and very natural men and women.[119]

They provided, the artist felt, a philosophic, albeit satiric, presentation of life: "'Cats and monkeys,—monkeys and cats,—all human life is there!'"[120] How different from the idealism of Theobald! But of course the "cats and monkeys" craftsman is all that Theobald is not. He is successful financially, since skillful with his hands albeit gross in his conceptions. He is an artisan who will and does work—he even executes the ideas of others. Lastly, he is an artist who has for a mistress the "divine Serafina,"[121] worshipped by Theobald, and thought of constantly by him as another Mary.

---

118 pp. 293 and 482.

119 pp. 293-482.

120 pp. 293 and 482. Later, in Rome, the narrator kept hearing this "fantastic, impertinent murmur" (in 1908, this "so impertinent and so cynical echo," pp.297-492), and while it is true that James ends the story by repeating the words of the cynical artist, surely they represent neither the theme of the story nor the sentiments of the author. Yet Stuart P. Sherman, in his zeal to prove that James was no democrat, misrepresents the "Cats and monkeys" quote, intimating that it expresses James's attitude ("The Aesthetic Idealism of Henry James," in The Question of Henry James, ed. F. W. Dupee,

New York, 1945, p. 72). Ford Madox Ford perhaps comes much nearer the mark in quoting the passage to show young James's disillusionment at Europe's morals (Henry James: A Critical Study, New York, 1916, pp. 139-140).

121 An interpretation not as deliberately unfair as Sherman's, but one coarse and insensitive enough is that of Osborn Andreas (Henry James and the Expanding Horizon: A Study of the Meaning and Basic Themes of James's Fiction, Seattle, 1948, p. 147) who writes that "Mr. Theobald...prepares and plans for so long a time to paint [the masterpiece] and to make love to the woman who is to be its subject...[that] By procrastination he makes of his life a monument to sexual and artistic impotence."

It is interesting that the story, as first written, had two episodes which may have pleased Sherman and Andreas: (1), a disagreeable ending, and (2), a more frank treatment of Serafina. The elder Henry James, writing to the novelist (then in Rome) on January 14, 1873, first expressed the family's admiration for "The Madonna." He continued: "But I have a story to tell. Mr. Howells couldn't agree to give twenty-five pages of one number of the magazine to it; that was positive. And then besides he had a decided shrinking from one episode--that in which Theobald tells of his love for, and his visit from, the Titian-ic beauty, and his subsequent disgust of her worthlessness, as being risky for the magazine; and then, moreover, he objected to the interview at the end between the writer and the old English neighbor, as rubbing into the reader what was sufficiently evident without it. On both the first and second points, we all thought that while Howells in general is too timid, there was good ground for his timidity in the present case. Both Mother and Alice shrank from both the episodes as not helping the understanding of the story along, and as being scary rather in themselves. Willy thought the second quite unnecessary and superfluous, and thought the first, if it had not been so much detailed but had been condensed into half a column, would perhaps do. But I thought they were both utterly uncalled for by the actual necessities of the tale, while they would both alike confer upon it a disagreeable, musky odour strikingly at war with its unworldly beauty. I went to Howells accordingly this morning, and told him that if he would consent to publish the whole tale in one piece, I would take upon me the responsibility of striking out the two episodes. He agreed, and he has made the connection of the parts perfect, so that no one would ever dream of anything stricken out. He promises me also to save the excluded pieces, and I will send them to you or keep them for you..." (F. O. Matthiessen, The James Family, New York, 1948, p. 122).

Throughout his career James kept working at improving diction by avoiding triteness and over-formality and by increasing accuracy and vividness. His constant attention to the careful choice of words may be seen in the revisions of "The Madonna," where such early favorites as "fancy" and "perceive" were changed, "fancy" eleven times and "perceive" four[122](not to mention the replacements that occur in passages quoted throughout this chapter). And he came apparently to regard as hackneyed or near-archaic such locutions as "slowly kindling eye," "an eye for contrasts," "her eye was bright," and "dropped her eye," for he changed them to "slow return of intelligence," "a sense for contrasts," "her brow was lighted," and "lowered her lids again."[123]

Even more interesting are the improvements made to diction dealing with awareness, or intelligence, of the characters in their reactions to each other;[124] in his later work, besides trying to eliminate weakness or indecisiveness, James attempted to gain a certain almost sensory quality of motion. No longer did his characters "observe" the faces of others; rather, they "took them in."[125] Less formally, too, the Italian artist, rather than "contemplate" the frolics of his monkeys, "followed" them,[126] and "impetus" became "push."[127] While it is true that the later James came more and more to qualify and re-qualify his statements, as a means to greater exactness and clarity, much of the qualification

122 "Perceive" replaced: pp. 287-466, 291-476, 294-484, 297-491. "Fancy" replaced: pp.277-440 (four times), 279-445, 280-446, 284-460, 285-461, 292-479 (twice), 296-490.

123 pp.294-485, 294-483, 296-490, 297-491.

124 Following his usual wont, James eliminated stage directions if they showed nothing of the manner of speaking or of the degree of awareness of the speaker (pp.279-444,285-458, 285-462, 292-479 [twice]).

125 pp.289-471 ("taken in").

he engaged in early in his career took the form of an over-use of the word "seemed," which rendered ineffectual the statement that followed. When he re-examined and improved this tale, he habitually replaced "seemed" with the past tense of the verb or with some more positive term of awareness or perception, such as "struck."[126]

Figurative language received some of James's attention (although, again, not as much as one would expect). Sometimes a figure was expanded, sometimes one was introduced, to replace the earlier literal statement. While images involving water always were characteristic of James, revisions of "The Madonna" show how he improved them, or inserted them. Theobald, for example, no longer "plunged into the sea of metaphysics and floundered awhile in waters too deep for intellectual security" but "plunged" and "floundered" in "waters that were not for my breasting."[129] And the early "frank as he was intellectually" became the Jamesian "with all this overflow of opinion and gesture."[130] Metaphors of unexpected violence seemed to attract James: Theobald shivered "in this chilling blast of scepticism"; later, less poetically, he shivered and shook "his ears under this bucketful of cold water."[131]

---

126 pp. 293-483 ("follow").

127 pp. 290-475.

128 "Seemed" to "struck": pp.289-472, 293-482, 280-448 ("was to strike me"). "Seemed to glow" became "glowed" (pp.295-487). Instead of saying, when Theobald realised that Serafina was old, that his "sense of wasted time, of vanished opportunity, seemed to roll in upon his soul in waves of darkness," the narrator said that they "surged in" (pp.290-473). Another replacement was "affected me as" (pp.286-465). See also pp.295-487, 288-469, for "seemed" to "was." The qualifying "a sort of" was omitted at least seven times, as early as 1879 (pp.286-15, 296-21, 268-3, 298-24, 275-7, 276-8, 293-19).

129 pp.279-446

130 pp.283-456.

131 pp.281-451.

Critics of the Rebecca West variety have failed to note that commonplace imagery definitely had a place in James's scheme if it replaced literal statement[132] or if it helped the realism of the dialogue. Instead of "asking no impertinent questions" of Theobald, the narrator tried never to seem "to cross a certain line with him,"[133] and when invited to see Serafina ("'A beauty with a soul!'") he at first answered "'I shall rejoice to witness the conjunction.'" but later "'...you do keep your cards up your sleeve.'"[134]

In addition to eliminating hackneyed diction, and improving and adding imagery, James by revision neared psychological accuracy and truthfulness in so far as his handling of emotion was concerned. Granted that Theobald, under stress of great emotion, no longer "tapped" but now "smote" his forehead;[135] there was generally an emotional toning down in the s tory, marked by the replacement (sometimes in 1879) of such words as "picturesque" and "romantic,"[136] "fantasy" and its derivatives,[137] "extraordinary," "excessively," "prodigiously," "masterly," and "phenomenon."[138] Actions too were toned down: when Theobald was about to introduce the narrator to

132 "A withered crone" is rather trite, but more easily visualized than "an old woman," the term it replaced (pp.294-484).

133 pp. 283-457.

134 pp.286-464. The revision also is more friendly, less sarcastic.

135 pp. 290-474.

136 pp. 277-439, 296-490.

137 Twice in 1879 (pp.266-4, 270-9) and twice in 1908 (pp.293-481, 297-492).

138 pp.295-488; 296-490; 283-455; 285-461; 276-437.* Of these, "prodigiously" was removed in 1879, replaced by "remarkable" (pp.283-25).

Serafina, instead of flinging open the door, he merely opened it.[139] Yet the revision probably will elicit more reader sympathy than an earlier version, since in it the emotions are treated more honestly than before and since here the artist is more worthy of sympathy.[140] Frequently the 1908 edition's appeal to the reader is direct: in the framework device at the start, the "little picture" that stimulated the telling of the tale became the "precious object in circulation,"[141] and the men who heard the story, from a "listening circle" became "under the spell."[142] In order to show more accurately the emotions that Florence stirred in the two Americans—their sensitivity and appreciation—James changed "we roamed slowly about" to "we roamed far and wide,"[143] and, realizing the importance of specific place setting in the "Madonna," changed "the river" to "the Arno."[144]

139 pp. 286-465. And once James achieved suspense in a revision concerning the opening of a door. When the narrator is about to discover Serafina breakfasting with the Italian artist, James wrote not that he "entered" the room but that he "reached" it (pp.306-455).

140 In addition to several instances already cited, there is this passage, which James made more kind: "If my friend [Theobald] was not a genius, he was certainly a monomaniac; and I found as great a fascination in watching the odd lights and shades of his character as if he had been a creature from another planet." The revised version (italics mine, in both): "If my friend was not a genius he was certainly a natural rhapsodist, or even a harmless madman; and I found the play of his temper, his humour and his candid and unworldly character as quaint as if he had been a creature from another planet" (pp.283-455-456). See note 57.

141 pp. 276-437. 142 pp.276-438.

143 pp. 277-442.

144 pp. 290-475. Even such a minor change as that of "a little crimson velvet smoking cap" to "one of the loose velvet caps affected by sculptors in damp studios" adds atmosphere and suggestiveness to the story (pp.291-477). Similarly, "brilliant slippers" to "bright 'worked' slippers" (ibid.).

Not only did he substitute less specific words for "barouche" and "phaeton," which if kept would have dated the tale;[145] James also did away with terms that (like "fancy") he came to regard—if not as archaic—at least as trite,[146] or over-formal or unnatural. More colloquial, natural or modern diction replaced (sometimes as early as 1879) the original "observed," "happy judgment," "behold," "denote," "contemplate," "expatiated," "deeply versed in," "broad and pure," "fatal mediocrity," "the lovely city," "to seek a physician," "'...has he been thus?'" "visage," "parlor," "brethren of his craft," "propitious to lingering repose," and "delivered... persuasive allocution."[147]

145 For "barouche and phaeton," the term "open carriages" was used (pp.290-475); and once "carriage" was replaced by the less specific "vehicle" (pp.295-480).

James may have felt in 1908 that the word "tunic" was used only infrequently. In any event, "a sort of black velvet tunic" was (New York Edition) "some fashion of black" (pp.277-439). One is reminded of James's change of "lounging gownsmen" to "acquaintances" (A Passionate Pilgrim, pp.108-420).

146 "Flavor" and "woo" are terms that James, even early in his career, came to dislike. In 1908, conversation once had not "flavor" but "pitch" (pp.284-458). In 1879 Theobald had perceived not the "genial flavor" but the "savor" of the narrator's sarcasm; in 1908 the idea was expressed differently (without the term "perceiving") for he "saw that I was but sowing the false to reap the true" (pp.281-450). Using figurative language of the same general category, James changed "cream of the gallery" to "flower of the array" (pp.279-445) and "woo the ideal" to "cultivate the ideal" (pp.281-450).

One recalls that in A Passionate Pilgrim, the terms "woo," and "flavor," (and "flatter," and "tickle,") used in contexts of sensitivity or appreciation, were changed.

147 1875, 1908: pp.263-437 (and 291-463, 301-471, 312-481), 274-446, 305-475, 295-466, 293-464, 270-443, ibid., 280-452, 263-437*, 270-271 -443, 320-488, 321-488, 273-445-446 (and 323-490), 286-458,* 273-445, 291-462, 313-482.*-Two terms, "fatal mediocrity" and "parlor," were replaced as early as 1879 (pp.1,28). The "persuasive allocution" of 1875 had been "seductive" in 1873 (p.293).

Finally, James the revisionist replaced vague pronouns,[148] corrected his usage of "beside - besides" (in 1879)[149] and "like - as,"[150] as well as faulty—or at least questionable—agreement (once in 1879),[151] and rewrote passages that were either ambiguous, awkward, or illogical:

1875	1879
...Mrs. Coventry, whom I found...waiting at her carriage door at the gate of the cemetery.	...Mrs. Coventry, whom I found...waiting in her carriage at the gate of the cemetery.[152]
1875	1908
huge miniature copy of the Madonna della Seggiola	huge, if reduced, copy...[153]
1875	1908
"'in the cunning of an eye and hand'"	"...an eye and a hand"[154]
1875	1908
as [because?] I hesitated whether to enter, a ... maid came...out	while I hesitated to enter...[155]
1875	1879
My return was delayed, through the absence of the English physician on a round of visits, and my vainly pursuing him from house to house before I overtook him.	My return was delayed through the absence of the English physician, who was away on a round of visits and whom I vainly pursued from house to house before I overtook him.[156]
1875	1908
But before we left the Mantegna, he pressed my arm and gave it a loving look.	Before we left the Mantegna, however, I felt him squeeze me and give it a loving look.[157]

---

148 For instance, "'it'" became "'what I show you'" (pp. 286-464).

149 In 1875 Serafina exclaims "'He has given me many things beside!'"and the narrator asks "'...doesn't it occur to you that beside being strong in his genius, Raphael...?'" In 1879, "besides" was used (pp.299-43, 279-20).

150 The reference to Serafina as an "'enchantress who had made twenty years pass like a twelvemonth'" was changed: "'pass as a twelvemonth [passes]'" (pp.290-475).

151 "The black and yellow marbles of the church facade, seamed and cracked with time and wind-sown with a tender flore of

Although the interim editions of the "Madonna" illustrate only slightly James's steady improvement in characterisation and dramatisation, they do reveal his constant efforts for simplicity, consistency, and correctness of style, punctuation, and mechanics. They show, too, that (whatever the reason) the years roughly between Roderick Hudson (1875) and The Portrait of a Lady (1881) constitute a "formal period," at least in the use of subject-verb contractions. A comparison of (generally) the first (1873) and the definitive (1908) editions of the "Madonna" reveals how James expanded, changed, or added figurative language, frequently (for realism and naturalness) employing commonplace images. He made improvements to the diction of awareness, and he eliminated diction that was trite, over-emotional, formal, or dated, while at the same time increasing both accuracy and vividness.

---

its own" was made to read "marbles of the...facade...Wind-sown with a...flora of their own." (pp.285-463). And the verb became plural in "The poise and carriage of her head was admirably free and noble..." (1875, 1879: pp.295-39).

152 pp.322-70.

153 pp.286-458.

154 pp.279-451.

155 pp.306-475.

156 pp.321-69.

157 pp.273-446. James evidently felt that this was not a misplaced modifier:

1873	1908
"...fetched a couple of candles from the mantlepiece, which he placed, lighted, on the table" (p.287. In 1875, no commas around "lighted.")	"...addressed himself to a couple of candles on the mantelpiece, which he lighted and transferred to the table" (p.467).

It seems to me glib and superficial to classify James's more important revisions as revisions of "form" or "style."[158] James in 1873 told a story; in 1908 he told it again, and, like any mature storyteller, told it better than he had done years before. The "Madonna" is a story in which suspense and foreboding play a vital part—in 1908 James heightened them. It is a story too that presents both sides of a question ("meditation" and "creation")—again, more fully in 1908. Although the narrator takes the side opposite that of the central character, the story to succeed must present the central character sympathetically; the 1908 version pictures Theobald in a more appealing light than before, and elicits more pathos. Finally, the "Madonna" is an ironic story. For the New York Edition, James strengthened the contrast of the two Serafinas—the real one (viewed so remorselessly by the narrator) and the one created by the idealization of Theobald. At the same time James made richer the texture of the story and increased the irony in yet another way when he underscored the striking contrast between Theobald and the successful Italian artisan, intimate friend of the "Madonna Serafina."

158 Lyon N. Richardson was correct in saying that "the revised form (of the "Madonna") occasionally reflects more the character of James and loses some of its anonymity of style" and in praising the "highly personal idiom" and the "mature style (which) has a beauty of its own and springs naturally from his manner of thought, conveying in all its tones his own sense of things" (Henry James: Representative Selections, New York, 1941, pp.lx-lxi). Professor Richardson was prevented by limitations of space from discussing the revisions that improved the "Madonna" as a story.

Dr. Lucas ("Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories"—see notes 5,12,20,35) treated the revisions of the "Madonna" at some length, classifying them all under the rather sweeping headings of "form" or "style." He found only sixteen "rewordings or rephrasings" that "clarify or intensify the tale itself" and four that made for "accuracy of fact and characterisation" (p.22). In some revisions that improved characterisation

he detected only "sharper specification and clearer meaning" (p.23). He felt it adequate to give only four illustrations of revisions that caused character reactions to be "clarified and amplified": (1) the satirical quality of Mrs. Coventry; (2) Theobald's opinion of Serafina's sweetness; (3) Serafina's gesture ridiculing Theobald; (4) Serafina's proximity at breakfast to the Italian artist (p.25). And, in summary, he listed the eight goals of James in revising the "Madonna": uniformity, contemporaneity, accuracy, consistency, clarity, intensity, variety, vitality (p.26). These were among the goals of James in revising, but he had others—especially characterization, dramatization, and irony.

CHAPTER IV

THE REVISIONS OF MADAME DE MAUVES

Madame de Mauves first appeared in the Galaxy early in 1874;[1] in the decade that followed it was reprinted three times in revised form (1875, 1879, 1883)[2] and once (1880) unrevised.[3] Among these early revisions one finds the usual miscellany of alterations in mechanics: the hyphen was rather consistently inserted;[4] capitals and abbreviations were altered, for accuracy and uniformity;[5] generally, italics were dropped from foreign terms, especially in 1875.[6] There were also many minor changes in punctuation,[7] and even a few in paragraphing,[8] made for the editions of 1875, 1879, and 1883.

1 The Galaxy, XVII (February, March 1874), 216-233, 354-374.

2 A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales (Boston, 1875), pp. 365-495. See Chapter II, note 5.
The Madonna of the Future, and Other Tales (London, 1879), I, 150-280. See Chapter III, note 3, paragraph 2.
The Siege of London, Madame de Mauves (London, 1883), pp. 105-197.

3 The Madonna of the Future, and Other Tales (London, 1880), pp. 110-195. See Chapter III, note 3, paragraph 3.

4 But see Chapter III, paragraph 3, and notes 12-19, for what appears to be the opposite trend in the revision of "The Madonna of the Future."
In the 1875 edition, these terms, originally written as two words, were hyphenated: "six-o'clock," "fellow-countryman," "love-notes," "self-effacement," "night-wind," "gas-lamps," "small-talk."
In the 1879 edition, these terms, heretofore written as two words, were hyphenated: "good-night," "theatre-door," "garden-wall," "lamb-chops," "side-dishes," (in the) "long-run," "wine-stain," "bread-crumbs."

In the 1875 edition, these terms, originally written as single words, were hyphenated: "school-boy," "eye-glass," "house-tops."

In the 1879 edition, these terms, heretofore written as single words, were hyphenated: "re-assuring," "re-admitted,""re-directed," "over-estimated," "pre-occupation."

In the 1883 edition, these terms, heretofore written as single words, were hyphenated: "now-a-days," "arm-hole," "re-arranged," "re-appearing."

There were of course a few inconsistencies: "two-thirds" (1874), "two thirds" (1875), "two-thirds" (1879); "garden wall" (1875), "garden-wall" (1879), "garden wall" (1883); "dead weight" (1874), "dead-weight" (1875, 1879) "dead weight" (1883); "common place" (1875), "common-place" (1879), "common place" (1883); "readmitted" (1875), "re-admitted" (1879), "readmitted" (1883); "wine-glass" (1874), "wine glass" (1875), "wineglass" (1879) "wine-glass" (1883). Besides these inconsistencies, there were a few terms which dropped rather than added the hyphen: in 1875, "bedtime" and "strongly flavored joy"; in 1879, "farmhouse"; in 1883, "heartache."

5 "Mademoiselle" and "Madame" both were written out (once) in 1875 (and "Madame" twice more in 1879). The story itself was originally Mme. de Mauves.

In 1874, "street" and "rue" were not capitalized, but in 1875 one reads "Wall Street" and "Rue Vivienne." In 1875 James dropped the capital from "the sibyl" but first used it for "the Fates," "Heaven," and "Puritannical." In 1879 he initiated it, perhaps unnecessarily, in "Ultramontane works of fiction," "a Legitimist vicomte," "an Abbe," "the Boulevard," and "He [God]."

6 In 1875 James dropped the use of italics for "bourgeoise," "bosquet," "fiancée," "escapade," "femmes d'esprit," "ennui," and "Viola!" In 1875 he only temporarily dropped them (replacing them in 1879) from "dévote," "tête à tête," and "sergeant de ville." Twice in 1879 James used italics to replace the earlier quotation marks for "a Murray's Belgium" and "the Figaro." (Only two accent marks were changed: "Thérèse" became in 1875 "Theresa," and "dévote" became in 1879 "devoté.")

7 In 1875, 19 commas were added and 18 omitted. In 1879, 32 were added and 31 omitted. In 1883, 56 were added and 26 omitted.

In 1875, 4 commas became semicolones, and a semicolon became a colon. In 1879, 3 commas became semicolons, 3 colons became semicolons, a semicolon became a comma, and a comma became a dash. In 1883, 3 semicolons became colons, 2 colons became semicolons, and a semicolon became a comma.

In 1875, a colon before dialogue became a period. In 1879, twice periods before a paragraph of dialogue became dashes, and a colon before dialogue became a dash. In 1883, a colon became a period before dialogue and a colon-dash became a dash.

In 1879, twice ~~before~~ a rather exotic use of dots (to indicate a dramatic pause)was eliminated. "...that she had told him.(....) His presence now...." "he should have pleased her! (....) He...." In both 1875 and 1879, 3 exclamations were added, and 1 omitted, in dialogue.

The only changes with much real significance are those that show the "formal" period mentioned in Chapter III. In the 1875 edition, for instance, 112 dashes (and two commas) became comma dashes [,-], but in 1879 in 110 instances (and in 1883, in 15) the comma dash was replaced by the simple dash. In the 1875 edition six times the original contracted form of the subject-verb was written out, but in 1879 in 107 instances the uncontracted form replaced the contracted one, generally in dialogue—thus then the "formal" period seems to be ending for the comma dash just as it reaches its peak for the uncontracted subject-verb. Occasionally in 1879 James inserted a word for purposes of parallelism or emphasis or rhythm,[9] and a few times added the perfect tense of the verb.[10] In each edition, earlier mistakes in proofreading were rectified, but new ones made.[11]

---

8 In 1875, twice 1 sentence was made into 2, and once 2 became 1. In 1879, 1 was made into 2 twice, 2 became 1 three times, and once, 1 sentence became 3.

In 1875, twice 2 paragraphs became 1, and in 1879, twice 1 paragraph became 2.

9 The italics are mine and indicate the word added in 1879: "He was...and he made...."; "of pity and anger, as well as of admiration"; "...was indisposed and was unable to see...."; "'I forgot that you are going.'" The latter replaced the unrhythmical "'I forgot you're going.'"

10 Thus, "The landlady's gossip cast no shadow on its [memory's] brightness" was made to read "had cast," and "...its historic glories were not established by..." became "had not been." James also used the historical present to have de Mauves say that "'a woman's first duty is to please....'" (italics mine.)

In 1875, "cattle yard" correctly became "castle yard," "hosts" correctly became "hostess," and a terminal period properly replaced a comma. "Hemling" became, later in the story, "Kemling," only because the error in the February Galaxy was rectified for the March issue. (In 1879, the incorrect "Hemling" was changed.) The Galaxy printer, incidentally, was not impeccable, for in its magazine appearance the story has two section VII's, so that "VIII" is really "IX."

11 Two errors made in printing the 1875 edition escaped correction in that of 1879. "Long more" became "Longmore" not

---

Madame de Mauves is twice as long as "The Madonna of the Future," but in the early revisions one finds more than twice as many changes, particularly in diction. The explanation is twofold: the later story is more intricate, with greater subtlety of characterization, and it had been less carefully polished before initial publication.

Several of the changes made for the editions of 1875 or 1879 improved clarity or accuracy, or relieved awkwardness. Thus, in referring to Richard de Mauves' hoped-for marriage with Euphemia Cleve, James in 1879 indicated not that the event was "suspended" but that it was "put off" (i.e., deferred).[12] Giving the grammarian no room to cavil, James (again, 1879) changed "the terrace gate" to "the gate of the terrace," used "an" before "historic," had a lane lead "into" rather than "to" the forest, used the subjunctive eight more times than before, replaced "for" by "on account of," and strove for consistency in his use of "towards," "afterwards," "further" and "farther." The inadvertently amusing statement that Longmore's heart was beating "so that [sic] he was sure his voice would show it" was rectified by the insertion of "fast"—it was (1879) beating "so fast that he was sure...."[13]

---

until 1883, and a terminal mark for "'They were femmes d'esprit.'" appeared not until 1883. But what was probably a printer's error was changed in 1879: "After a while she came out...and last [sic] introduced him" was made to read "...and at last...." Both the 1879 edition and the 1883 one made one fresh mistake. In 1879, in revising "a very few days reconciled her to his good looks, as [just as] they would have reconciled her to his ugliness" to "... looks, as effectually they would have...," the "as" was inadvertently omitted ["as effectually as"]. In 1883, "seem" incorrectly appeared as "seemed."

12 1875-1879: pp. 394-168.

13 1875-1879: pp. 471-258.

There are several words which James, by the late 1870's, had come to dislike, among them "a vast deal," "flavored," "placidly," "making (one's)bows to," and "flatter"—all were removed at least once for the 1879 edition of Madame de Mauves. (Two words that James was overly fond of at this time are "antique" [worshippers] and "primitive"[fibs].) In an effort at less stiff and more fresh diction, James in 1875 replaced "meagre" with "stinted," and "mild plea" with "humble plea"; for more emphasis (again, 1875) James changed "loathsome" to "detestable," "hated" to "abhorred," and "a kind of inspiring charge" (that Madame de Mauves had given Longmore) to "an inspiring commission." Striving for added urbanity and sophistication James wrote in 1875 not of "God's sunlight" but of "the process of the sun" and in 1879 not of a "cane," or "rigid courtesies," or "the talk," but of a "stick," "thin amenities," and "the tone of this conversation."

The prose is more idiomatic, the dialogue more natural, in succeeding editions. In 1875 the addition of a word (italics mine) improved the idiom: "the house of De Mauves," "an amenity," "'to think of you as angry.'" The change of preposition helped in 1879, when one is face to face not "to" a companion, but "with" him, and when there are passages not "in" human action, but "of" it. As for dialogue, Madame de Mauves, like A Passionate Pilgrim, reveals James's early mistaken fondness for "'Nay!'" (changed to "'Ah no!'"). The formal "'upon the history of'" became the less stiff "'on the subject of,'" and "'a dogged, clinging, inexpugnable conscience'" was toned down to one that was "'dogged, obstinate, [and] clinging.'" In the first two editions, Long-

more felt that Madame de Mauves did not "'care about the Dutch painters at all,'" but in 1879, that she did not care "'a button'" about them.[14]

Most important of all are those seemingly slight, but actually important, revisions by which the drama of situation is heightened or underscored. The reader experiences more empathy in 1879 than in 1875 when he reads not of the "indelicacy of the position in which [Longmore] was being forced"(italics mine) but of the position "in which he found himself."[15] And the young man is reacting more strongly when he "immediately stepped out on the terrace" (italics mine) than when he merely "stepped out."[16] During those times that Longmore was struggling to break away from Saint-Germain (home of the heroine) James, in the first two editions, too-conscientiously furnished detail that distracts the reader from the more important dramatic values: one learns that Longmore "packed his valise that evening," and, later in the story, that he "packed his trunk the next day with dogged heroism and wandered off to the terrace." But in 1879 only the important facts appear: that he "waited for the morrow" and that he "the next day wandered off."[17] Occasionally the change of a single letter alters the picture in the mind of the reader; M. de Mauves, in a worried state, in 1875 "resumed his restless walk, and at last stopped abruptly before his wife, who had taken up a book" but in 1879 he "at last stopped abruptly before" her.[18]

---

14 1875-1879: pp. 416-193.

15 1875-1879: pp. 452—235-236.

16 1875-1879: pp. 471-258.

17 1875-1879: pp. 432-212, 488-279.

18 1875-1879: pp. 491-282. See note 94.

Figurative language was improved in a few instances for the editions of 1875 and 1879. M. de Mauves, speaking of English writers, referred originally to the "gray veil" but more disparagingly in 1875 to the "brown fog" that they fling over the world.[19] Longmore initially feared that he could no more make Euphemia love him than he "could veil with a wish the starry sky he lay gazing at through his open window";[20] James probably felt that his readers had not been conditioned to so original an image, so, out of deference to convention, he changed it, using in 1875 the more familiar figure of transposing the constellations, and in 1879 the still more common one of pulling them down. Two later images made by James—of exposing a weak side, and of putting to flight—are so characteristic of him that personal preference probably dictated them,[21] but other changes were almost mandatory, among them the removal of the inappropriate word "masked" from a romantic, sentimental context. Longmore wondered if in Madame de

19 1874-1875: pp. 232-421.

20 1874: p. 369.

21 The awkward "M. de Mauves had more torruptions than a summer day's questioning of his conscience would have releassed him from" concluded in 1879 with "...would have put to flight" (pp. 366-158).

Madame de Mauves said (in 1875) that "'if I found a poor creature clinging to [a compromise] from day to day, I should think it poor friendship to make him lose his hold." One questions if James made any improvement by having her say (in 1879) that if she found "'a poor creature who had managed to invent [a compromise], I should think it questionable friendship to expose its weak side'" (pp.438-439--219-220).

The personal preference of James probably dictated his change of "a love that no offence could trample out" to one that "no outrage could stifle" (pp.480-270). Frequently James used images rather violent in nature.

Mauves there was "some precious memory which masked a shrinking hope"; the 1875 change, while not vastly better, is an improvement—by it the memory was one that "contained the germ of a shrinking hope.[22] Another change, made in 1879, pictures "jealousies and vanities" as "scrambling for precedence," which is better than the earlier "leading off the dance," with its disconcertingly pleasant connotations.[23] Finally, there was the image of Longmore, in a joyous moment, feeling as if something had been "knocked down across his path"; James made this, in 1879, something that had been "cleared out of his path."[24]

The characterisation of Richard de Mauves and of his sister, Madame Clairin, was improved in the first two revisions.[25] The Count had offered Longmore a "light-gloved hand" but in 1875 it was a "fair, plump" hand—somehow one dislikes him instinctively. When one learns that de Mauves wished Longmore to "amuse" his wife so that he could with equanimity continue his liaison in Paris, one actively dislikes him. More emphatically in 1879 than before, he derogated his wife to the young stranger, saying not that to his friends she is "'polite, but she's freezing,'" but that

22 1874-1875: pp. 370-481.

23 1875-1879: pp. 456-240.

24 1875-1879: Ibid.

25 James did little at this time to his original characterisation of Euphemia Cleve (in 1874, Clive) and her mother, except to picture the girl more attractively in 1875, when her "almost heavy gray eyes" became "almost languid" ones, and when she was a "sweet" rather than a "neat American girl." Madame de Mauves seems a bit older in 1875 by having been "placed for her education...in a Parisian convent" fourteen rather than twelve years before.

she is'"perfectly polite, but she is simply freezing.'" [26]
More shrewdly and coolly than before, he considered the possibilities offered by Longmore, meanwhile puffing his cigar, in 1874 "for a while" but in 1875 "reflectively."[27] And when Longmore, to his chagrin, rejected the insidious hint, de Mauves tried by flattery to persuade him to stay, adding in 1879 the remark about Longmore's being "'a man of the world.'"[28] The adverse opinions of both Longmore and Mrs. Draper (the confidante) were touched up in early revisions: he thought of de Mauves, ambiguously, originally as "amazing" but in 1875 as "annoying"; she wrote that "the poorest of us [Americans] have [1875] moral needs a Frenchman can't appreciate" but in 1879 more scornfully, "moral needs that the cleverest Frenchman is quite unable to appreciate."[29]

Madame Clairin is, if possible, even more of a de Mauves than her brother, and, spurred on by family pride, defends him unstintedly. Rather than sully the name, she scornfully (1879) calls Euphemia her "'sister-in-law.'"[30] And in contexts that deal with Richard, and his birthright as one of a long line of philanderers, the name itself is frequently dropped, causing a

26 1875-1879: pp.420-199.

27 1874-1875: pp. 232-420.

28 1875-1879: pp. 421-200. M. de Mauves, at receipt of the news that Longmore planned a trip to Brussels, exclaimed (1875), "'I'm very sorry.'" but (1879) "'I am so very sorry!'" (pp.419-197).

29 1875-1879: pp. 373-142.

30 James used this device again in later versions.

greater sense of family and of age. Her avowal that "'The De Mauves are real Frenchmen....' became "'Our men have been real Frenchmen....'"[31] Her "'A De Mauves must be a DeMauves'" was made into "'A De Mauves must be of the old race.'"[32] Finally (and here she inadvertently held the mirror up to herself) she said that Richard would not "'be a DeMauves,'" but in 1879 that he wouldn't "'be my brother'"[33] if he were not wildly in love with the lady in Paris.

The attitude of the de Mauves toward philandering caused Longmore to feel intense sympathy for Madame de Mauves. In 1875 he thought of her "burden" as her "tribulation," and of her "intense grief" as her "constant sorrow," which term gives a more stoical and long-suffering quality to her sadness. Instead of "such a depth of unconquerable sadness" in her eyes, in 1879 he saw there "such an unfathomable sadness."[34] As is so frequently the case in James, however, some of the diction of emotion or sentiment was toned down. Madame de Mauves struck Longmore in 1879 not as an "appealing" but as an "interesting" figure, and one to whom his presence might cause not "suffering" but "annoyance." Still, one feels that Longmore is more sentimentally drawn to her when it is her "loneliness" (1879) rather

31 1875-1879: pp.448-231. In 1875 and 1879, James used "De Mauves" to show pride in family.

32 1875-1879: pp.449-232. It had probably once been a wealthy family. The "'Chateau de Mauves'" of 1875 became "'our house in Auvergne,'" with the implication that they had several (pp.446-231).

33 1875-1879: pp.452-236.

34 1875-1879: pp.432-213.

n her "moral isolation" that attracts him.[35]

Madame de Mauves wishes her fellow-American to leave before they get more deeply involved emotionally (although the reader never senses any fear on her part that she will debase herself, and play Richard's game). She desires that Longmore "'waste no more time at Saint-Germain.'" Her hope in 1879 is not that he will "'consider' this "'advice'" but that he will "'act upon'" it.[36] In a later interview with her (had he acted upon her advice immediately there would have been no story) he objects more spiritedly than before to her stoicism,[37] but following a still-later

35 The term "moral isolation" is, however, very apt. James made this change twice (pp. 435-216, 437-217).

36 1875-1879: pp. 417-195. Mr. Osborn Andreas offers the following explanation and comment, to which I cannot subscribe: "In Madame De Mauves (1875) James again emphasizes the essential immorality of any attempt to order other people's lives for them. Euphemia Cleve, after she had suffered for four or five years from her husband's neglect and infidelities, falls in love with Longmore and he with her. The affair is progressing nicely and the two would have become lovers had not Euphemia's husband, Richard de Mauves, and his sister, Marie, losing patience at the slowness with which the situation was developing, fatally taken it upon themselves to explicitly urge the enamoured pair to go ahead and have an affair. This violation of her personal and private independence of decision, this public notice taken of a personal matter so offends Euphemia that she dismisses Longmore, the one man who could have made her happy. The source of this tragedy was Richard's and Marie's lack of delicacy, their want of genuine regard for Euphemia's and Longmore's feelings" (Henry James and the Expanding Horizon: A Study of the Meaning and Basic Themes of James's Fiction, Seattle, 1948, p. 24).
It seems to me that the two would never have become lovers, even had Euphemia been permitted a "personal and private independence of decision." Neither Longmore nor any other man could have made her happy, once her lawful husband had failed to do so. Euphemia would never cheapen herself in a search for happiness.

37 Referring to the way in which she accepted her situation with de Mauves, he told her in 1875, "'You're killing yourself with stoicism,—that's my belief.'" In 1879, more strongly, "'...that is what is the matter with you!'" (pp.435-215).

talk with her, when she again appealed to him to leave gracefully, he felt (1875) that "It was living keenly to stand there with a petition from such a woman to revolve." James changed this sentence, eliminating its awkward, flat ending, by writing in 1879 that "It was living keenly to stand there with such a request from such a woman ringing in one's ears."[38]

II

The revisions made by James for the 1883 edition of Madame de Mauves are relatively unimportant, but those for the New York Edition, a quarter of a century later, are of course extensive, and demand our careful attention. (Unless otherwise indicated, all succeeding references will be to the editions of 1883 and 1908.)[39]

Mrs. Cleve, mother of Euphemia, was largely responsible for the girl's marrying Count de Mauves, for, being "fonder of Homburg and Nice than of letting out tucks in the frocks of a vigorously growing daughter,"[40] she put Euphemia in a Parisian convent school, where the impressionable girl, believing as she did that "the best birth is the guarantee of an ideal delicacy of feeling,"[41] cherished romantic dreams of marrying a nobleman. James delighted in

38 1875-1879: pp. 481-271.

39 The Siege of London, Madame de Mauves (London, 1883), pp.105-197. The Novels and Tales of Henry James (New York, 1908), XIII, 219-330.

40 1883 and 1908: pp.113-114 and 224. Unless otherwise indicated, succeeding footnotes will be to these editions.

41 1883: p. 114. James, however, carefully kept morality above imagination. The girl's "good faith," at first accounted for by the "purity of her imagination," later was laid to the "purity of her moral vision" (pp.114-224). (James was not, it should be

expanding, for the added irony he obtained, Euphemia's naively high estimates of "the best birth." The passage quoted above flowered into her belief that "the enjoyment of inherited and transmitted consideration, consideration attached to the fact of birth, would be the direct guarantee of an ideal delicacy of feeling. She supposed it would be found that the state of being noble does actually enforce the famous obligation."[42] Again ironically, James enlarged Euphemia's conviction that "the consequence of a picturesque family tradition imparts an exquisite tone to the character," giving her in 1908 the belief that "enjoyment of a chance to carry further a family chronicle begun ever so far back must be, as a consciousness, a source of the most beautiful impulses."[43] Just how "beautiful" the "impulses" of the nobility are, the reader may judge for himself when he sees Marie de Mauves (later Madame Clairin) invite her schoolmate home for a visit, ostensibly to see the _castel_, actually to meet the impecunious Richard.[44]

---

added, so moral as to become humorless. Euphemia's insistence that this noblemen's "blood should be of the very finest strain" became her determination that "he should have 'race' in a state as documented as it was possible to have it" [pp.115-226].)

42 1908: p. 224

43 pp.114-225. Besides enlarging on what he meant by "family tradition" James was able to avoid use of a word which had long since become anathema to him, the word "picturesque."

44 The friendship of these two convent school girls was (1883) "based on their points of difference," but (1908) "founded on the perception—all [Euphemia's] own—that their differences were just the right ones" (pp.115-226). Their relationship was marked by (1883) the "sisterly patronage" of Marie, but (1908) the "spell" she cast over Euphemia (pp.117-227). The _castel_ was grander in the final edition, when Euphemia stayed not in a "little turret chamber" but in a "massive" one (pp.124-238).

At the castel Euphemia Cleve did meet Richard. She met also his grandmother, Old Madame de Mauves; although a deep attachment sprang up between the two, they never could understand each other. In trying to show adequately this lack of understanding, James relied strongly on figurative language, attempting to impress on the reader by images how new an experience the young American was to the old European. The first such change was that of a museum-piece figure: old Madame de Mauves instead of blinking at the girl tenderly "from under her spectacles" looked at her "from behind an immense face-a-main that acted as for the relegation of the girl herself to the glass case of a museum."[45] In keeping with this change was the one that involved not the (human) voice of Euphemia's conscience but the (mechanical) key of her conscience: in the New York Edition she felt that the girl had been "'wound up by some key that isn't kept by your governess or your confessor or even your mother, but that you wear by a fine black ribbon round your neck.'"[46] The grandmother had taken such a liking to this strange young creature that, despite the family's straitened condition and Euphemia's wealth, she had tried to dissuade Richard from his campaign of marriage. Realizing, eventually, that he would win the girl's hand, and still failing to understand the moral code of Americans, Old Madame de Mauves tried to advise the future Madame de Mauves to adopt the Continental code of morality.

45 pp.119-229.

46 1908: p. 229. In 1883 she had felt that the girl listened "'to the murmur of your young spirit, rather than to the voice from behind the confessional or to the whisper of opportunity'" (p.119).

In tendering this advice, she continued the figure of the key: "'If you wish to live at ease in the doux pays de France don't trouble too much about the key of your conscience or even your conscience itself—I mean your own particular one.'"[47]

Old Madame de Mauves finally came to the realization that Euphemia simply did not understand her, so (since she could not dissuade Richard)[48] she took what was perhaps the only course left open to her—she retracted her earlier counsel to the girl, now encouraging her to remain her sweet, sturdy, naive self, "'to forget the worldly rubbish...about frivolous women being happy.'"[49] The reader finds it difficult to believe that this worldly-wise old woman actually did expect Richard to render "justice" to the purity of Euphemia, yet if her words are

47 1908: p. 229. In 1883 she had advised her, "'If you expect to live in France, and you wish to be happy, don't listen too hard to that little voice [the murmur of her young spirit] I just spoke of—the voice that is neither the curé's nor the world's'" (p.119).

48 Nor was there any chance that Euphemia would be dissuaded. With her teen-ager's infatuation, she could not know the true value of de Mauves. And so romantic were the visions that she conjured up while at the convent school that the courtship was scarcely any campaign at all. She regarded her mother pityingly since Mrs. Cleve could not appreciate him— "the Baron's type was one which it took some mystical illumination to appreciate" in 1883, and in 1908 "her lover's type [was] an historic, a social masterpiece..." (pp.127-241). The mother imposed a two year waiting period, hoping in vain that the daughter's "mystical illumination" might dim. In his last sight of her before the waiting period the Count's confidence was bolstered by (1883) the "mute assurance of her eyes" and (1908) the "mute assurance of her pale face" (pp.128-243).

49 pp. 125-239. In 1908, "'the happiness of frivolous women.'"

taken as mere whistlings in the dark, irony and foreboding are gained, and if they strike a responsive chord in the reader, suspense is heightened:

1883	1908
"Whatever befalls you, promise me this: to be yourself. The Baronne de Mauves will be none the worse for it. Yourself, understand, in spite of everything—bad precepts, and bad examples, and usage, even. Be persistently and patiently yourself, and a De Mauves will do you justice!"	"Whatever befalls you, promise me this: to be, to remain, your own sincere little self only, charming in your own serious little way. The Comtesse de Mauves will be none the worse for it. Your brave little self, understand, in spite of everything—bad precepts and bad examples, bad fortune and even bad usage. Be persistently and patiently just what the good God has made you, and even one of us—and one of those who is most what we <u>are</u>—will do you justice!" 50

The plight and the sorrow of Madame de Mauves are described more aptly, than before in the New York Edition. Mrs. Draper, writing to Longmore, had called her case "'the miserable story of an American girl, born to be neither a slave nor a toy, marrying a profligate Frenchman, who believes that a woman must be one or the other,'" but the final version of this passage is less direct and in better taste. In it the American girl, "'born neither to submit basely nor to rebel crookedly,'" marries a "'shining sinful Frenchman.'"[51] (Her repeated refusals either to "submit

50 pp. 125--239-240.

51 pp. 112-222. More strongly, and showing James's fondness for "blighted," Mrs. Draper wrote "'I told you that she was unhappy,'" but later "'I spoke to you of her rather blighted state'" (<u>ibid.</u>).

basely" or to "rebel crookedly" make up the story. Mrs. Draper does not want Madame de Mauves to do either: she encouraged Longmore, "'Make her smile with a good conscience.'" and later, "'make her want to forget; make her like you.'")[52]

Madame de Mauves was not the type who would enjoy showing her pain. Using a rather unfortunate term, James pictured her as having "none of the coquetry of unhappiness," but later, relieved of the questionable benefit of the term "coquetry," she had "none of the conscious graces of the woman wronged."[53] In the final version, one no longer reads that "her earnest wish was to forget" her sorrow, but that "her most earnest wish was to remember it as little as possible"[54]— with so much sorrow, not all of it can be forgotten. Longmore interpreted the occasional quaver in her voice as "the sudden weariness of a spirit self-condemned to play a part" but (1908) as "the sudden weariness, the controlled convulsion"[55] of such a spirit. To him, "It seemed one of fortune's most mocking strokes that she should be surrounded by persons whose only merit was that they threw the charm of her character into radiant relief." James made this into a memorable image when he wrote for the New York Edition that those who surrounded her "threw every side of her, as she turned in her pain, into radiant relief."[56]

The stoicism of Madame de Mauves, her refusal to complain, was the source of much of her appeal to Longmore. Instead of referring to her "deep reserve of sorrow," James wrote of her "policy of

52 pp. 113-222.

53 pp. 129-245.

54 Ibid.

55 pp. 141-260.

56 pp. 135-253.

silence," and replaced "that passionate love of peace of which she had spoken" by "the passionate love of peace ruling her above all things else."[57] More figuratively and more accurately it was not her "gentle stoicism" but "the snow of the high cold stoicism" that "touched him to the heart."[58]

Although he knew it to be "gross" and "impertinent"[59] to watch her in her pain, and that she preferred to be left alone, Longmore stayed on. Frequently by revealing searchingly the young man's reactions, James shows him as more strongly "touched to the heart." For example (when she tried bravely to joke about her sorrow) "There was something delightfully gentle to him in her tone, and its softness seemed to deepen as she continued." was changed to "There was something that deeply touched him in her tone, and this quality pierced farther as she continued."[60] More passionately than before, he told her that he felt (1908) "'helpless and sore'"[61] about her, spoke not of "'a kind of rage'" but of the "'vain rage'" to which he had been aroused by the knowledge that the world was not good enough for her, and admitted having sensed not "'something that I have believed to be a constant sorrow'" but "'some trouble...that I've permitted myself to hate and resent.'"[62]

57 pp. 131-247, 152-275.

58 pp. 133-352.

59 In 1883 it was "impertinent" and "indelicate" to make "a daily study of such a shrinking grief," but in 1908 "it was impertinent; it was gross to keep tugging at the cover of a book so intentionally closed" (pp. 133-252). James not infrequently would sacrifice alliteration for figurative language.

60 pp. 140-141--259.

61 He cared for nothing (1883) as long as there was that "'depth of unconquerable sadness in [her] eye'" but cared for nothing (1908) as long as "'I only feel helpless and sore about you'" (pp. 152-275).

62 pp. 153-277, 140-259.

Although James revised only slightly to show Madame de Mauves reacting more strongly to Longmore (typical is her "candid interest...in his affairs," which became an "immediate interest"[63] in them), he a few times heightened the sense of their physical nearness.[64] Once instead of turning and looking at her, Longmore "inclined himself to her"; in the scene of final parting, instead of disengaging her hand, she "disengaged herself."[65]

---

63 pp. 139-258. Once she was made less formal in describing her happiness when in his presence. She told him (1883), "'It need not disturb you, Mr. Longmore, for I have often found myself in your company a very contented person.'" In 1908, "'It needn't disturb you, my dear sir, 'she wound up with a certain quaintness of gaiety,' for I've often found myself in your company contented enough and diverted enough'" (pp. 141-260).

64 In keeping with this, a greater sense of the privacy of their talks is gained when she shows him not "a little gate in the garden wall" but "a private gate in the high wall" (pp. 128-244).

65 pp. 152-275, 192-326. See notes 146 and 173.

As an "international nouvelle" then, Madame de Mauves, by the benefit of revision, presents with increased irony the young American girl's estimates of the "ideal delicacy of feeling" which the "best [French] birth" guaranteed, and shows more clearly than before the inability of the old Frenchwoman to understand this strange young foreigner. As a nouvelle of characterization, leaving in abeyance its international side, the revised version elicits added reader sympathy and respect for the heroine, who accepts more stoically her greater pain, and who is more appealing to an old, worly-wise woman and a young, idealistic man. To the antagonist of his story (the philandering French husband of his international nouvelle), James in revision gave particular attention; the definitive characterization of M. de Mauves[66] rendered him more reprehensible than ever and thereby furnished Madame de Mauves greater cause to seek consolation in the adoration of Longmore; since she remained adamant, the extent of the moral triumph is increased.

Less cosmopolitan now, de Mauves spoke only "fair" rather than "very fair English."[67] In the eyes of James, certainly, his taste and his moral sense sank still more, for (1908) he enjoyed Baudelaire,[68] whose view of evil (James had written in 1877) was so "almost ludicrously puerile" that the poet in order to be "effectively inspired" needed "stinking corpses and starving prostitutes and empty laudenum bottles."[69] More accurate

66 Physically, he is two years younger—thirty-three rather than thirty-five at the time of his marriage (Euphemia was seventeen) (pp.120-232). In what seems to be an inevitable change with James, his moustache is described in different terms—his face (1883) "was adorned by a fantastically pointed moustache"; in 1908 (it was dusk) his face "mainly presented to view the large

and revealing terms were used in the description of his courtship of young Euphemia, so that he is seen to be drawn to her by elemental physical attraction, and the consideration he tenders her shows itself as plainly based upon mere expediency (thus his "gallant consideration" becomes the "deliacy he practised").[70] Watching her from behind his Figaro he had "admired and held his tongue" but now he "admired and desired...."[71] Her innocence, which had struck him as the "most charming stage of [young women's] development" now seemed the "most potent source of their attraction"; no longer did this innocence inspire him "with profound respect"--quite a different matter, it "moved him to perfect consideration."[72]

Mrs. Cleve was not the only one who saw him for what he really was (in 1908, "a presumptuous and penniless Frenchman").[73] His sister roundly declared that he had no conscience, and his grandmother, being aware as she was (1883) that to him women were like "the light gloves one soils in an evening and throws away."[74]

---

outward twist of its moustache" (pp. 111-220). De Mauves walked away, in 1883 "twisting his picturesque moustache"; in 1908 he "renewed the curl of his main facial feature" (pp. 112-221).

67 pp. 112-221. 68 pp. 137-255.

69 French Poets and Novelists (London [1878, 1884], 1893), p. 61. The fact that de Mauves could not abide having his wife read Wordsworth to him may have suggested to James his later reference to de Mauves' liking for Baudelaire, and this added (1908) remark of the Count's to his wife: "'Every nation has its own ideals of every kind [i.e., Wordsworth's], but when I remember some of our charming writers" (pp.145-265).

70 pp. 122-235. 71 Ibid.

72 pp. 123-235, 122-235.

73 Earlier, "a penniless Frenchman," pp. 126-240.

74 Expanded (1908) to "those very lavender gloves..." (pp. 122-235).

pleaded with him not to woo the innocent girl, and angrily called him (1908) a "mauvais sujet beyond redemption."[75] His arrogance and cynicism, his total lack of moral sense, James came to realise in 1906, could not be shown by the word "frivolous," so to replace Longmore's mental observation that "M. de Mauves was frivolous; it was stamped on his eyes, his nose, his mouth, his carriage" he wrote (also expanding the passage) that "M. de Mauves was both cynical and shallow; these things were stamped on his eyes, his nose, his mouth, his voice, his gesture, his step."[76] Such cynicism, such shallowness, could explain the failure of this "pagan" to appreciate the fine nature of his "Christian" wife, and could account for the "gulf" between them being (1908) an "impassable" one.[77] Longmore could understand this, but with difficulty; but he could not understand at all how such a philanderer could flaunt his infidelity.[78] Yet flaunt it de Mauves did. His daily trips to Paris were made because "he had 'business'" there; he had announced this "not in the least with a tone of apology," but, more arrogantly in 1908 he mentioned "de gros soucis d'affaires...with an all-embracing flourish and not in the least in the tone of apology."[79]

75 Marie told the grandmother (1883) that he "had not a conscience," but (1908), more emphatically, that she was appealing to him "on the ground of a principle that didn't exist in him" (pp.118-232). In 1883, Old Madame de Mauves had called Richard a "mauvais sujet (pp.119-231).

76 pp. 131-247. James had also understated the case in calling him a "placid cynic"—this became a "robust and serene cynic" (and, correctly, he became not a "perverted" but a "perverse" creature) (pp. 121-234).

77 "Impassable" added in 1908 (pp.137-255).

78 De Mauves had, of course, no moral sense. He was (1883) "as unable to draw a moral inference of the finer strain as a schoolboy who has been playing truant for a week to solve a problem in

Not that Madame de Mauves received no praise from her husband. Quite the contrary, for if she were really "one of the rarest of women,"[80] then his keen judgment of the sex was shown, but, what was more important, perhaps then Longmore would attempt to "console" her, and thus render de Mauves' own philanderings less open to censure. But it did not have to be Longmore—ultimately it did not have to be a gentleman "worthy of the knowledge," for M. de Mauves intimated (1883) "to gentlemen whom he deems worthy of the knowledge [but 1908, "to gentlemen whom he thinks it may concern"], that it would be a convenience to him to have them make love to her."[81] Or, as James expressed it elsewhere in the 1908 edition (more frankly than in 1883), he was "much inconvenienced by the Countess's avoidance of betrayals."[82]

---

algebra." James substituted for this image a shorter one, in which "the life of the spirit was as closed to him as the world of great music to a man without an ear" (pp. 137-255).

Another image from music appears in 1908. Longmore had felt that perhaps "his wife liked melancholy for melancholy's sake." In the final edition perhaps "it was not a man's fault if his wife's love of life had pitched itself once for all in the minor key" (pp. 136-253).

79 pp. 136-264. He had probably decided, Longmore thought, that his wife was "stupid"—"incurably stupid" in 1908 (pp.137-255). In 1883 he "relished a higher flavour [than his wife] in female society," but, more baldly in 1908, he "liked women who could, frankly, amuse him better" (pp. 137-255).

80 In 1883, "one of the sweetest of women" (pp.138-256).

81 pp. 148-269.

82 In 1883, "more irritated than gratified by his wife's irreproachable reserve" (pp. 138-251).

Hoping to secure the cooperation of Longmore in such a "betrayal,"[83] the Count waited one night for the young man, "leaning against the parapet [on the terrace]." To insure the reader that this was no accidental meeting, James in 1908 had de Mauves "planted there against the parapet."[84] After superciliously[85] throwing off (1908) "a light bright remark or two"[86] about America and its quaint (and to him, delightful) custom of allowing liberty to its young girls,[87] the Count[88] got to the matter at hand. He desired Longmore to stay on and "'talk to

83 At this point in the story the reader knows there is no chance of such cooperation. In the first place, Madame de Mauves had made clear that she wished to be left alone to her fate. And, although Longmore had not yet actually seen the Count with his mistress, he felt (1883) "a sudden angry desire to cry out to him that he had the loveliest wife in the world" and (1908) "a sharp, a sore desire to cry out to him that he had the most precious wife in the world" (pp. 142-262).

84 pp. 143-262.

85 The urbanity of M. de Mauves was never ruffled, until later in the story. It was an urbanity that ran the gamut; assurance, insolence, insincerity, dishonesty. The source of this urbanity was both hereditary and acquired: from a "distinguished social type" de Mauves becomes to Longmore an "historic type" (pp. 137-256; see note 48, fourth sentence); his positiveness, from being a "manner rounded and polished by the traditions of centuries" becomes rounded and polished by the "habit of conversation and the friction of full experience" (pp. 136-254).

86 In 1883 he gave "a humorous account of his visit to America" (pp.143-263). In 1883 his "urbanity only went so far as to admit that [America as a gigantic joke]was not a bad one"; his "blandness" was more irritating (1908), for it "went but so far as to allow that jokes on that scale are indeed inexhaustible" (ibid.).

87 He had made (during the two year waiting period) "researches into the 'opportunities' presented to French noblemen"—by "opportunities" was meant "the liberty allowed to young girls" in America (pp. 143 and 263). While Euphemia was not allowed to see him, "he seemed to have spent many agreeable hours" in the company of these young girls; more strongly, he "had clearly spent his most agreeable hours" with them (ibid.).

88 The term "Baron" was generally replaced by "Comte"or "Count" in 1908.

89 pp. 145 and 265.

[Madame de Mauves] about everything,'" so as to dispel her annoying "'morbidity,'"[89] but the American uncooperatively and unimaginatively asserted his intention to leave. The generous Count became more and more irritated as his alternate urgings to stay,[90] and in any event to return soon, fell on barren soil; M. Longmore refused to help show the wife of M. de Mauves (1908) "'how much one may bend without breaking.'"[91]

III

Nearly midway the story, Longmore has resolved to leave for Brussels; by this action he would please Madame de Mauves and let the Count know that his insidious invitation[92] had been spurned. Before entraining, however, he chances upon the Count and his mistress[93]—moved by pity and anger,[94] he returns at once to Saint-Germain,[95] where his "devoted respect"[96] so deeply touched Madame de Mauves that (1908) "a convulsion [of weeping] shook her."[97] The

90 Many slight changes were made, to heighten the intensity with which he tendered the invitation and his irritation at being refused, among them, "'Pray do [come back]'; and the Baron laid his hand urgently on his arm," which became, "'Pray do'—and the Count made a great and friendly point of it" (pp.144-264).

91 In 1883, that "'one may bend a trifle without breaking'" (pp.145-266).

92 In 1908 he wanted to give de Mauves no chance to suppose he had taken the "low hint"; in 1883, no chance to suppose he "had understood him" (pp.146-270).

93 Although naive, the American knew at once that she was "one of those ladies whom it is no breach of good manners to look at as often as you like" (pp. 150 and 272). James made only four revisions, all slight, to the short scene in the restaurant (pp. 150-151--272-273).

94 Which (1883) "had space to rage [1908, to "range"] at their pleasure, for doubts and scruples had abruptly departed" (pp. 151-273). The change of "rage" to "range" is typical of the original word suggesting one infinitely more effective. See note 18.

moral foundation of her stoicism, though, remained unshaken—when she raised her eyes they (1908) "uttered a plea for non-insistence that unspeakably moved him."[98] Throughout this section (V) James made her a more sympathetic character,[99] yet increasingly rigid,[100] so rigid that Longmore, in a state of unwonted boldness and anger, sarcastically echoes her remarks about the merits of resigning ourselves to "'the reality [1908] we happen to be in for.'"[101]

---

95 He had no "distinct desire to 'make love' to her," but he did want to show her that there was still in the world "one vividly honest man" (pp. 152 and 274)

96 pp. 153 and 276.

97 Earlier she "burst into tears" (pp. 153 -276).

98 Earlier she silently pleaded with him for no "excessive emotion" (ibid.).

99 James strengthened the pathos of her "loneliness," twice using the term to replace "moral isolation" (pp.154-155--277, 156-279). Once, instead of resuming speaking "quickly, as if talking were a relief," she did so "quickly, as if talk were at last a relief" (pp. 155-279—italics mine).

100 Her stoicism, moral at its base, allowed her to view shocking actions philosophically and from olympian heights of detachment; horrible and strange people and things, from "'very contemptible'" became "'of very little importance'" (pp. 156-279). She says that "'the life of many people'" is "'a sort of compromise"'—in 1908, "'a conscious compromise'" (pp. 156-280). Longmore echoed her, "expressively" in 1908 (ibid.).

101 Still self-consciously on the defensive, she had told Longmore that people must make the best (1883) "'of the reality'" (pp. 157-281). Again he echoed her, and spoke slightingly of her conscience.

At this point M. de Mauves appears, relishing his unaccustomed role of the wronged husband. (Having correctly guessed that the sight of him with his mistress would result in Longmore's return, he had been walking through the grounds, looking for the couple.) The Count was given by James only two speeches, one to each person, and both insulting. He tells Madame de Mauves, "'I was not aware that I might congratulate you on the return of monsieur.'"[102] "'You should have known it,' she answered gravely [1883], 'if I had expected Mr. Longmore's return.'" She was (1908) more spirited and more sarcastic: "'You should at once have known it,' she immediately answered, 'if I had expected such a pleasure.'"[103] To Longmore the Count (1908) says, "'It's needless for me to make you welcome. Madame de Mauves knows the duties of hospitality.'"[104] Back indoors, Longmore again is harrassed unexpectedly and unfairly, this time by Madame Clairin, who had frightened and repulled him earlier[105] (and would do so again) by her brazenness and cynicism. In a fit of petulance at its not being true, she accuses him of "'success with my sister-in-law.'"[106]

102 "Monmieur" was capitalised in 1883 (pp. 158-282).

103 ibid.

104 Changed only slightly from the edition of 1883 (pp. 159-283).

105 By practically proposing to him: "...her caressing cadences were so almost explicit an invitation to solicit the charming honour of her hand" (1908: p. 251). His response left much to be desired, for her "hard eyes over the thin edge of her smile...frightened him" (ibid.). (Both passages were changed from 1883, p. 134). James made her harder and bolder in this scene, just as he had done in his references to her ill-starred marriage to M. Clairin.

106 pp. 160 and 284-285. Pointedly, Saint-Germain is "'horribly dull'" to other young men, who do not have his success. To his answer that success is easy, Madame de Mauves bein "'kind-

Although to make a "sacrifice"[107] was not easy, following the unjust imputations of the de Mauves—brother and sister—Longmore's "respectful devotion"[108] led him to stay away[109] from Saint-Germain for several days (Section VI). "When at last he went back" (an improvement over 1883's "when he called again")[110] he was met—much to his dismay—by Madame Clairin,[111] who "emerged like a discord in a maze of melody."[112]

---

ness itself,'" she responds, "'To her own countrymen!'" As she said this in 1908 she dramatically "swung open her great fan" (pp. 160-285).

Use of the fan for emphasis appealed to James. Later Madame Clairin tells Longmore her family's time-hallowed pattern of morality:

1883	1908
"Again Madame Clairin paused and opened and closed her great fan. 'Let [Madame de Mauves] conform!' she said, with amazing audacity" (p.164).	"Again Madame Clairin paused, again she opened and closed her great modern fan, which clattered like the screen of a shop-window. 'Let her keep up the tone!' she prodigiously repeated" (p.290).

107 Staying away, called simply "this" in 1883, was "the sacrifice" in 1908 (pp.161-286).

108 pp. 161 and 286. Often in 1908, in Longmore's thoughts the informal term "Euphemia" was replaced by one more dignified and reverential.

109 Most of the time he realised that they were of different worlds. In 1908 an added reference designated her as "deep within the circle round which he could only hover" (pp.161-286).

110 Ibid.

111 He had been hoping to meet Madame de Mauves, and that she "would come out and spend half the day in the forest." For a greater sense of intimacy, James had Longmore hope (1908) that she "would renew with him for an hour or two the exploration of the forest" (pp. 161-287).

112 pp. 161 and 286. Another figure of speech from the world of music. In his revisions James more than once had to

In this interview, unlike the last, she is her usual cynical, flagrantly immoral self, her look and tone "charged" not with "roundabout" but with (1908) "insidious meanings."[113] Bitterly and sarcastically she demands to know (1883) what are Longmore's "'ideas? I wish to call your attention'" to Madame de Mauves' unhappiness, but, more tauntingly in 1908 she queries him concerning his "'ideas? A stupid one of my own—possibly!—has been to call your attention to'"[114] this unhappiness. She is more angry in the definitive edition, but so is Longmore, who, remembering what he had seen in Paris, counters with asperity that the "'grounds'" of Madame de Mauves' "'discontent'" have "'simply stared me in the face.'"[115] His allusion is understood; Madame Clairin elects (1908) to remain sardonic:

1883	1908
"I know perfectly what you mean. My brother, in a single word, is in love with another woman."	Madame Clairin considered a moment with her eyes on him. "Yes—ces choses-là se voient. My brother, in a single word, has the deplorable habit of falling in love with other women." 116

---

rectify his early loose handling of point of view. At this juncture in the story Longmore knew (in 1875, italics mine) "that he looked disappointed, and that Madame Clairin was observing him, and this consciousness impelled her to give him [1879, "him to give her"] a glance of almost aggressive frigidity. This was apparently what she desired. She wished to throw him off his balance, and if he [1879, "she"] was not mistaken, she had the means" (pp.446-226).

A few pages farther on, a similar instance of a shift within a sentence occurred. This one James overlooked until the final edition: "Longmore started and coloured, and she hardly knew whether he [1883] were going to assent or to demur"; "He had a start but he controlled [1908] himself, speaking quietly enough" (pp.168-295).

113 pp. 162-287.

114 pp. 162-288.

115 pp. 163-288.

116 Ibid.

Clearly, infidelity is not to her really a "deplorable" habit, for she defends its historical precedent—all the de Mauves men have philandered.[117] "'These are fine traditions ...'" she maintained in 1883; in 1908, more arrogant in her emphasis, she calls them "'great traditions and charming precedents, I hold....'"[118] Further, Longmore learns, tradition and precedent demand that the de Mauves women not be jealous, but that they too—always discreetly—have affairs.[119] The more she

117 This idea was strengthened by the assertion that each de Mauves gave his wife "'even when she was very charming'" (added in 1908) the right to be jealous (pp. 163-289). It has been pointed out (note 31) that James in early editions capitalized "De Mauves" whenever family pride was being shown, but in late editions sought the same result through avoidance of the family name itself. In the scene under discussion he changed "'a De Mauves'" to "'a <u>galant homme</u> among us,'" and to "'my brother,'" as well as "'the De Mauves'" to "'our men'" (pp. 163-289, 166-292, 163-289).

118 pp. 164-289.

119 Contrary to the belief current among some scholars, James often replaced foreign terms in his later revisions. Here he called the de Mauves wives not "'femmes d'esprit'" but "'dear brave women of wit'" (pp. 164-289). In this important clarification, one sees easily for the first time in 1908 that by an "'escapade'" Madame Clairin meant simply one that is <u>not</u> discreet:

1883	1908
"'Not one of them had the bad taste to be jealous, and yet not one in a dozen was guilty of an escapade,—not one of them was talked about" (pp. 163-164).	"...not one in a dozen ever consented to an indiscretion —allowed herself, I mean, to be talked about'" (p.289).

thinks of the "'little American bourgeoisie's'" refusal to "'fall into line'" or to "'keep up the tone,'"[120] the more incensed Madame Clairin becomes; disdaining to refer to her (1908) as a de Mauves or even as "'my sister-in-law,'" she uses the epithet "'our charming, but not accommodating, friend.'"[121]

Longmore, shocked, can only gasp "'Ah!'"[122] A minor shock (one has seen that not morality but social "tone" is her concern) is Madame Clairin's attitude of primness:

1883	1908
"I've never remarked on her conduct, but I've quite lost patience with it."	"I've never permitted myself, you may believe, the least observation on her conduct, but I can't accept it as the last word either of taste or of tact."[123]

Next Longmore was treated to a sympathetic account of how the poor Count had had his pockets searched--unfortunately for him they had furnished his irate wife with mementoes of another lady.[124] Most embarrassing and shocking of all to Longmore was the recital[125] of how M. de Mauves openly encouraged his wife to form a liaison with her fellow-American,[126] enjoining her to learn for herself that "'virtue is none the less becoming for being good-natured.'"[127]

120 Replacing 1883's "'A De Mauves must be of the old race'" (pp. 164-289). See also note 106.

121 pp. 164-290.

122 Early, his "reply was ambiguous; he simply said, 'Ah!'" but (1908) "Longmore felt himself gape, but he gasped an 'Ah!' to cover it" (pp. 164-290).

123 Ibid.

124 Instead of being "'called to account'" he was (1908) "'hauled over the coals'" (pp. 165-291).

125 He has not been silent through all of this--at this moment he broke in to accuse Madame Clairin of being unable to understand that honest men would unstintedly admire the actions of Madame de Mauves.

James did not rely solely upon the words of Madame Clairin for the shock which this scene was meant to produce. Once, commenting authorially, he replaced a "she said" with "she amazingly pursued";[128] the cheery "'We count on you!'" with which she concluded her invitation, earlier spoken "with a smile," was accompanied (1908) by "a wondrous strained grimace";[129] towards the end Longmore—embarrassed, disgusted, "stunned," (more quickly so in the revision) "was [1883] slowly turning away" from her, but he "had [1908] slowly averted himself."[130] Apparently he found it difficult to think, for in answer to her question—whether he still planned to go to Brussels—he answered no longer in a "reflective" but in a "colourless" tone.[131]

---

126 Called by the Count (1908) not "'the poor fellow'" but her "'poor compatriot'" (pp.166-293).

127 Ibid.

128 pp. 167-293.

129 Ibid.

130 pp. 167-294.

131 pp. 168-294.

One of the chief problems faced by James in making Madame de Mauves of nouvelle-length was that of sustaining suspense. He met it at this juncture in the nouvelle (Section VII) by: 1) the description of the conflicting emotions[132] surging within Longmore; 2) the entrance into the story of the young couple who serve as a foil to Euphemia and Longmore. The latter could feel "no prevision that he should 'profit,' in the vulgar sense,"[133] but, three pages farther, had only contempt for his devotion to the idea of "sacrifice," which he now regarded as a "trap for minds muddled by fear."[134] This was the propitious moment, when his thinking was thus fluctuating and wavering, for him to see

132 He felt pain at the thought of her being forced to live with the "baser multitude" (pp. 169 and 296), but joy at knowing there was no longer any secret between them--Madame Clairin had gratuitously promised that Madame de Mauves would soon know that he was aware of the husband's open suggestion to the wife.

To replace his statement that Longmore "could hardly have said whether his emotion was a pain or a joy" James (1906) wrote that he "could have given no straight name to his agitation," thereby making the emotions seem more mixed (pp. 169-296).

133 pp. 169 and 296. He still was most interested in the "beauty of her character" (pp. 169-297).

134 There is (1908) more stress put on the principle of "sacrifice," as well as (by use of italics) more on his thoughts of revolt towards this principle.

1883	1908
"...he had in his composition a lurking principle of asceticism to whose authority he had ever paid an unquestioning respect.... Sacrifice? The word was a trap for minds muddled by fear, an ignoble refuge of weakness. To insist now seemed not to dare, but simply to be..." (pp.171-172).	"...a lurking principle of sacrifice, sacrifice for sacrifice's sake, to the author of which he had ever paid due deference.... Sacrifice? The word was a trap.... To insist now seemed...simply to *be*... (p.299).

Claudine and the painter, a very attractive married couple who were staying at a little inn near Saint-Germain. Their devotion and happiness Longmore found very affecting,[135] but the experience was a bittersweet one, for he was reminded of his own lack of good fortune (in 1883 he looked "from one to the other" but in 1908 "from one of these lucky persons to another").[136]

Eventually he learned the ironic fact that the reader has suspected—these two happy young people were not married. Furthermore, the landlady at the inn, who seemed irreproachable enough and not at all like Madame Clairin, praised very highly the background of Claudine. James for the final edition strengthened her encomiums by making them more Gallic and more sincere: Claudine, in 1883 "'a lady—a true lady'" and "'a very nice little woman'" is in 1908 "'a lady—a vrai dame'" and "'gentille—but gentille.'"[137] And Longmore (or James?) asked not "'Who is she?'" but "'Who then is so distinguished a young woman?'"[138] Following this emphasis on Claudine's gentility, James openly stated (with a lighter touch in 1908) the parallel:

1883	1908
[Longmore felt that somehow he was] spiritually the same as the young painter, and that the latter's companion had the soul of Euphemia.	...only a graver equivalent of the young lover and that rustling Claudine was a lighter sketch of Madame de Mauves. 139

A few sections earlier it would have been not credible but now it seems natural enough to find that Longmore, walking back to Saint-Germain, experienced(1908) "less philosophic resignation to

135 In the final revision, the painter called to her (added) "familiarly" (pp.173-301).

136 pp.175-303-304.

137 pp.176-305; 176-304.

any event and more of the urgent egotism of the passion pronounced by philosophers the supremely selfish one."[140] The reader anticipates a highly-charged scene when Longmore and Madame de Mauves next meet, for he expects no change in the relentless morality of the heroine. For this effect, James resorted to the use of a dream, in which Longmore saw an oarsman (M. de Mauves) repeatedly propel him across the stream to Madame de Mauves, who looked at the passenger "gravely and pityingly"[141] but who nonetheless managed, each time the craft touched the shore, to be on the other side.

The final extended scene between Longmore and Madame de Mauves (Section VIII) James revised with considerable care for the New York Edition,[142] giving to both young people more ardor, he in his desire for her, she in her appeal that he not "disappoint" her.

After spending "the day" (1908, "every minute of the day")[143] in thinking of her, Longmore, when again in her presence,[144]

---

138 pp. 176-304.

139 pp. 177-306.

140 Changed only slightly from the 1883 edition (pp.176-305).

141 pp. 178 and 307. It is of some interest that while Section VII is not particularly short, James had relatively very few revisions in it. Part of the reason lies in the amount of nature description--James made almost no change to two such pages (pp.169-171--297-299). In the final three pages of the section (describing his thoughts while walking towards Saint-Germain, and his dream, pp. 176-178--305-307), practically no revisions were made, except to have Longmore wish not "greatly" but "unutterably" to stand by her side (pp. 178-307).

142 Although Section VIII is shorter than VII, it has three times as many 1908 revisions.

143 pp. 180-310.

144 When he first saw her, he (1883) "could see that her eyes were fixed upon him" but (1908) he "felt her eyes fixed on him"

found himself awe-struck and incapable of speech, and of action--for although he "felt as if [1908, "was sure"] it would make all things clear to stride forward and fold her in his arms,"[145] he did not embrace her. The reader of the final edition, though, senses more strongly their physical nearness, for in it instead of standing "before her" Longmore "leaned closer to her"; and the "ardor" that he felt is now "eagerness" and "desire."[146] Once again capable of speech, derisively he echoed her appeal to (1883) his "reason" and (1908) his "fairness of mind."[147]

"'Don't disappoint me'"[148]--repeating her appeal despite his outburst, elaborating upon it, speaking slowly and emphatically,[149] she gave (1883) "the singular appearance of a woman preaching reason with a kind of passion." Relieved of the weak "a kind of,"

(pp. 179-309). Similarly, a bit later he felt (1883) "that she was watching him" but (1908) "felt her watching him" (pp. 182-313).

145 pp. 179-309. His awe prevented any such action. "But a moment later he was still standing looking at her...." was changed to the stronger "...he was still dumb there before her..." (ibid.). Keeping this revision in mind, James on the next page replaced "He was silent a moment" by "He waited again" (pp. 180-310).

146 pp. 180-310, 184-315, 180-310. See note 65.

147 pp. 181-311. He almost believes that she is amusing herself at his expense. In 1883 he broke out, "'My reason? Reason is a mere word! The only reality in the world is the thing one feels!'" In 1908, "'My fairness of mind? Of all the question-begging terms!' he laughed. 'The only thing for one's mind to be fair to is the thing one feels!'" (pp.181-311).

148 Italics James's, in both editions (pp. 181 and 312).

149 Her "'I should suffer--I should suffer keenly,'" on which her voice lingered "with emphasis" became (1908) "'I should take it, I assure you, very hard indeed,'" which she spoke "with all emphasis" (pp. 182-312). She does not want to say, in the future, that there was "'one man'" and he failed, but that there was "'one man'" who failed (ibid., italics James's).

given beauty and more feeling, Madame de Nauves offered in 1908 "the odd spectacle of a beautiful woman preaching reason with the most communicative and irresistible passion."[150] Such a paradox made Longmore "almost bewildered" (1908 , "mystified and bewildered") for, after all, the "intention of her words was all remonstrance, refusal, dismissal; but her presence [1908 , "presence and effect"] there, so close, so urgent, so personal, seemed a distracting contradiction of it."[151] Making more clear how her physical nearness affected Longmore, James wrote that her breath on his cheek as she finished speaking "stirred in his whole being [1883] a sudden rapturous conjecture" but in 1908 a "perverse imagination."[152] The young man continued to doubt the sincerity of her words (italics are mine):

1883	1908
Were her words in their soft severity a mere delusive spell, meant to throw into relief her almost ghostly beauty, and was this [this desire] the only truth, the only reality, the only law?	Were not her words, in their high impossible rigour, a mere challenge to his sincerity, a mere precaution of her pride, meant to throw into relief her almost ghostly beauty, and wasn't this the only truth, the only law, the only thing to take account of? [153]

But soon—and although his words belie it for a few more minutes,[154] this is his final stand—Longmore realised that she

150 pp. 182-312.

151 Ibid.

152 pp. 182-313.

153 Ibid.

154 It seems to me psychologically realistic that, despite the beauty of her ideal of conduct, a short time was necessary before Longmore accepted with good grace this ideal. Madame de Nauves wanted him to leave of his own volition, acting through the "'fulness'" of his "'wisdom'" [and, added in 1908, the "'excellence'" of his "'taste'"] (pp. 183-314).

was sincere in what she said, and that what she said was right, so that (1908) "this last sophistry of his great desire for her"[155] died away. In both editions "her beauty, more and more radiant in the darkness, rose before him as a symbol of something vague, which was yet more beautiful than itself."[156] James liked this image: "With this sense of her friendship [1908, "her tenderness still in her dreadful consistency"]...Longmore's soul [1908, "spirit"] rose with a new flight...."[157]

Again Longmore derisively echoed her (see note 147): one reads (1883) "'The fulness--the fulness!'" and (1908) "'Ah, wisdom and taste!' the poor young man wailed" (pp.183-314).

Another speech by the young man was lengthened by James for a more natural speech rhythm, and is made more emotional through the stage direction that was inserted. Longmore accused Madame de Mauves of wanting to think of him as "'a creature who never has existed,--who never can exist! A creature who knew you without loving you,--who left you without regretting you!'" In 1908 the passage reads "'...a stupid brute who has never existed, who never can exist!' he broke in. 'A creature who could know you without loving you, who could leave you without for ever missing you!'" (pp.183-314).

155 In 1883, "this last suggestion of his desire"(pp.182-313).

156 pp. 183 and 313. Weakly in 1883, James wrote merely that "he did understand her"; strongly in 1908, he had Longmore become so inspired that he "let everything go but the rage of a purpose somehow still to please her" (pp. 184-315).

157 pp. 184-315. The "dreadful consistency" phrase epitomizes her character. A moment earlier, before he was completely in accord with her, he spoke (1908) bitterly of her "'horrible and unnatural lucidity,'" a term replacing the weak "'that'" (pp. 183-314).

At this moment, the peak of their triumph, they are (dramatically) interrupted, accosted[158] by the person least able to appreciate their victory--Madame Clairin. (This is a particularly striking Jamesian effect.) Madame de Mauves looked at Longmore, and her eyes seemed to say "'Call it what you will, what you have to urge upon me is the thing which this woman can best conceive. What I ask of you is something she cannot!'" By changing the tense, James (1908) showed the finality of the moral victory of the two Americans: "'...what you're wanted to urge upon me....'" And, more emphatically, "'What I ask of you is something she can't begin to!'"[159] James again by revision made reference to the victory, for the eyes of Madame de Mauves, as they continued to rest upon Longmore, seemed to beg him (1883) to "suffer her to be herself, and to intimate that that self was as little as possible like Madame Clairin" but in 1908 (italics mine) to "suffer her to be triumphantly herself, and to intimate--yet this too all decently--how little that self was of Madame Clairin's particular swelling measure."[160]

---

158 Madame Clairin appeared at the drawing-room window just as Longmore (in the flush of elation at his recent decision) was walking rapidly across the terrace toward Madame de Mauves. Scornfully she remarked that in the interests of good manners they should come into the house; Madame de Mauves did not give the remark the dignity of a reply. James made Madame Clairin less of an eavesdropper by changing his picture of her, from standing "posted [at the drawing-room window], watching him" to standing "framed in the opening as if, though just arriving on the scene, she too were already aware of its interest" (pp.184-315).

159 pp. 184-185--316.

160 pp. 185-316. (Another of James's images from music.)

It has been shown that James by revision emphasized the international aspects of this nouvelle. Further, by increasing both her pain and the stoical resignation with which she bore it, James intended that his heroine should inspire in the reader, as she did in Longmore, more sympathy and respect. The young man, however, was not too all-respectful, and was indeed more ardent in the New York Edition, causing a heightening of suspense concerning his decision. Finally, the cynicism of Madame Clairin (often indirectly picturing that of her brother) was made increasingly flagrant.

M. de Mauves, who has been perhaps too much in the wings, now (Section IX) takes the center of the stage and holds it almost unremittingly until the final curtain.[161] The chief task facing James from here on was to picture convincingly the change that had to occur in de Mauves, by making him puzzled by Longmore, suspicious of his motives, and above all, jealous. Then when he learns that the strange young American did respect his wife, he will do likewise, but it will be too late.

161 James is, however, going to permit Longmore a final brief leave-taking of Madame de Mauves. But before he does so, and before the encounter of the two men, he adds a bit to the characterization of the two young people. Longmore's high regard for Euphemia is shown by emphasis being placed on his regret at leaving her (see text for note 162); he felt that she had already "consigned him" to this "very dusty, dreary, lonely world" (earlier it had been a world into which she "was turning him away") (pp. 187-319). Her stoicism is again highlighted: instead of feeling that he could not cause her to alter her decision, Longmore "knew" it (pp. 185-317); he wondered to what principle she had "dedicated," rather than "attached" herself (ibid.); with conciseness and greater emphasis (through the omission of "dim" and "a sort of") instead of having "a dim, overwhelming sense of a sort of invulnerable constancy being the supreme law of her character" he had "his hard impression that endless constancy was all her law" (pp.186-318).

It was easy enough for James to bring the two men together. Longmore had been walking around morosely, "groaning" at the dark future ahead of him, and pausing "sightlessly before the shops,"[162] when he saw a gentleman take an icy leave of a person (presumably a lady) in a carriage and stalk to a chair in a sidewalk café. The man was de Mauves, the "person" no doubt his mistress.[163] Neither Longmore nor the Count was in the mood for affable conversation, but both were keyed to do battle—James caught the electric tension of the scene (1908, italics mine) by writing that they exchanged "formal remarks that did little to lend grace to their encounter."[164] This combat, merely one of silent glances, is, with its lack of physical action, heavily psychological and inward even for James, who in trying to avoid an annoying use of proper nouns found himself (in early editions) with too liberal a sprinkling of indefinite pronouns—six of them he eliminated in the final edition (except for the "shoe pinched him," italics are mine):

1883	1908
But as M. de Mauves came towards him he felt deep in his heart that he abhorred him. He noticed, however, for the first time, a shadow upon the Baron's cool placidity, and his delight at finding that somewhere at last the shoe pinched him, mingled with his impulse to be as exasperatingly impenetrable as possible, enabled him to return the other's greeting with all his own self-possession.	But now, as M. de Mauves came toward him he felt abhorrence well up. He made out, however, for the first time, a cloud on this nobleman's superior clearness, and a delight at finding the shoe somewhere at last pinching him, mingled with the resolve to be blank and unaccommodating, enabled him to meet the occasion with due promptness. 165

162 In 1883, he had merely thought of the dark future (pp. 185-317) and had, with no emotion shown, simply looked "at the shops" (pp.187-319).

163 "A person" is the designation furnished by Jame p. 188 and 320).

M. de Mauves, willing to understand Longmore (that is, his American morals),[166] grows increasingly dubious as to his motives. Laying great stress on the "impenetrable," "unaccommodating" side of Longmore, James changed his earlier comment about de Mauves being "puzzled and tormented" by what he "saw" in the eyes of Longmore, having him "puzzled and tormented" instead (italics mine) by what he "had at last both to recognise and to miss in

---

164 In 1883 they had exchanged "formal greetings which did little to make their mutual scrutiny seem gracious" (pp.189-321).

165 pp. 188-321. Two other similar illustrations should be given (italics mine):

1883	1908
"The Baron's ill-humour did him good, so far as it pointed to a want of harmony with the lady in the coupé; but it disturbed him sorely, as he began to suspect that it possibly meant jealousy of himself" (p.190).	"The Count's ruffled state was a comfort so far as it pointed to the possibility that the lady in the coupé might be proving too many for him; but it ministered to no vindictive sweetness for Longmore so far as it should perhaps represent rising jealousy" (p.323).
. . . . .	
"...the cloud deepened on his [de Mauves'] face, and he turned away and frowned as he lighted a cigar" (p.189)	"...the shadow at any rate fell darker across the brow of his critic, who turned away and frowned while lighting a cigar" (pp. 321-322).

In another change, James removed the intruding author, writing not of "Madame Clairin's revelations, as we may call them" but of them" as he [Longmore] might have regarded them" (pp. 188-321).

166 Once, to make more vivid the difficulty of a Frenchman's understanding the morals of an American, James wrote not of the eyes but of the "New York face" of Longmore (pp.189-321).

those eyes."[167] (James "so beautifully kept it up" in describing how these eyes "took possession" of de Mauves.)[168] Victory is heady for Longmore—he even taunted the Count; unfortunately the earlier edition was too subtle, too ambiguous here, and had to be clarified in 1908. While glancing at a newspaper, the Count

1883
uttered some cold commonplace on the political situation, which gave Longmore a fair opportunity of replying by an ironical sally, which made him seem for a moment aggressively at his ease.

1908
threw off some perfunctory allusion to the crisis—the political—which enabled Longmore to reply with perfect veracity that, with other things to think about, he had had no attention to spare for it. 169

An uncomfortable half-hour passed, with (1883) the Count "feeling a nervous need of playing the spy" and Longmore "indulging ferocious relish of his discomfort."[170] Finally, there appeared friend of de Mauves, a heliotrope-smelling dandy in direct line of descent from Sir Fopling Flutter. With the arrival of this

167 pp. 189-322. Longmore gave de Mauves the appearance of being "primed for an enterprise more inspiring than the finest of his own achievements." Continuing, "He had puzzled the Baron before, and this was once too often." In 1908, using two favorite devices—alliteration, and the question—James had him appear "primed as for some prospect of pleasure more than Parisian." And, "He had never really quite satisfied his occasional host, but was he now, for climax, to leave him almost gaping?" (pp. 189-190--322).

168 In 1883, "They judged him, they mocked him, they eluded him, they triumphed over him, they treated him as no pair of eyes had ever treated him." In 1908, "They took possession of him, they laid him out, they measured him in that state of flatness, they triumphed over him, they treated him as no pair of eyes had perhaps ever treated any member of his family before" (pp.189-322).

169 pp. 190-322-323.

170 These phrases do not appear in the New York Edition, since James chose to replace them by a passage that shows instead the tension and the stubborn silence of the two men.

dandy the scene comes full circle. [illegible] begun with the Count angrily leaving his mistress. [illegible], at its close, he has not only begun to see his old friends in their true light but also to entertain deep misgivings about Longmore in his potential role as a "consolation" for Madame de Mauves. In short, he is starting to love his wife, but although he would much prefer to return immediately to Saint-Germain, fear of losing face compels him to join the dandy in going off to see "the Duchess," newly arrived in town. Excusing himself to Longmore, he says ("drily" in 1883) "'...you, too, probably have occupation for the evening?'" but in 1908 clearly revealing his unease, he "appeared to have some difficulty in saying it."[171]

The final words of Madame de Mauves to Longmore were unchanged in 1908. She continues to say, Cordelia-like: "'Good-bye. May you have all the happiness you deserve!'"[172] Like Cordelia's, her words reveal to the discerning reader a depth of feeling and respect. They illustrate too her almost unnaturally rational and intellectual quality. As for the parting itself, the final treatment suggests more affection on the part of both, and a more roman-

---

1883	1908
"The two men sat for half an hour exchanging stinted small-talk, the Baron feeling a nervous need of playing the spy, and Longmore indulging a ferocious relish of his discomfort. These thin amenities were interrupted, however, by the arrival of a friend of M. de Mauves..." (p.190).	"The two men pretended meanwhile for half an hour to out-sit each other conveniently; and the end--at that rate--might have been distant had not the tension in some degree yielded to the arrival of a friend of M. de Mauves..." (p.323).

171 pp. 191-323. Longmore answered that his only occupation was to catch his train (presumably the one for Saint-Germain, for on further questioning he indicated his intention of leaving for there in half an hour).

tic sense of physical nearness (italics are mine):

1883	1908
He took her hand and looked at her, but something was passing in him that made it impossible to return her hand's light pressure. Something of infinite value was floating past him, and he had taken an oath not to raise a finger to stop it....Madame de Mauves disengaged her hand, gathered her shawl, and smiled at him almost as you would do at a child you should wish to encourage. Several moments later he was still standing watching her receding figure. When it had disappeared he shook himself, walked rapidly back to his hotel...and departed.	He took her hand *with his eyes on her*, but something was at work in him that made it impossible to deal in the easy way with her touch....was floating past him, and he had taken an oath, *with which any such case* [her physical nearness] *interfered*, not to raise a finger to stop it.... Madame de Mauves disengaged *herself*, gathered in her long scarf and smiled at him....was still *there* watching *her leave him and leave him*. When *she* was out of sight he shook himself, walked *at once* back ...and departed. [173]

Back at Saint-Germain, M. de Mauves learned that the dangerous and unfathomable Longmore had started back to America; instantly he cancelled his plans to dine in Paris with his mistress,[174] only to find himself too mystified and too emotionally upset to go in at once to dinner at home. As James put it, definitively, he "remained outside—outside of more things, clearly, that his mere *salle-à-manger*";[175] when finally he did go in, after walking uneasily on the terrace for at least a quarter of an hour, he drank (1908) "more wine than usual."[176]

---

172 pp. 192 and 326.

173 pp. 192-326.

174 Literally, in 1883, he was "dressed with a scrupulous freshness which seemed to indicate an intention of dining out"; with delightful innuendo, in 1908 he had "dressed as he usually didn't for dining at home" (pp.192-193--326). In 1883 the carriage that was to take him to the station he sent away "curtly"; in 1908, "without hesitation" (pp. 193-327). The mistress did not accept his treatment gracefully; later in the evening he received from her a

Throughout dinner the Count angrily made silent appeals to his sister (Madame de Mauves was present), in a vain attempt to learn why their scheme had failed—why had Longmore gone? One expects a stormyscene when (dinner over, and Madame de Mauves out of earshot) the Count is able to speak openly to Madame Clairin; the reader of the New York Edition expects him to be very severe, and decidedly the dominant one, for while in 1883 he fixed her with "a piercing glance," in 1908 he did so, putting "to her a question she knew she should have to irritate him later on by not being able to answer,"[177] and while her silent reply was in 1883 "an elevation of the eyebrows, which did the office of a shrug of the shoulders," it was in 1908 "for the present at least...an elevation of the eyebrows that resembled even to her own humour the vain raising of an umbrella in anticipation of a storm."[178]

---

scolding telegram, which he answered in one word, "Impossible" (pp. 194 and 328).

175 Earlier, he remained alone in the drawing-room, "frowning and wondering" (pp. 193-327).

176 Earlier, "a great deal of wine" (ibid.).

178* pp. 194-328. See note 180.

177* pp. 194--327-328.

Dinner finally over, Madame Clairin went to de Mauves privately. Again he is (by revision) the dominant one; the 1883 statement that de Mauves "took no notice of her presence for some time; but he was the one person to whom she allowed this license." was replaced, and the characterisations utterly reversed by the 1908 passage in which the Count "took no notice..but this affected her as unexpected indulgence."[179] Realizing after a few moments her inability to explain Longmore's conduct,[180] de Mauves disgustedly permitted her to leave;[181] on her way out the thought (added in 1908) struck her that "she was--if there was no more to come--getting off easily."[182] James for the most part told the story of Madame de Mauves through the consciousness of Longmore; these new entrances into the consciousness of Madame Clairin served their purpose well, for proportionately as she becomes less impressive[183] the Count becomes more so, and his dominance over her adds to his characterization the stature so badly needed. Now, given this greater degree of seriousness and dignity, de Mauves in his final violent action will be more plausible and more moving and, most important of all, the victory of Madame de Mauves will attain largersignificance.

179 Ibid.

180 Admitting that she cannot understand Madame de Mauves, Madame Clairin in 1883 gave "free play to the shrug she had been obliged to suppress at the table," but in 1908 she "now felt thankful for the umbrella" (pp.194-328). See text for note 178; James in revision carried through in his changes of imagery or idiomatic dialogue.

181 He (1883) "silently allowed her to depart, as if it had been her duty to provide him with an explanation, and he was disgusted with her levity." James in 1908 changed "levity" to "blankness," and added her thought about getting off easily (see text for note 182) (pp. 194-328).

182 Ibid.

183 She is at one point reduced to the level of a buffoon,

Later in the evening, de Mauves "saw his wife sitting alone on the terrace, but remained below strolling along the narrow paths" of the garden. Since the word "strolling" does not picture a man full of unease, of a soul's torment, James for the final edition wrote that the Count "remained below, wandering, turning, pausing, lingering."[184] It grew late, Madame de Mauves went in; finally, around midnight, the Count "dropped upon a bench, tired, with [1883] a kind of angry sigh" but, more accurately in 1908 "with a long vague exhalation of unrest."[185] At last it "was sinking into his mind"—in 1908, into his "soul"—that he did not understand his wife![186]

It is typical of James that through Mrs. Draper, two years later, Longmore learned what eventually happened.[187] The Count had'"repented and asked her forgiveness'" but she had "'inexorably refused,'"[188]

---

when one reads—of the dinner—not that "There was little talk; what there was, was supplied by Madame Clairin," but that "There was little talk, scarcely a convival sound, save the occasional expressive 'm-m-m!' of Madame Clairin over the succulence of some dish" (pp. 194-327).

184 pp. 194-329. Since James chose only very infrequently to give the thoughts of de Mauves, it was vital that he select with the utmost care each word describing his actions.

185 pp. 195-329.

186 Ibid.

187 Mrs. Draper had heard the story from "'a very young Frenchman'" (pp. 196-330). Since he was a friend of Madame Clairin's, James referred to him not as "'a friend of Euphemia's charming sister-in-law'" but more logically (1908) as "'a friend of that charming sister of the Count's'" (pp. 196-331).

188 pp. 196 and 331.

whereupon he blew out his brains.[189] To Mrs. Draper, Madame de Mauves "'was stone, she was ice, she was outraged virtue'"[190] and in Longmore she caused "a singular feeling—a feeling for which awe would be hardly too strong a name." Emphatically, and more impressive rhythmically, when thinking of her (in 1908) he experienced "a singular feeling—a feeling of wonder, of uncertainty, of awe."[191]

James in revising this nouvelle underscored the irony in Euphemia Cleve's naive belief that noblesse oblige, and carefully pictured the inability of the girl and old Madame de Mauves to comprehend one another. He made the Count and Madame Clairin more arrogant and cynical in their flagrant immorality (and Madame de Mauves proportionately a more sympathetic character); and in direct fashion as well, James elicited added reader sympathy for her, through improved description of the pain she suffered, and a more deeply stirred Longmore. All of these improvements combined to heighten the international aspects of Madame de Mauves.

Emotion was made stronger throughout the story: Longmore was a less pale and wan lover than heretofore, more ardent, and intenser in his objection to her unbending stoicism; the heroine's appeal against excessive emotion was itself increasingly fervent; and, in their frequent outbursts of anger, de Mauves and Longmore and

189 Choosing to give up sarcasm and replace it by bitterness, James changed the Frenchman's report to Mrs. Draper. "'That's the charming little woman who killed [her husband]!'" became "'That's the terrible little woman [Bac (1908)] "discovered" that he had blown out his brains (pp. 196-197-331).

190 pp. 196 and 331.

191 pp. 196-331.

Madame Clairin became living men and women. Conflict (including the inner struggle of Longmore) is strong in Madame de Mauves; the definitive handling of the inevitable scenes in which characters clashed raised tension and emotions to a higher pitch, and the alternate urgings felt by Longmore, more incisive than before, caused reader empathy and lent suspense to the matter of his ultimate decision; James's later more adroit dramatization of the conflict between the two Americans and the two Frenchmen increased the sense of finality of the former's victory. Finally, there were the New York Edition revisions improving the characterization of M. de Mauves; to the extent that they made his repentance and his violent self-inflicted retribution plausible and affecting, to that extent is the reader moved to share with Longmore his feeling "of wonder, of uncertainty, of awe."

CHAPTER V

THE REVISIONS OF DAISY MILLER

Although such mediums as radio, television, movies and the stage have recently brought before the general public (often with the titles changed) such works of James as The American, "Four Meetings," Washington Square, The Portrait of a Lady, The Aspern Papers, The Liar, The Tragic Muse, The Turn of the Screw, The Ambassadors, and The Sense of the Past, in the mind of all but the James scholar, he seems destined still to be instinctively associated with Daisy Miller.

The summer of 1878 marked the appearance of Daisy Miller: A Study in the Cornhill Magazine,[1] and the following year it came out three times, under the imprint of Macmillan (London), Bernhard Tauchnitz (Leipzig), and Harper (New York).[2] If internal evidence could be trusted, the Harper edition would seem the latest of the three, for in it there are 177 punctuation changes not found in the other two;[3] however, Harper's Magazine reviewed Daisy (in January, 1879) shortly before the appearance of these nearly identical London and Leipzig editions, so much closer to the Cornhill original[4] than the Harper edition.

1 The Cornhill Magazine, XXXVII, XXXVIII (June, July 1878), 678-698, 44-67.

2 Daisy Miller: A Study, An Internation Episode, Four Meetings, 2 Vols. (London, 1879), I, 1-193. An International Episode, which first appeared in the Cornhill Magazine, December, 1878-January, 1879, is concluded in Volume II. "Four Meetings" originally appeared in Scribner's Monthly, November, 1877. See note 14. Daisy Miller: A Study, An International Episode, Four Meetings (Leipzig, 1879), in Collection of British Authors, Vol.

Besides the variations in punctuation, the Harper version differs from the other three twenty-five times in such matters as spelling and mechanics.[5] An error in the Cornhill (repeated in the editions of Macmillan and Tauchnitz) was corrected in the Harper printing, marking it as the most carefully revised, although the earliest of the three 1879 book appearances

1879, pp. 7-106. The copyright date is April, 1879. This edition of Daisy is almost exactly the same, textually, as that of Macmillan cited above.

Daisy Miller; A Study (New York, 1879), in Harper's Half-Hour Series, No. 82, 116 pp. This volume was "Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1878, by Harper and Brothers/In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington." Harper likewise obtained 1878 copyright on its 1879 volume of An International Episode. Concerning this matter of an 1878 copyright (and the possibility of the Harper revisions having been made later than those for Macmillan), Harper at this date is unable to shed any light: "I am sorry but our records do not go back far enough for me to be able to reply to your inquiries about various editions of DAISY MILLER" (letter of Miss Dorothy B. Fiske, September 28, 1949). Macmillan of London very generously attempted to clear up the question of advance copyright: "We believe that in order to secure copyright in this country at that time, we had to publish the book before the last instalment appeared in the United States. Harpers could wait for corrections and apparently did so, but they kept to the original sections of the CORNHILL magazine version" (letter of T. M., October 14, 1949). Daisy, however, appeared in this country not in installments but in book form, after having first appeared in England.

3 The comma was added (69), omitted (28), changed to the semicolon (15), the colon (1). The semicolon was changed to the comma (11), the colon (2). The dash was added (2), omitted (6). The exclamation point was added (4), omitted (4), changed to the comma (2). Two sentences were made one (5), one sentence was made two (2). The other 26 changes all involve, in one way or another, the use of the dash in setting off parenthetical elements. In a few instances it was the Macmillan—not the Harper—edition that differed from the Cornhill version.

The four-part division, however, was introduced in 1879 by Macmillan, not Harper, making Harper's seem earlier. (Incidentally, even the recent reprints that are based upon a Harper text follow the original June and July [Cornhill] two-part division of Daisy.)

4 It should be noted that there are seventeen instances of all three of the 1879 editions making the same change to the Cornhill version. See note 9.

5 And Victorianism, Harper softening "Damn" to "D—n." Harper used lower case for "a Count," asterisks for periods in ellipsis, hyphenated young Randolph's "Mother-r" ("Motherr" in Cornhill), and was conservative in such words as "in-doors" and "spindle-shanks" (one word in Cornhill). Harper spelled "Vevey" and "Comanche" with an "a". See note 10.

of Daisy.

Rules for use of the comma were more carefully observed by James (or the Harper printer): introductory parenthetical matter was now set off, the comma dutifully replaced the semicolon "between two independent clauses joined by a coordinating conjunction," while disappearing from around restrictive elements. Use of the semicolon eliminated the "comma fault," and single sentences were more effectively written as two. More important for the layman reading the Harper version of Daisy were the punctuation changes that made the dialogue more realistic: semicolons after the introductory "Well" became commas, the dash or the comma was inserted to show a pause by the speaker, the comma replaced the dash around unstressed parenthetical elements, and the exclamation point was excised after casual statements (but made the terminal mark for emotional utterances). Finally, in speaking to Winterbourne of Mrs. Walker, Daisy (in the Cornhill, Macmillan, and Tauchnitz versions) tells him " 'I knew where you knew her.' " Correctly in the Harper edition of 1879 she says, " 'I knowwhere you knew her.' "[6]

Whereas the 1879 Harper edition of Daisy differs more than 200 times from the Cornhill, and Macmillan and Tauchnitz versions, the latter two (but not the Harper) contain a mere twenty variant readings; only infrequently are the nine in punctuation improvements, while the five in use of the hyphen are relatively unimportant.[7] The alterations in diction were

6 But in its edition of 1883 Harper printed "knew." And in 1879 "permissible" appeared in Harper as "permisable."

7 As is so frequently the case, the handling of compound words is both more and less free; for instance, Cornhill and Harper have "half an hour" (sometimes hyphenated in Cornhill) and "grand-daughters," but Macmillan prints "half-an-hour" and "granddaughters." See note 16.

never adopted in Harper editions, and, for that matter, appear only in this Macmillan printing of Daisy: the change of "shouldn't" to "wouldn't," "Gracious!" to "Gracious me!" "interlocutor" to "interlocutrix," "further" to "farther," and "brilliant" to "skilful."[8]

Besides those changes peculiar to either the Harper or the Macmillan (and Tauchnitz) edition, there are seventeen instances in which all three adopt the same alteration to the spelling, punctuation, or mechanics of the original Cornhill version.[9] Reference must be made to these deterrents to systematic collation, inconsistencies. In the Cornhill, "half a dozen," "half an hour," and "button-hole" appear variously with or without hyphens. "Too-emphatic" is not always thus in Macmillan (and Tauchnitz), only the Cornhill makes "anyone" and "downstairs" consistently one word, and "H seven" could be assured of pious treatment only at the hands of Harper. On both sides of the Atlantic, the spelling was the same for "inquired," "offence," "reflections," "practised," and "centre." Harper remained adamant in its spelling of "Vevay,"[10] denominated by all other publishers (including Cornhill) "Vevey."

The conclusions (something less than spectacular) reached thus far are that the house printers may have made many of the very slight early revisions (in spelling, punctuation, and mechanics) to Daisy Miller,[11] and

8 Strict interpretation might put "wouldn't" and "farther" in the category of grammar changes. (Similarly, the 1879 Harper had printed Cornhill's "towards" and "afterwards" without the final "s." In 1892 Harper added the "s.")

9 Cornhill's "everyone," "anyone," and "someone" appear (generally) as two words in the book editions, and its "Good-by" is in them "Good-bye."

10 And, until 1892, its spelling of "Commanche."

(considering the minor changes in diction that had their hour upon the page and then were seen no more) that James did not here bring to revision his usual high seriousness. A fact that collation of other stories reinforces begins to appear, the observation that in succeeding editions of a fiction, James worked from the last previous edition issued by that particular house, ignoring an intermediate, improved version bearing another imprint--farther on in this study it will be seen that James used the 1879 Macmillan Daisy in preparing for the press its 1883 edition. The same may be said of the Harper editions of 1879, 1883, and 1892 (the version, unfortunately, read by the general public).

Daisy Miller (still subtitled A Study) appeared twice more in 1883. Of the eighteen changes in the new Harper edition[12] (from its 1879 one), all but one could easily have been made by the printer;[13] but if the punctuation alterations were the author's, they are in the vein of his development around 1880, for generally at this time the earlier of two versions is the more exact and precise, and the later, freer and more simple.

---

11 If one knew James to be in the habit of buying (perhaps as gifts to friends in Cambridge) several copies of English magazines in which his work appeared, one would tentatively suggest that for each book version, he worked with a fresh, unmarked copy of the Cornhill, paying no attention to the one already revised-upon.

12 Daisy Miller; A Study, and Other Stories (New York, 1883), in Franklin Square Library, No. 303, pp. 1-12. The other stories were An International Episode, "The Diary of a Man of Fifty," and "A Bundle of Letters." The latter two first appeared, respectively, in Harper's Magazine (and Macmillan's Magazine), July, 1879, and The Parisian, December 13, 1879.

13 Instead of "...with her hostess; Winterbourne judged it becoming ..." one reads in the 1883 edition "...with her hostess and Winterbourne judged..." The other seventeen changes involve merely the use of the hyphen, omission of the comma, and the like.

Macmillan also brought out an 1883 edition of Daisy;[14] about one-fourth of the sixty-nine changes from its 1879 edition[15] involve the more modern, unhyphenated printing of such words as "garden wall," "half an hour," and "downstairs,"[16] and two-thirds are insertions or omissions of the comma. James (or the Macmillan printer) added it after introductory matter, between independent clauses, and especially around elements heretofore restrictive but now (with more clarity--and, more formality) nonrestrictive; the later, more independent James is foreseen, however, in the frequent disappearance of the comma between adjectives in series and from such expletives as "Oh dear!" and "Oh yes!" One of the three important changes to punctuation of dialogue is not an improvement: Winterbourne, trying to persuade Daisy to sever her relations with Giovanelli, warned her that the Europeanized Americans at Rome would show their disapproval of her conduct "disagreeably"; originally she had sounded very hard and calculating, demanding of the young man, " 'How disagreeably?' " In the 1879 Macmillan edition, a wide-eyed, naive Daisy had asked, " 'How--disagreeably?' " But the 1883 version inexplicably drops the dash, and again there is a metallic

14 Daisy Miller; A Study, Four Meetings, Longstaff's Marriage, Benvolio, in Collection of Novels and Tales by Henry James (London, 1883), pp. 1-72. This was the tenth volume in Macmillan's fourteen-volume set, apparently planned for some years in advance (see text for note 17). "Longstaff's Marriage" first appeared in Scribner's Monthly, August, 1878, and Benvolio in the August, 1875, Galaxy. It should be noted that these two stories are replacing An International Episode (see note 2, first citation).

15 Comparison of each passage in which there is a punctuation change in 1883 with both 1879 and 1883 editions of the other publisher reveals nothing in matters of chronology and borrowings; with all four books open before him, one finds, for example, that when the two Macmillan editions are at variance, sometimes the earlier Macmillan agrees with both Harper editions--at other times, the later Macmillan agrees with both Harpers. There are also variations upon this theme.

quality in the response of Daisy. A slight change elsewhere improved her dialogue, however, for where she had earlier spoken to Winterbourne of going " 'to Italy.' " she now (1883) excitedly anticipates her visit " 'to Italy!' " Mrs. Costello, in the Harper editions, condemned Daisy with her quiet assertion that " 'She is a young lady who has an intimacy with her mamma's courier.' " Illogically, the earlier Macmillan edition had weakened this to a question, but more incisively and spiritedly, in this 1883 version it becomes an exclamation.

Thus far, then, there have been five changes in diction (ignored later) between the Cornhill edition and the 1879 Macmillan printing of Daisy, as well as several alterations in punctuation for the Harper version of 1879, and several between Macmillan's two editions.

The negligible number of alterations present in the Harper edition of 1883, combined with the plausible assumption that publishing procedure is fairly standard among the major houses (that what was true of Macmillan might also be true of Harper), suggests that all of the "1879" and "1883" revisions of Daisy Miller; A Study attributable to James could have been made by him within a year of its original appearance in the June and July, 1878, pages of Cornhill, for "T.E." of Macmillan generously furnished the information that while "Our records naturally do not cover textual details, and we have not time for more than a limited amount of research.... We published it in two volumes in February, 1879. It was reprinted in March. It was then re-set and stereotyped for a second edition in one volume in August, 1879, and the 1883 edition was from these plates. This would explain the

---

16 Recurrence of the same change is not included in the tabulations; the appearance in this edition (two times for each) of "half an hour," "Good-night," and "by the way" is considered as three changes, not six.

differences between the text of February and March, 1879, and that of 1883. Your letter gives us the impression that you have not seen the second edition, 1879."[17] (Apparently, then, the 1883 Macmillan revisions were made between March and August, 1879, some three and a half to four years before the edition was printed, and about a year later than Daisy's debut in Cornhill.) "T.H.'s" letter would seem to offer further evidence that each publishing house followed its own earlier version, casting no covetous side glances at the editions bearing other imprints, and that, in matters of chronology, it is unwise to speak too glibly.

Again in 1892 Harper issued Daisy Miller (this time without the subtitle, A Study).[18] This edition varies in a few instances from its last previous (1883) one, in the use of hyphens (4), capitals (2), quotes or italics (4), and asterisks (1), and in the adoption of the Cornhill (and Macmillan) spelling of "Comanche," "towards," and "afterwards." In it eleven commas are inserted and thirteen omitted, a short sentence of dialogue (" 'Well,' he said, 'I am not.' ") is given separate paragraphing, single sentences are three times punctuated as two, semicolons are replaced (twice by a dash, and once by a comma), and a comma becomes a colon (and a colon, a comma)—each change was an improvement. Punctuation revisions (terminal as well as internal) also served to make the dialogue more realistic; in

17 Letter of October 14, 1949. See note 14. On January 18, 1879, James wrote his mother that Macmillan was "just on the point of bringing out Daisy Miller, The [An] International Episode, and Four Meetings in two little big-printed volumes.... There is every reason to expect for them a very good success, as Daisy M. has been, as I have told you before, a really quite extraordinary hit" (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York, 1920, I, 68).

18 Henry James, Jr., Daisy Miller and An International Episode (New York, 1892). (James had dropped the "Junior" in 1883, following the

addition to the change of colon to semicolon (3), semicolon to comma (1), and comma to semicolon (1), there was the logical insertion and omission (one of each) of a question mark, and two felicitious additions of an exclamation point. Four other variants occur in 1892, one of idiom ("supply information with regard to "becoming"... in regard to").[19] Obnoxious Randolph instead of kicking the dirt up "not a little" kicked it up (less formally) "a little." A sentence was compressed, for " 'You can drive, you know, or you can go by the little steamer.' " reappears as " 'You can drive or go by the little steamer.' " Finally, Winterbourne's plea to Daisy not to " 'walk off to the Pincio at this hour' " was invested with more foreboding—in 1892 he enjoins her not to go there" 'at this unhealthy hour.' "

There is no escaping the conclusion that from its original publication in 1879 to its appearance in the New York Edition in 1909, Daisy Miller received from James virtually no significant revisions. It does not seem likely that the fame of Daisy would have rendered so conscientious a revisionist complacent; it is possible that those bitter ironies—its uncritical yet adverse readers, and his failure to be dissociated from it—made James loath to give it, from 1878 to 1892, the careful re-perusal that revision demands.

Often using the same plates, Harper has continued to issue the 1892

---

death of his father the year before; this edition bears the copyright 1878 and 1892—the earlier date may throw some light on the reappearance of the designation "Jr.") A feature of this edition was that it was "illustrated from drawings by Harry W. McVickar." Including "Frontispieces" and "Decorations," the hand of McVickar provided 100 such embellishments; James's antipathy towards illustrations leads again to the feeling that he was cool towards his heroine.

19 The recent Penguin reprint of Daisy uses the earlier "with regard to."

version of Daisy conveniently available in most of the recent cheap (and carelessly-done) reprints—[20] even the New York house of Macmillan, failing to avail itself of the monumental 35-volume definitive and "Complete Edition" of James published in 1921-23 by its London house,[21] brought out in 1927 a volume of Daisy based upon the Harper edition of 1892.[22]

The 1892 plates of Daisy were utilized by Harper in 1902, 1906, and 1916, the latter edition[23] with an introduction by James's lifelong friend, William Dean Howells. Harper's 1920 printing of Daisy omits the introduction, which had, however, already reappeared in 1917, when Boni and Liveright added the story to its Modern Library of the World's Best Books;[24] in the same year Daisy also reappeared in London, under the imprint of Thomas Nelson and Sons, but Phillips identifies its text as that of the 1879 Macmillan version.[25]

20 Moved by the temerity of the scholar and pledging myself to the secrecy of the dissertation, I made inquiry of both Harper's and Scribner's concerning royalties for the reprinting of Daisy from their versions. Miss Dorothy B. Fiske, of Harper (letter of September 28, 1949), tactfully avoided my question (see note 2). Charles Scribner's Sons candidly admitted that "While we should wish to answer your letter in detail if possible, it is hardly practicable nor could we feel that the great labor and time involved is justified by the relevance of the results. A record of payments too would be arduous (sic) with the books, possibly many out of copyright published by various houses" (letter of September 28, 1949; I am unable to make out the initial with which the letter is signed). Scribner has never reprinted its 1909 version of Daisy.

21 This edition included Washington Square, The Bostonians, and several short works not found in the Scribner set. As Phillips points out (Bibliography, p.127) Houghton Mifflin, Harper, and Scribner, by use of uniform size and binding, have achieved the "aspect of a collective edition of much of Henry James's fiction." Houghton Mifflin has issued ten volumes, Harper, four, and Scribner, eleven. Although the Harper Daisy of 1920 (a part of this pseudo-collective edition) uses the 1892 text, Phillips states that the "plates of the New York Edition have been used frequently..." (ibid.).

22 Or perhaps arrangements could have been made with Scribner (whose text was followed by London Macmillan). Even the Macmillan 1883 text

One continues to wonder why the New York house of Macmillan, in its 1927 printing of Daisy,[26] used neither the definitive text of Scribner nor that of London Macmillan, but instead, the popular one of Harper's, to which it made only eleven minor alterations, nine of them matters of spelling, mechanics, or punctuation.[27] The problem will likely remain unresolved, for according to the first vice-president, one H. S. Latham, "We are afraid we cannot give you any very helpful information....The general editor of the Modern Reader's Series, in collaboration with the volume editor [Martin W. Sampson], chose the text...and we rather imagine that, for some reason or other, the text which you say was used...appealed to these two editors. We cannot consult Professor Thorndike, who was the general series editor, as he is no longer living, and we imagine that he would be the only one who could have answered your question."[28]

Not only Penguin, but according to Dr. Lucas, Dial, Caxton, World, and Haldeman-Julius (the latter two of which I have been unable to examine) all reprinted an earlier version of Daisy,[29] and Miss Viola R. Dunbar tells

---

would seem as logical a choice as the Harper one of 1892. (Collation of three pages of the 1927 New York Macmillan volume with the 1883 text reveals as many differences in punctuation and mechanics as are to be found in the entire eighty-seven pages of the 1927 Daisy when it is collated with that of 1892.)

23 Phillips failed to cite the 1906 printing, and gave 1917 as the date of the 1916 one (Bibliography, pp. 40-41).

24 In Boni and Liveright's Modern Library of the World's Best Books, the only changes to the 1892 Harper text are the omission of a comma and the spelling of "Vevey."

25 Bibliography, p.15.

26 Daisy Miller and An International Episode, ed. Martin W. Sampson, in Modern Reader's Series (New York, 1927).

27 Here we again find "Vevey" (but the old two-part division of the story). Commas and hyphens are both added and omitted, the relative pronoun "that" becomes "who," and a thought was put within quotes.

us that "Most of the easily available reprints (including Modern Library[30] and Penguin Editions) have used a corrupt version of the original text (the Harper edition of 1883)."[31] The Penguin reprint, however, along with those of Dial, and Caxton,[32] follows the text of the Harper edition of 1898. It is puzzling that Miss Dunbar, who recently made such a splendid contribution to James bibliography,[33] should have overlooked this edition.

---

28 Letter of September 30, 1949. Reprint houses, too, frequently display a disappointing lack of omniscience. In endeavoring to explain "which edition of the book was used for setting," S. Stein wrote, concerning the Penguin Daisy (1947), that "since the last copyright line in our edition reads 'Copyright 1920 by Mrs. Henry James,' it seems safe to assume that [the edition used] was later than the 1898 edition you refer to" (letter of February 2, 1950).

29 John S. Lucas, "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948), p.46.

30 The present (Random House) Modern Library has no edition of Daisy. See note 24.

31 "The Revision of Daisy Miller," Modern Language Notes, LXV (May 1950), 311-317.

32 Daisy in the 1947 Penguin reprint is accompanied by the ubiquitous An International Episode.

The Great Short Novels of Henry James, ed. Philip Rahv (New York, 1944). The contents: Madame de Mauves, Daisy Miller, An International Episode, The Siege of London, Lady Barberina, The Author of 'Beltraffio,' The Aspern Papers, The Pupil, The Turn of the Screw, The Beast in the Jungle.

Selected Novels of Henry James, ed. Arthur Zeiger ([New York] 1946), in Caxton Library of World's Greatest Literature. The other "novels" are The American, The Europeans, and An International Episode. Of these "novels" the longest is the Atlantic (December, 1878, January, 1879), but Mr. Zeiger's texts range towards early works, and early texts of these works, for as he writes, "The texts employed are those of the original editions, rather those [sic] of the revised New York edition [sic] ..." (p.viii).

33 "Addenda to 'Bibliographical and Critical Studies of Henry James, 1941-1945,' American Literature, XI (January 1949), 442-435," American Literature, XXII (March 1950), 56-62. See Chapter I, note 88, for other studies by Miss Dunbar.

Indeed, her article opens on the theme that not until he revised for the New York Edition did James make "the ironic discovery that Daisy, far from being a slander, was really an idealised treatment..."[34] and that the belatedness of the discovery accounted for the fact that until 1909 "the story had appeared as Daisy Miller: a Study."[35] But it was with this 1892 edition that James dropped the subtitle A Study.

Except for the spelling of "Vevay" in Dial (and Caxton) and the Penguin use of the 1883 "with regard to" idiom, these three reprints are regularly in accord with the fifty-eight changes (noted above) adopted in the 1892 Harper; quite clearly, they do not follow the Harper edition "of 1883." There are of course variations between the reprints and their 1892 text, for contemporary printers seem to take a pardonable freedom with punctuation half a century old--and, it must be confessed, a few times to good effect; of the proofreading, however, no such encomium may be made. Penguin dropped two commas while adding one, made a date more contemporaneous ("the 23rd"), capitalised what had been a lower-case opening word in a sentence, and omitted the preposition in "got astride (of) his alpenstock." But it also incorrectly inserted a dash, illogically changed a terminal mark in dialogue, omitted the first set of quotes in "studying" (thus, studying"), and gratuitously printed "his little hard voice" as "his hard little voice."[36] Five punctuation changes (and an omission of italics) appear in the Dial reprint;

34 "Revision of Daisy Miller," p. 311.

35 Ibid., p.312. Miss Dunbar refers to the Harper edition of 1883, and the "Mac Millan [sic] 1879 text"; her failure to mention the Tauchnitz, the 1883 Macmillan, and the other two of Harper (1883,1892) leads the reader to believe that there were only two early book editions.

36 The New York Edition makes it "a small sharp hard voice," and the Scribner "Standard Edition," "a sharp hard voice."

Caxton (which also dropped the italics) altered ten marks of punctuation; both printed "she asked slowly" as "she added slowly." Further, besides changing " 'Gracious!' " to " 'Gracious?' " and "he had no enemies" to "he has" none, Caxton experienced some difficulty with word endings, reproducing "vaguely-lighted monuments" as "vaguely-lighter" ones, "Them" as "They," and "ceasing to advance" as "ceasing to advancing." Both Caxton and Penguin made significant omissions:

1892 Harper	1946 Caxton
...in joining her amoroso, should not appear more impatient of his own company, and he was vexed because of his inclination.	...in joining her amoroso, should not appear more impatient of his inclination.

1892 Harper	1947 Penguin
"You certainly won't leave me!" he protested.	[omitted]
"And if you want very much to know, we are neither of us flirting; we are too good friends for that; we are very intimate friends."	"And if you want very much to know, we are too good friends for that; we are very intimate friends."

Plodding wearily across this darkling plain, the discouraged Jacobite finally descries the faint but cheering rays cast by the reprints of the Scribner Daisy. In 1915 a single-volume Daisy was added by Martin Secker (London) to its "Uniform Edition of the Tales" of James;[37] despite the

37 Twice reprinted, 1919 and 1924 (the latter was the copy I examined). Each of fourteen long stories or nouvelles in the edition was a separate volume.

In 1947 Eyre and Spottiswoode of London brought out an inexpensive (5 shilling) Daisy Miller (Atlantis Press). According to the Times Literary Supplement for February 5, 1949 ("Henry James Reprints," p.96), four London publishers--including Eyre and Spottiswoode--had elected to follow the definitive rather than the early text in their reprints of James. (Only Rupert

title pages's solemn declaration that the "text follows that of the Definitive Edition," deviations from the 1909 version occur so frequently that it was felt necessary to collate the Secker edition with an accurate reproduction of the (not readily available) 1922 definitive edition,[38] on the theory that perhaps James had made revisions to Daisy even after 1909, and that Secker utilized them in 1915, seven years before they were destined to reappear in the (posthumous) Macmillan set. This assumption, however, proved groundless—the 1922 Daisy is, almost exactly, the same as that of 1909; therefore, the frequent deviations in the Secker text are not from the hand of James.

One holds no cavil with Secker for seventeen of the punctuation changes,[39] but its replacement of two dashes in dialogue[40] seems unfair to the author. In the interest of uniformity a publishing house has its own rules on questions of mechanics, so that seven variant readings of such words as "bare-headed" and "eyeglass" are minuscule;[41] so too perhaps are the four-

---

Hart-Davis chose the earlier texts.) It is the present (embarrassed) writer's duty to report that he postponed until too late the examination of the text of this London (1947) Daisy—all evidence, however, points to the use of the definitive text.

38 Daisy is the opening story in Volume XXIII of Macmillan's 35-volume set (which bears the title "The Novels and Stories of Henry James. New and Complete Edition").

My "accurate reproduction" was found in Four Great American Novels, ed. Raymond W. Short (New York, 1946), which I compared with the Scribner text, and then used as a substitute for the Macmillan volume.

39 Twelve comma changes, and five changes involving the dash.

40 Once each by a comma and a semicolon.

41 There were five instances in which Secker followed Scribner's procedure relative to the hyphen, while Macmillan deviated from it. And twice, both London houses made the same change to the Scribner use of the hyphen (Secker also added the "s" to "towards.")

teen occasions when both the 1909 and the 1922 editions (but not Secker) italicized foreign terms. It does not, however, seem the prerogative of the printer to change a contracted " 'He's' " in dialogue to the stiff " 'He is' " or to endeavor gratuitously not once but ten times to improve the terminal punctuation of dialogue. Human fallibility, which accounted for the omission of the pronoun in " 'Well, I guess....' " could also explain the Secker printing of "a small sharp hard voice" as "a sharp hard voice" and of " 'And who is Giovanelli?' " as " 'Who is Giovanelli?' " The Secker changes of "...was highly animated, she was..." to "...animated for she was..." and its insertion of "that" in " '...you'll tell me now [that] I'm not a nice girl.' " remind one of the grammarian who teaches correctness at the expense of stylistic integrity, and its rendering of "an immense negation" as "a great negation" is pure and simple tampering with the author's text.[42]

Henry W. Holt (New York) in 1946 printed Daisy from the 1922 Macmillan text (except for two lapses, English spelling is used). Six of the seven

42 Despite certain disclaimers, it seems that editors, or printers, do feel justified in making minor emendations. C. A. Madison of the College Editorial Department of Henry Holt and Co. (letter of September 27, 1949) states that "It is our policy not to modify punctuation in the work of a responsible author."; but Professor Short, who edited so excellently Holt's Four Great American Novels, writes that "In spite of my recommendations, the Holt Press insisted on certain modifications of punctuation and spelling" (letter of September 20, 1949). And (in answer to my query concerning the many differences between Scribner punctuation and mechanics and that found in the American Writers Series James) Mr. Allan Abbott, editor of the American Book Company's college textbooks in English, writes of the "common practice of publishing houses of conforming the authors' punctuation to the style adopted by the publisher doing the book--unless the author objects." Mr. Abbott added however that "It is our practice now to make no alteration whatever in quoted material" (letter of September 26, 1949).

B. Stein (letter of February 2, 1950) of the New American Library (publisher of the Penguin Daisy) writes with delightful candor that "Printers and proofreaders are not allowed to change anything in the text without questioning it first. One of the complaints against printers, in particular, is the mechanical way in which they will set copy, mistakes and all, if there happen to be any which weren't caught."

variants from the 1909 Scribner edition[43] could possibly have been made by Macmillan, but there is one glaring (albeit understandable) case of omission:

Scribner	Holt
...bonnet-ribbons; she glanced at Winterbourne. Then, while she glanced and smiled, she brought out....	...bonnet-ribbons; she glanced and smiled, she brought out....

Examination (one by proxy, as it were) of the "definitive" reprints of Daisy Miller issued since the New York Edition prompts one to believe that after 1909 James made no revisory touches to the work; add to this the virtual absence of any significant revisions before the Scribner edition, and one concludes that--as his revisions go--James really revised Daisy Miller only once.

Miss Dunbar noted that in preparing his famous story for inclusion in the New York Edition, James worked with the 1879 Macmillan version.[44] One would naturally expect the last previous edition to have been the volume used, but comparison of the 1892 and the 1883 Harper versions (where they vary) with the corresponding passage in the New York Edition discloses that the latter agrees much more often with the earlier (the second) Harper edition,[45] especially in such reliable items as diction and sentence structure

43 Four are of punctuation. All three spelling errors are plausible: the printing of "frank gay eyes" as frank "grey" ones; "in young unmarried than in old married ones" as "older" ones; "...showed so far delightfully regular." as "...showed so far delightfully regular."

44 "Revision of Daisy Miller," p.312,n.

45 It agrees with the 1892 edition 2 times in spelling, and 16 times in punctuation and mechanics, but with the 1883 edition 30 times in variant punctuation.

(there were seven such bits of evidence). Application of the same technique to the second and the first (1879) Harper text reveals again that the earlier of the two versions is the most likely original of the 1909 Scribner Daisy. Since nothing yet has been as it should be,[46] one follows the hunch that James did use an 1879 edition—not Harper's, but Macmillan's—and this seems to be the case. In five instances both candidates differ from other editions but agree with Scribner's, signifying nothing; but whereas in the variant readings Harper is the apparent source eight times, Macmillan differs from it while resembling Scribner a gratifying twenty-seven times. Statistics per se, in such an erratic subject as this, lead to conclusions that are, at best, tenuous—one of the commas or the hyphen could distort their accuracy. The most trustworthy evidence is that furnished by significant and unique punctuation, and diction; two such items favor the Harper edition, but seven that of Macmillan—semicolons that unquestionably are preferable to the comma in Harper, the remark that Daisy " 'wouldn't' " (rather than " 'shouldn't' ") have taken Winterbourne for a real American, her " 'Gracious me!' " (rather than " 'Gracious!' "), and the dash that makes naive her response to Winterbourne's warning about the adverse reactions to her behavior," 'How—disagreeably?' "

In case the reader is reminded of the butterfly on the wheel, one hastens to acknowledge that the James of the Major Phase revised automatically the punctuation of whatever edition was at hand, and that the important improvements to diction made between 1878 and 1892 are so few as to render immaterial what edition he worked from—except for the fine type, rough paper, and the lack of margin, he could just as well have used the original Cornhill.

---

[46] One is relieved to report that, in revising for the New York Edition, James did not use the Cornhill version.

- II -

The success of William Dean Howells in treating the American girl abroad encouraged James to create Daisy Miller;[47] the story grew itself (James recalled, many years later) came "in Rome during the autumn of 1877; a friend...happened to mention—which she might perfectly not have done—some simple and uninformed American lady of the previous winter, whose young daughter, a child of nature and of freedom...had 'picked up' by the wayside, with the best conscience in the world, a good-looking Roman of vague identity, astonished at his luck, yet (so far as might be, by the pair) all innocently, all seriously exhibited and introduced: this at least till the occurrence of some small social check, some interrupting incident, of no great gravity or dignity, and which I forget."[48] Daisy was "indited in London the following spring"[49] and sent to Lippincott's, whose editor, although having "lately appeared to appreciate my contributions... promptly returned me my missive, and with an absence of comment that struck me at the time as rather

47 "Recall...the two reviews of Howells's A Foregone Conclusion which James had written on his return from Europe in 1874. He had praised his friend's novel...highly and with a hint of envy...especially the portrait of Florida Vervain, and he had recalled that of Kitty in A Chance Acquaintance. In those two heroines, 'delicate, nervous, emancipated young women, begotten of our institutions and our climate, and equipped with an irritable moral consciousness,' James had believed that Howells had 'outlined his field.' Moreover, it had seemed to him that Howells ...had 'hit' it. He had found the subject which it was most important for American fiction to note and do justice to and preserve—the American girl. He had discovered her possibilities for the novelist. He had studied her, understood her complexities, and portrayed them....James had undoubtedly resolved to devote himself to the same cause, but he had delayed treating her till he should have time to study her, so that he could really 'do' her and not, as in some of his own early stories, but suggest her charm. It was Howells, then, who...in Florida Vervain, suggested that [the American girl] became...most interesting when she left her native land for Europe. Perhaps...this was one reason why [James] had returned to Europe—to study her there" (Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley, The Early Development of Henry James, Urbana, 1930, pp.269-270).

grim...till a friend to whom I appealed for light...declared it could only have passed with the Philadelphian critic for 'an outrage on American girlhood.' This was verily a light, and of bewildering intensity....To the fault of being outrageous this little composition added that of being essentially and pre-eminently a nouvelle; a... type, foredoomed at the best...to editorial disfavor."[50] James's "admirable friend the late Leslie Stephen," however, published Daisy in the Cornhill, whereupon it was "promptly pirated in Boston--a sweet tribute I hadn't yet received and was never again to know...."[51]

Daisy, the work by which James has always been best known, was never an unmixed blessing; on June 17, 1879, the thirty-six year old author wrote Howells that "I am delighted to hear of the flourishing condition of my fame in the U. S. and feel as if it were a great shame that I shouldn't be there to reap a little the harvest of my glory. My fame indeed seems to do very well everywhere--the proportions it has acquired here are a constant surprise

---

48 The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur (New York, 1935), p. 257.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid., p. 260.

51 Ibid. The Atlantic Monthly for February, 1879, writes of James's "short tale, Daisy Miller, recently published in the Cornhill and the Living Age" (XLIII, 259). The Tauchnitz edition contains this note (dated April, 1879, and signed by Henry James, Jr.): "I desire it to be understood that the present is the only edition of 'Daisy Miller,' 'An International Episode' and 'Four Meetings' published on the continent of Europe with my assent" (unnumbered page opposite the "contents" page).

to me; it is only my fortune that leaves to be desired."[52] James elaborated upon this, informing Howells ruefully that this "fame, expanding through two hemispheres,[53] is represented by a pecuniary equivalent almost grotesquely small. Your account of the vogue of Daisy Miller and the International Episode embittered my spirit....I have made $200 by the whole American career of D. M...."[54]

The other reason for James's finding in Daisy only a mixed satisfaction is of course the adverse criticism heaped upon it by the general public, for little seems to have been written about Daisy (in the literate magazines) by its paid reviewers, most of whom returned a favorable verdict. We are told[55] that "The few reviews of Daisy Miller were favorable and were devoted mostly to discussion of the truthfulness of the character of Daisy. All reviewers praised the exquisite skill with which the story was told and the character of Daisy delineated. Except for the critic in Harper's,[56] they

52 F. O. Matthiessen, The James Family; Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, Henry, and Alice James (New York, 1948), p. 501. See note 17.

53 In Pandora (1884), which immediately follows Daisy in Volume XVIII of the New York Edition, a German gentleman is seen reading Daisy in its Tauchnitz reprinting, hoping thereby to arrive at an understanding of the American girl.

54 The James Family, p.501.

55 Richard Nicholas Foley, Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866 to 1916 (Washington, D.C., 1944), p.19.

56 Harper's, Dr. Foley found, "considered Daisy totally lacking in resemblance to any existent American girl" (ibid.,n.). The "Editor's Literary Record" in the January, 1879, Harper's devoted only one paragraph to its house's volume of Daisy. The mother and daughter, it felt, "are as much within the range of possibility as the Siamese twins." But (in a more conciliatory vein) the "Literary Record" regarded it as obvious that it had not been James's "purpose" in this "brilliant and graceful trifle" seriously to present them "as typical representatives of our country-women" (LVII, 310).

emphasized the faithfulness of the portrait to its original,[57] and tossed aside the 'protests of the girls who belong to her own class and pronounce her a caricature' and the objections of the newspaper critics and nationalistic readers who regarded the book as an affront to American girls and their parents abroad."

Besides defending James's intentions, Mr. Howells furnishes us with some indication of the furore (albeit perhaps chiefly oral) caused by Daisy, when many years later (1902) he wrote that "our civilisation could not imagine the sincerity in which the tribute was offered to it. It could not realise that Daisy Miller was presented in her divine innocence, her inex-

57 "North American Review and Scribner's considered the characters as accurate portraits of certain types of Americans abroad, types too often found there" (Criticism of James, p.19,n.).

Not in its "Literary Record" (See note 56) but in its "Contributors' Club" column the March (1879) Harper's praised Daisy, regarding it as "positively startling in its straightforward simplicity and ... authenticity.... All poor Daisy's crimes are purely conventional. She is innocent and good at heart, susceptible of praise and blame; she does not wish even to surprise, much less outrage, the stiffest of her censors. In short, the things she does with such dire effect at Vevay and at Rome would never for an instant be remarked or criticised in Schenectady" (LVII, 400-401).

In the intervening month between these Harper's verdicts, the Atlantic and (as Dr. Foley notes) Scribner's had praised Daisy. The February (1879) issue of the latter magazine pointed out that "While quite free from any real impropriety herself, [Daisy] lays herself open to the vulgar comments of the world. In the eyes of people who think much of social etiquette, Daisy Millers [American flirts] appear far worse than women of real wickedness [European coquettes]. .... Daisy was ill-trained, reckless of what others thought, and thoroughly satisfied that her judgment was equal to anybody's" (XVII, 610).

The Atlantic "Contributors' Club" for February glows in a manner reminiscent of the praises of Howells: "... I am shocked to find that what I gratefully accepted as an exquisitely loyal service to American girlhood abroad is regarded by some critical experts as 'servilely snobbish' and 'brutally unpatriotic' " (XLIII, 258). This Jacobite contributor went on to praise James as a "valiant champion ... of the young American What-is-it, whose beauty and whose vagaries are the eighth wonder of the other hemisphere" (p.259).

unquenchable trust in herself and others, as the supreme effect of the American attitude toward womanhood....The American woman fumed in the poor girl a libel of her nationality, almost a libel of her sex, and failed to seize her wilding charm, her flowerlike purity. The American youth would none of Daisy Miller....."[58] Returning to his theme a year later (1903) Howells (again, perhaps, with pardonable overstatement) declared that "the strange thing was that these traits (of Daisy) were charming and honorable distinctions of American girlhood as it convinced Europe, in the early 1870's, of a civilization so spiritual that the innocent daughters could be not only without the knowledge but without the fear of evil."[59]

English readers were never so emotionally involved with this "charming and honorable" girl as were her innocent American sisters[60] (although as late as 1890 Andrew Lang parodied Daisy),[61] but they became highly indignant, six months later, at An International Episode. They might have come to regard James with some equanimity had it not been for Howells'

58 William Dean Howells, "Mr. James's Masterpiece," Harper's Bazar, XXVI (January 1902) 34. The sentence concludes "...not because the American woman was ungracious or ungrateful, but because she was too jealous of her own perfection to allow that ignorance might be reckless, and angels, in their ignorance of evil, might not behave as discreetly as worse people."

59 "Mr. Henry James's Later Work," North American Review (January 1903), in The Question of Henry James, ed. F. W. Dupee (New York, 1945), p.7.

60 They seem, though, to have understood her no better, nor James's intentions. The Quarterly Review for January, 1882, accused James of pretending to show "the secrets of American life and character," both of failing in the attempt. Daisy, it felt, was not typical. Quoted in Donald M. Murray, "Henry James and the English Reviewers, 1882-1890," American Literature, XXIV (March 1952),8. Mr. Murray's dissertation dealt with "The Critical Reputation of Henry James in English Periodicals, 1875-1916" (New York, 1951).

61 "James and English Reviewers," p.39.

1882 article "Henry James, Jr.,"[62] in which he not only identified his subject with the new "school" of realism, but exalted him over such English literary giants as Dickens and Thackeray. The unwitting James had to suffer in England the results of his friend's praises in America. (Unfortunately, Howells, the champion of realism, was criticized throughout the 1880's in both England and America,[63] and James's name became, to the English reader, linked with his.) Then in 1884 came James's controversy with Stevenson over the matter of realism. Clearly, realism had not yet won its fight; three years after Daisy Miller, critics in England misinterpreted the ending of The Portrait of a Lady and castigated James for implying that Isabel was to return to America, there to live in sin with Goodwood[64]—it comes as no surprise to find James asking Howells in 1884 "...what is the use of trying to write anything decent or serious for a public so absolutely

62 Century Magazine, XXV (November 1882), 25-29. Howells felt that "it is the character, not the fate, of his people which occupies" James (p.26). Warning to his subject, Howells commented that our liking for some of James's characters "comes about through their own qualities, and is not affected by insinuation or by downright petting, such as we find in Dickens nearly always and in Thackeray too often" (p.28).
(Harper's for June, 1879, furnishes an amusing account of the English readers' reaction to Part II of An International Episode [LVII, 759].)

63 See Murray, "James and English Reviewers," passim, and Leonard Lutwack, "William Dean Howells and the 'Editor's Study,'" American Literature, XXIV (May 1952), 195-207.

64 "James and English Reviewers," p.4. See also F. O. Matthiessen, Henry James: The Major Phase (New York, 1944), pp. 180-181.
Even a conventional happy ending did not prompt Daniel Frohman to produce James's dramatization of Daisy (see The Complete Plays of Henry James, ed. Léon Edel, Philadelphia and New York, 1949, pp.117-119), although he did succeed in getting Daisy Miller, A Comedy published in 1883 (in the Atlantic, April-June, and by James R. Osgood in book form). Mr. Edel notes that "The play rewrites the original story considerably. Eugenio, the courier of the tale, becomes the villain of the piece and the shadowy lady in Geneva, briefly alluded to in the story as the friend of Winterbourne, becomes the all-important Madame de Katkoff of the play. In the tale Daisy dies of malaria and is buried in the Protestant Cemetary of Rome. In the play we are left with the promise of an early marriage between Daisy and Winterbourne" (Complete Plays, p.119).

idiotic."[65]

Almost as soon as the public, by its reactions, demonstrated its inability properly to interpret Daisy Miller; A Study, James had begun to create in his mind the character of Isabel Archer, and, by his own account in the Preface had actually done some work on The Portrait of a Lady by the spring of 1879.[66] He had wanted, imperatively, to picture an American girl gifted with both charm and character, and one who would silence the derogations of Daisy. Although James did not drop the subtitle A Study from Daisy until 1892, there may be significance in the designation Portrait, for Morris Townsend of Washington Square, the novel that immediately preceded the Portrait, struck the author as being "not a portrait—he is sketched from the outside merely, not fouille."[67] The character of Daisy (like those of Searle, Theobald, and Madame de Mauves, although James in the latter's story did dispense with the first person narrator) was likewise sketched from the outside—the reader sees her through the often-confused eyes of Winterbourne, never once entering her consciousness as he so rewardingly does in, for instance, the extended fireside soliloquy of Isabel's in the Portrait.

Thirty-one years after Daisy had first appeared, James could not remember why he had "qualified" it with the subtitle, A Study: it must have been "for reasons which I confess I fail to recapture unless they may have taken account simply of a certain flatness in my poor little heroine's literal denomination. Flatness indeed, one must have felt, was the very sum of her story; so that perhaps after all the attached epithet was meant but

65 Letters, I, 104.

66 Critical Prefaces, p.40.

67 The James Family, p.325.

as a deprecation, addressed to the reader, of any great critical hope of stirring scenes."[68] This "deprecation" of James's, addressed to his reader of the Preface in 1909, could perhaps reflect James's weariness with the whole question of Daisy—during his American lecture tour of 1905,[69] his Chicago audience evinced more interest in the identification of Daisy than in his lecture on Balzac.

Sixteen years after Daisy's debut in the Cornhill (two years after the dropping of the subtitle in the 1892 Harper reprinting), and fifteen before her definitive appearance in the Scribner edition, James was approached by Henry Harper, who wanted a "little international story on American snobbishness abroad," and who himself suggested the "subject on which ...a tale of the Daisy Miller order, might be based."[70] James saw

68 Critical Prefaces, pp. 268-269. Contemporary criticism in 1879 may be of more value than later musings. Harper's ("Editor's Literary Record") for January, 1879, noted that "Mr. James discriminates judiciously when he styles The Europeans a sketch rather than a novel. It is, indeed, a series of brilliant sketches, held together by a slight thread of continuity, but lacking the intimate fusion of parts essential to narrative or dramatic unity" (LVII, 309).

The following month, the Atlantic ("Contributors' Club") noted that "Mr. James calls his short tale, Daisy Miller ... a study," and offered as explanation the opinion that, like The Europeans, Daisy was "a collection of portraits of character carefully studied." (See note 62, first sentence.) "It is [the Atlantic felt] certainly evident that [James] has not the genuine story-telling gift, the power of inventing a story interesting for its own sake. His talent lies in another field, that of keen observation and fine discrimination of character, which he portrays with a subtle and delicate touch" (XLIII, 259).

In our own time, F. W. Dupee, author of the American Men of Letters Series Henry James (1951), suggests that James called The Europeans "a sketch" and Daisy Miller "a study" because the public was not accustomed to his "methods of economy and suggestion in an age of Victorian abundance" (p.108).

69 Marie P. Harris, "Henry James, Lecturer," American Literature, XXIII (November 1951), 302-314. A Chicago newspaper (March 11, 1905) quoted him as calling Daisy "the crystallization of many impressions, the final product of much observation. Daisy Miller is a type, not a portrait drawn

at once that to be properly done, the story would have to be longer than Harper wanted:

> The primary interest is not in any mere grotesque picture of follies and misadventures, of successes and sufferings: it's in the experience of some creature that sees it and knows and judges and feels it all, that has a part to play in the episode, that is tried and tested and harrowed and exhibited by it and that forms the glass, as it were, through which we look at the diorama. On the very threshold one sees the difficulty that the subject is too big—too big for treatment on the Daisy Miller scale....[71]

And would not such a "treatment" be different from that of Daisy Miller? Would not such a "glass," one that would enable the reader to "look at the diorama", be a portrait, in the manner of that of Isabel Archer, and not a study, a sketching "from the outside merely," like Daisy Miller? It seems to me that Miss Viola R. Dunbar, in her recent study of the revision of Daisy,[72] accepts too literally selected remarks made by James in the Preface: "When James revised this story in 1909 for the New York Edition, he made the ironic discovery that Daisy, far from being a slander, was really an idealized treatment of the American girl. He saw then, as he said he always should have seen, that this work was not at all a critical realistic study, but was conceived 'quite inordinately and extravagantly[,] in poetic (sic) terms'....As he phrased it, 'my supposedly typical little figure was of course pure poetry, and had never been anything else...'. Freed from the pretense that Daisy was 'typical,' James in

---

with slavish realism to one model. There may be one hundred Daisy Millers for all I know" (p.308).

70 The Notebooks of Henry James, edd. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock (New York, 1947), pp.176,167.

71 Ibid., p.176.

72 "The Revision of Daisy Miller," Modern Language Notes, LXV (May 1950), 311-317.

revising the story applied 'the helpful imagination' even more than before.... In his new interpretation of the work, he saw that it never should have been called 'a study' and he conscientiously deleted that qualification."[73] At the conclusion of her article (which is, generally, as sound and as revealing as her first sentence here) Miss Dunbar writes that "It seems probable that he merely tried to bring out more clearly the meaning of the situation—to make the reader feel more deeply the pathos of appealing innocence misjudged by inflexible formalism. In 1909 he was freer to emphasize such meaning than in 1878, when he was limited by the conception that Daisy was 'typical' and his work 'a Study.' "[74]

Despite the fact that James himself wrote of "the simple truth, which ought from the first to have been apparent to me, that my little exhibition is made to no degree whatever in critical but ...in poetical terms,"[75] one finds it difficult to believe that it took him, the author, until 1909 to realise the poetry of Daisy. One feels that his original conception of Daisy was poetic, but that his execution of her story was not, since he presented her from the outside, through Winterbourne, in the manner of a study. Even Winterbourne in 1909 does not always see Daisy with a poet's eyes; yet the discerning reader in 1878 could have done so. It should be borne in mind too that in the long history of the English novel (even before Defoe) the subtitle had been a reputable appendage, not appreciably docked by 1878. But by 1900 the subtitle was to be seen only infrequently; while James may have wished to give the title a more modern sound, by the dropping

73 Ibid., pp.311-312.

74 Ibid., pp.316-317.

75 Critical Prefaces, p.269.

of A Study, Daisy remains one in the point of view used.

One receives no impression that James was shackled by any "pretense that Daisy was 'typical' " or that there was any "new interpretation of the work." Daisy was beautifully revised, but not newly interpreted. Nor can one believe that James in 1878 did not feel completely free to "emphasize" Daisy's "appealing innocence misjudged by inflexible formalism" - although he was shocked to learn in 1878 that for his inflexible reader he had not emphasized it enough. And James was paraphrasing his own words, made some years before (in 1889, 1892, or 1899) he reread Daisy for its revision, when he wrote that "my supposedly typical little figure was of course pure poetry, and had never been anything else...."[76]

76 Ibid.,p.270. The two unnamed ladies whose remarks (made in Venice "at a certain hour long afterwards") James quoted in the Preface likewise had in mind the early versions of the story when they discussed the poetic quality of the heroine. One of them felt that the only fault of James's fictional Daisy was that she " 'touchingly...transmuted so sorry a type' " as the real-life ones whom the three were observing. The other Europeanized friend accused James of " 'unprincipled mystification of our sense of [the character of Daisy, which] does it really too much honour' " adding that although he had been " 'provoked by a spirit of observation' " he had " 'yielded' " to his "incurable prejudice in favour of grace' " (Ibid., pp.269-270).

- III -

Daisy Miller was not one to blush self-consciously either when she looked at Winterbourne or when she knew others to be watching them.[77] No doubt, thought the gentle Victorian reader, a bold, brazen creature. If this was boldness, James made the most of it in revision, for originally, shortly after meeting Winterbourne "the young lady turned to" her brother Randolph, but in the New York Edition she "turned to the little boy, whom she addressed quite as if they were alone together."[78] Such behavior was something new for Frederick Forsyth Winterbourne,[79] who had been many years away from America, bending a deferential ear the while to his Europeanised aunt, Mrs. Costello. When Daisy chatted with the young man, here was "the most charming garrulity he had ever heard"; his reaction to her conversation was in 1909 much more full and instructive for the new reader--it was "the most charming innocent prattle he had ever heard, for, by his own experience hitherto, when young persons were so ingenuous they were less articulate and when they were so confident were more sophisticated."[80]

77 In 1879, "she avoided neither his eyes nor those of anyone else; she blushed neither when she looked at him nor when she felt that people were looking at her." In 1909, "she avoided neither his eyes nor those of anyone else; she neither coloured from an awkward consciousness when she looked at him nor when she saw...." Page 54 in the Harper edition, the early text used in this study; p. 40 in The Novels and Tales of Henry James (New York, 1909) XVIII. In later notes this citation would appear as pp.54-40.

78 pp.15-9.

79 The reader does not learn the two given names until 1909 (pp.41-31).

80 pp.52-40. Similar in effect, and extensiveness, is the change by which "He thought it very possible that Master Randolph's sister was a coquette; he was sure she had a spirit of her own; but in her bright, sweet, superficial little visage there was no mockery, no irony" reappeared as "He thought nothing more likely than that its [Daisy's face] wearer would have had her own experience of the action of her charms, as she would certainly have acquired a resulting confidence; but even should she depend on this for her main amusement her bright sweet superficial little visage gave out neither mockery nor irony" (pp.17-11-12). The omission of the term "coquette" in 1909 is important; see note 87.

The Daisy of an earlier generation of readers, then, was charming and garrulous, but the more clearly-presented one of a later day was charming, innocent, ingenuous, and confident; (perhaps her charm had not been seen as combined with innocence, nor her garrulity as composed of both ingenuousness and confidence). It is important to note that this "young person" was not as sophisticated as others of Winterbourne's acquaintance. Indeed, she was not in the least sophisticated - the absence of this quality in one so charming was the source of poor Winterbourne's confusion. Daisy was completely and entirely natural—that was why she did not blush readily, and it was why in the presence of a young man she would speak to her nine-year old brother "as if they were alone together." Such naturalness, such artless simplicity, is often misunderstood in a world where sophistication counts for so much. Winter-bourne (he of the cold domain) could scarcely be expected to understand this artless maid, with her guileless trust—it would take a Romantic poet, a Burns or a Wordsworth, for that. Still, it is to his credit that he followed to considerable degree his instinct, thus partially understanding Daisy.

James had written in 1879 that "the young girl's eyes were singularly honest and fresh"—but his readers had been checked by that scrupulous doubt of which Wordsworth wrote, they had insisted that his sprightly maiden was not a nun demure but was of Love's Court. In 1909, characteristically turning to imagery to make entirely clear something he felt important, James told his new readers that "her expression was as decently limpid as the very cleanest water."[81] Use of figurative language taken

81 pp.17-11, notes; is the only instance where the writer has used stilted and formal diction. Such terms include "perceive" (replaced at least seven times in Daisy), "observe," "affirm," "contemplate," "abode," "credence,"

from nature, especially water, was typical of James, but in the case of Daisy he would have felt it to be downright imperative. And where could more striking images of purity be found than in Switzerland, with its snowy peaks, its edelweiss growing high among the rocks, its placid lakes giving back the virginal surrounding scene ? So it is that Annie P. Miller (from, of all places, Schenectady) became Winterbourne's "little friend the child of nature of the Swiss lakeside" (sometime home of Rousseau).[82] And so it is too that James (who himself used more art to describe his work of nature) had Winterbourne's friend refer not to the " 'pretty American girl' " but to the " 'little American who's so much more a work of nature than of art.' "[83]

"ejaculation," "hilarity," "functionary," "distinguish," "feudal antiquities," "historic atmosphere," and "perilous." "Seemed" was too weak, vacillating a term, and was replaced at least five times by "struck." (It is of some interest that James came, when choice is permissable, to prefer "that" to "which," and "who" to "that." The preposition "upon" earned his disfavor also, and was replaced at least nineteen times by "on.")

82 pp. 39-49. James made an open reference to Byron's Manfred in the Colosseum scene. He could as easily have referred to Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, which also contains descriptions of the Colosseum (Canto IV, stanzas CXXVII-CXLV, passim), as well as of Rousseau (Canto III, stanzas LXXVII-LXXXI; XCII-CIV). Perhaps he had been re-reading Harold shortly before the revision, and the "child of nature" revision subconsciously resulted.

83 pp. 99-79. The disputed question of the innocence of Daisy recurrs in the revision more frequently than before. Changes or additions were made to keep it uppermost in the mind of the reader; some seem to champion the cause of Daisy, others to make plausible Winterbourne's confusion. Italics were used in "American girls were exceedingly innocent," and "the young girl" became "the innocent girl." Mrs. Miller had remarked, innocently enough, that her daughter " 'wants to go round' "; a slight but careful addition made her want " 'to go round everywhere.' " To Daisy's delighted " 'I'm going out in a boat!' " was added " 'with Mr. Winterbourne,' " and Eugenio's shocked response, " 'At eleven o'clock, mademoiselle?' " became " 'At this hour of the night, mademoiselle?' " (pp.24-17, 33-25, 45-34, 47-37, ibid.).

Winterbourne in 1879 "felt that he had lived at Geneva so long that he had lost a good deal; he had become dishabituated to the American tone"; in 1909 "He felt he had lived at Geneva so long as to have got morally muddled; he had lost the right sense for the young American tone."[84] He had become so morally muddled as to formulate (again, 1909) a theory of a type of American girl who presented the anomaly of being very forward yet at the same time "rigidly unapproachable." Even in this theoretical flight (wide of the mark in Daisy's case, at any rate, since she was neither forward nor rigid but simply unaffected and spontaneous) however, and contradictory as it may seem, he did have the discernment to see that Daisy defied classification. James made this considerable addition to a soliloquy of Winterbourne's: "She might be cold, she might be austere, she might even be prim; for that was apparently—he had already so generalised—what the most 'distant' American girls did: they came and planted themselves straight in front of you to show how rigidly unapproachable they were.... Only she was composed—he had seen that before too—of charming little parts that didn't match and that made no ensemble...."[85] Winterbourne was so "dishabituated to the American tone" (so "morally muddled") that somewhat later he thought it "probable that anything might be expected

84 pp. 23-16. The "felt that...so long that" passage reminds one how frequently James made this sort of omission, as well as others that rendered the dialogue more colloquial and natural-sounding, and the narrative passages more relaxed and less formal, as well as more concise. A sampling follows (parenthesis indicates 1909 omission): "...we...met...and (we) talked"; "she believes you (are) engaged"; "He felt (then, for the instant,) quite ready"; "Mrs. Miller apologised (to him) for receiving him"; "he was (an) extremely amiable (fellow)"; "(She was) bareheaded (;but) she balanced...."

85 pp.16-10-11.

of Daisy (even less charitably in 1909, "probable she did go even by the American allowance rather far").[86]

Yet the original version of Daisy clearly enough set forth that the girl was not a (European) "coquette" but was what Winterbourne denominated an "American flirt," a type differing from its European relative in that morally it was unimpeachable. Early female readers of this libellious work were informed that Winterbourne, through whose eyes she was usually seen, "was inclined to think Miss Daisy Miller was a flirt— a pretty American flirt. He had never, as yet, had relations with young ladies of this category. He had known, here in Europe, two or three women—persons older than Miss Daisy Miller, and provided, for respectability's sake, with husbands— who were great coquettes — dangerous, terrible women, with whom one's relations were liable to take a serious turn. But this young girl was not a coquette in that sense; she was very unsophisticated; she was only a pretty American flirt. Winterbourne was almost grateful for having found the formula that at

86 pp.35-26. Daisy's gaiety, her frequent and easy laughter, could have helped the stiff Winterbourne to his suspicious attitude. James, who was constitutionally unable to resist revising an early description of a mustache, a blush, or a smile, made some urbane and highly typical changes to references to Daisy's laughter. Her "violent laugh" became the "reign of her amusement" (and her "little laugh," "her amusement"). Instead of standing "there laughing," she "remained an elegant image of free Irish irony." Continuing to avoid use of the forthright term himself, James made Daisy's laughter her "gay indifference," "crowing," "weak optimism," "more natural light," "vague presumptuous intelligence," and "independence of humour." There are times, be it admitted, when the 1879 text is a handy reference work.

applied to Miss Daisy Miller." In revising James saw little need to do more than polish this passage; and one, from this vantage point, does not experience the difficulty that Winterbourne and the readers had in remembering the distinctions, and to which genus Daisy belonged.

Later in the story, after Daisy has begun to draw the fire of the unAmerican colony in Rome, Winterbourne counsels her to conform to the local mores. The passage, as it originally appeared, has a proof of Daisy's regard for Winterbourne (the"sweet hope" reference), and shows him apparently agreeing with her that all nice girls are flirts, for he wants her to flirt with him— flirting must be, then, morally above censure; it also contains her (apparently misunderstood) aphorism about flirting (albeit harmless) being more proper in unmarried than in married women; finally, it shows to the perceptive reader if not to the stiff, humorless young man, that Daisy's regard for him leads her, in her pique, to taunt him, saying more than she really means. Despite its original clarity, the passage was sharpened and made even more clear by James for the New York Edition:

1879	1909
"I am afraid your habits are those of a flirt," said Winterbourne, gravely. "Of course they are," she cried, giving him her little smiling stare again. "I'm a perfectly frightful flirt! Did you ever hear of a nice girl that was not? But I suppose you will tell me now that I am not a nice girl."	"I'm afraid your habits are those of a ruthless flirt," said Winterbourne with studied severity. "Of course they are!"— and she hoped, evidently, by the manner of it, to take his breath away. "I'm a fearful frightful flirt! Did you ever hear of a nice girl that wasn't? But I suppose you'll

87 This passage was scarcely retouched in 1909, except for the change of "one's relations" to "one's light commerce," and "this young girl" to "this charming apparition" (pp.24-17).

"You're very nice girl; but I wish you would flirt with me, and me only," said Winterbourne.

"Ah! thank you— thank you very much; you are the last man I should think of flirting with. As I have had the pleasure of informing you, you are too stiff."

"You say that too often," said Winterbourne.

Daisy gave a delighted laugh. "If I could have the sweet hope of making you angry, I should say it again."

"Don't do that; when I am angry I'm stiffer than ever. But if you won't flirt with me, do cease, at least, to flirt with your friend at the piano; they don't understand that sort of thing here."

"I thought they understood nothing else!" exclaimed Daisy.

"Not in young unmarried women."

"It seems to me much more proper in young unmarried women than in old married ones," Daisy exclaimed.

"Ah," said Winterbourne, "when you deal with natives you must go by the custom of the place. Flirting is a purely American custom; it doesn't exist here. So when you show yourself in public with Mr. Giovanelli, and without your mother— "

"Gracious! poor mother!" interposed Daisy.

"Though you may be flirting, Mr. Giovanelli is not; he means something else."

"He isn't preaching, at any rate," said Daisy, with vivacity. "And if you want very much to know, we are too good friends for that: we are very intimate friends."

"Ah!" rejoined Winterbourne, "if you are in love with each other, it is another affair."

tell me now I'm not a nice girl."

He remained grave indeed under the shock of her cynical profession. "You're a very nice girl, but I wish you'd flirt with me, and me only."

"Ah thank you, thank you very much: you're the last man I should think of flirting with. As I've had the pleasure of informing you, you're too stiff."

"You say that too often," he resentfully remarked.

Daisy gave a delighted laugh. "If I could have the sweet hope of making you angry I'd say it again."

"Don't do that— when I'm angry I'm stiffer than ever. But if you won't flirt with me do cease at least to flirt with your friend at the piano. They don't," he declared as in full sympathy with "them," "understand that sort of thing here."

"I thought they understood nothing else!" Daisy cried with startling world-knowledge.

"Not in young unmarried women."

"It seems to me much more proper in young unmarried than in older married ones," she retorted.

"Well," said Winterbourne, "when you deal with natives you must go by the custom of the country. American flirting is a purely American silliness; it has— in its ineptitude of innocence— no place in this system. So when you show yourself in public with Mr. Giovanelli and without your mother—"

"Gracious, poor mother!"— and she made it beautifully unspeakable.

Winterbourne had a touched sense for this, but it didn't alter his attitude. "Though you may be flirting, Mr. Giovanelli isn't— he means something else."

"He isn't preaching at any rate," she returned. "And

if you want very much to know, we're neither of us flirting— not a little speck. We're too good friends for that. We're real intimate friends."

He was to continue to find her thus at moments inimitable. "Ah," he then judged, "if you're in love with each other it's88 another affair altogether!"

---

88 pp.88-90 — 70-72. Winterbourne should have interpreted more clearly the way that Daisy looked at him. She gave him (1879) "a serious glance" and, later, "a single glance"; James made the 1909 edition more revelatory, for in it she gave him "he thought, the oddest glance," and she spared "but a single small queer glance for it, a queerer small glance, he felt, than he had ever yet had from her" (pp.40-30, 91-72). Once, when she had "continued to glance" at him, in 1909, "her eyes continued to play over" him (pp.68-69 — 54). Once instead of seeming "very glad to see him," she "frankly rejoiced to renew [illegible] intercourse" (pp.36-27).

Comparison by the reader of the "stage directions" in the two passages will reveal to him some of the many techniques finally arrived at by James. It will be noticed that the punctuation of the dialogue was made to accord with the degree of emotion indicated by the stage direction; in her second speech of 1879, she "cried," but there is no exclamation point. James's liking for alliteration in stage directions may be seen in both the early and the late passage; elsewhere we find in 1909 such examples as "said with spirit," and "quite colourlessly remarked." The intention of the speaker, with some psychological probing, is often found in 1909 ("she hoped, evidently"); replacements for "said Winterbourne" include he "was thus emboldened to reply," and "he reasoned in his own troubled interest." There are of course revisions by which one sees the speaker's awareness of the listener's reaction: "he asked" became "he asked with no intention of an epigram, and no effect of her perceiving one." It will be noted that the stage directions are practically a running commentary on the conversations, and that often one seems to see the omniscient author: for instance, the "startling world-knowledge" of Daisy; often there are entire sentences added, among them "It seemed, all amazingly, to do her good," and "It tapped, at a touch, the spring of confidence."

If the verb indicated little or nothing of the manner of speaking, and if the subject was merely the unrevealing "he" or "she," James normally deleted the stage direction— there are at least twenty-seven such excisions. If the proper noun first appears rather than the pronoun ("said Winterbourne") it often is changed to the pronoun for brevity (there are at least ten changes of "Winterbourne" to "he") and a more specific verb, perhaps augmented by a helpful adverb, appears ("he resentfully remarked"). Another device for brevity was that of combining the actual statement of speaking, with the description of manner: thus, "cried Miss Daisy Miller with a laugh" became "the girl laughed." Some typical Jamesisms to replace the commonplace "said," "declared," "asked," or "answered" include "put to," "asked without mercy," "amiably whined," "sketched," "agreeably mocked," "freely began," "ventured," "im-

Except when that recurring spectre— "the dreadful question of whether this was...a nice girl," "a wholly unspotted flower"—[89] blurred his vision, Winterbourne found Daisy charming, increasingly so. (Ironically of course the same natural quality that was part of her charm prompted in him the ugly doubts.) Her smile, once (1879) "light" and "slightly monotonous" became (1909) "clear" and "rather uniform."[90] James himself may have been smiling as he added the reference to her "charming teeth,"[91] but his intent was doubtless sober enough when he resorted (as pointed out above) to imagery from nature to picture her "brilliant little face" as her "shining bloom."[92] In the early days of the story an Annie P. Miller from Schenectady "came straight up to" Mrs. Walker, at the latter's party, but in 1909 a more graceful heroine "floated up to" her hostess.[93] One makes an observation with his rational, intellectual qualities, but he feels a conviction; Winterbourne, where formerly he had made the "observation" (at the Palace of the Caesars) that Daisy "had never looked so pretty," now in 1909 felt the "conviction" that she "had never showed to the eye for so utterly charming."[94] Thus too, he

---

partially contributed," "rang out," and "panted."

It is interesting that a contemporary critic, reviewing The Europeans, noted in the Atlantic's "Contributor's Club" (January, 1879) "One peculiarity of style...the large number of ...'stage directions.' Thus, fourteen times in three consecutive pages, taken at random from those containing conversation, it is particularly noted down that they 'looked at' each other....They 'look at' each other 'a moment,' and 'then' speak, uncountable numbers of times. Generally, in print, cela va sans dire" (XLIII,108).

89 In 1879, "the question of whether this was..." (pp.74-58). In 1879, "It was impossible to regard her as a perfectly well-conducted young lady..."; in 1909, "...as a wholly unspotted flower..." (pp.75-59).

90 pp.23-16.

91 pp.72 —56-57.

92 pp.66-52.

93 pp.86-68.

94 pp.102-81. The term "charming" was of course often used. In both versions, besides her "happy dimples" Daisy had "charming eyes" (pp.72 and 57). Using his technique of the superlative, James referred

became less the observer of Daisy and more the active participant in whatever drama she encountered. Experiencing a stronger attachment to this more beautiful girl, Winterbourne thought not of her as "Daisy Miller" but as "the little person he most desired to find,"[95] and he became impatient not simply to "see her" but to "see her again."[96] Even in the early "Study" James went so far as to mention the "certain sentimental impatience" that Daisy excited in Winterbourne; this was revised to read the "sweet appeal to his fond fancy, not to say his finest curiosity"[97] — the word "curiosity" has some importance, for Daisy was to her Europeanized compatriot something salubrious and different.

Even the most veteran Broadway tunesmith would be baffled by Daisy Miller, for as Mr. Howells pointed out, the sentiment kindled in Winterbourne by the charm and the uniqueness of Daisy "is never

---

in 1909 not to her "wonderfully pretty eyes" but called them "the very prettiest conceivable" (pp.17-11). "Her shoulders" became "her very white shoulders" (pp.87-69).

95 pp.86-67. In similar fashion (frequently in the revised stage directions) avoiding monotony and achieving economy (through presenting more information in the same space), "Winterbourne" was replaced by such terms as "her companion," "his critic," and "her other friend"; "Daisy" became "the young girl held in horror by that lady"; "Mrs. Walker," "the lady of the victoria"; "Mr. Giovanelli," "the subject of their contention."

96 pp.35-26.

97 pp.65-51. Besides revisory work, James inserted additions in 1909, to show how "inimitable" Winterbourne found Daisy: "He was to continue to find her thus at moments inimitable."; "Her detachment from any invidious judgment of this was, to her compeñion's sense, inimitable...."; "The soft impartiality of her constations... was a thing by itself — exquisite little fatalist as they seemed to make her" (pp.90-72, 37-28, 36-27).

In 1879 one reads that "the unexpected in her behavior was the only thing to expect." This does not indicate that Winterbourne found the quality appealing; but in 1909 one reads that ""he really liked, after all, not making out what she was 'up to'" (pp.93-74). James gave added emphasis to the charm of her uniqueness by changing "Winterbourne was amused, perplexed, and decidedly charmed" to "...amused and perplexed — above all he was charmed" (pp.23-16).

explicitly a passion."[98] But there are slight revisory strokes that heighten, in the Vevey and Chillon section, the sense of physical nearness[99] of the two young people, and that make Winterbourne's emotion more nearly resemble that of ardor. In the hotel lobby, instead of "passing[100] out with her among all the idle people," he "led her out through" them. Two evenings before, instead of "taking the hand she offered him," he had taken "her by the hand she offered."[101] Returning from their trip together to the Castle of Chillon he in 1879 noticed that "the young girl was very quiet"; in 1909 he felt, with some emotion, that "the young girl at his side, her animation a little spent, was now quite distractingly passive."[102]

There is evidence (in both versions of the story) even until the Colosseum scene that Winterbourne was not sure but that Daisy was a "wholly unspotted flower." But he failed to escape the effect of his long absence from America, and (although he argued with them, and rebuked the eminent hostess) he never completely rebelled against the dual influence of Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Costello.

98 "Mr. James's Masterpeece," p.12. The word "love" actually appears, I believe, only once, and that time rather tangentially. Winterbourne, who originally" had a pleasant sense that he should never be afraid of Daisy Miller," later was pleased to "believe that even were twenty other things different and Daisy should love him and he should know it and like it, he would still never be afraid of Daisy" (pp.94-75. Italics mine.)

99 Revisions so slight as to pass almost unnoticed were it not for their frequent occurrence and their similarity to revised passages in the "Madonna" and Madame de Mauves.

100 He "passed" out with her (pp.41-39).

101 pp.40-38.

102 pp.47-44.

His instinctive sympathy for Daisy sometimes came out in his unspoken thoughts, or in his facial expressions; it was not strong enough to make him disobey the imperious commands of Mrs. Walker, and to be, like Daisy, unheeding of the stern voice of convention. One finds this passage:

1879	1909
"She's going to walk with Mr. Giovanelli," Randolph proclaimed. "I am going to the Pincio," said Daisy, smiling.	"She's going to go it with Mr. Giovanelli," Randolph unscrupulously commented. "I 'm going to go it on the Pincio," Daisy peaceably smiled, while the way that she "condoned" these things almost melted Winterbourne's heart.[103]

Mrs. Walker appears on the Pincio a few moments later, and frantically signals to Winterbourne, who had chaperoned Daisy to her public tryst with Giovanelli and had remained to walk with them. One is rather unimpressed to read that at the first outbursts at Daisy's impropriety from this elderly disciple of decorum "Winterbourne raised his eyebrows"; the young man (who, indeed, argued the point with Mrs. Walker) strikes one as believing much more strongly in Daisy's innocence when (1909) he "— suddenly and rather oddly rubbed the wrong way by this — raised his grave eyebrows."[104] A few moments later, however, Winterbourne felt himself

103 pp.67-53. One notices that the revised passage gives a fuller characterization of all three persons — Randolph, Daisy, and Winterbourne.

104 pp.76 — 59-60. The reader of the revised version sees Mrs. Walker in a much more unfavorable light even than before. In 1879 she was "flushed" and "wore an excited air"; in 1909 he found her "flushed, excited, scandalised." Instead of "saying" that Daisy's actions were "'really too dreadful,'" she "earnestly appealed to him."

persuaded to drive away with Mrs. Walker, leaving an adamant Daisy to "go it" alone.

Later Mrs. Costello, accompanied by Winterbourne, likewise sees Daisy and her cavalier in public (at Saint Peters, on a Sunday afternoon); with this other highly articulate voice "of civilised society" Winterbourne is even less satisfying than before in his defense of Daisy, admitting (1909) that she and Giovanelli are "'as thick as thieves.'"[105] Yet he still thinks her innocent, and stillsfeels a compelling interest in her, shown in the scene when, unaccompanied by either of the elderly ladies, he comes across the girl at the Palace of the Caesars. Giovanelli deferentially wanders off so that they might talk. Daisy, stung by his woodenness, and trying to get some measure of his feeling for her, taunts him, demanding to know if he thinks she is engaged to the Roman. Originally James wrote that Winterbourne "was silent a moment," but for the definitive edition that he "asked himself, and it was for a moment like beating a heart-beat."[106]

"'That girl'" was now accurately designated as "'That crazy girl.'" Mrs. Walker originally felt Daisy to be "'very crazy!'" but later (1909) "'very reckless, and goodness knows how far — left to itself — it may go'" (pp.76 - 59-60). It was the "'imbecile'" mother (1909, "'so blatantly imbecile'") who was responsible for Daisy's shocking actions; still Mrs. Walker (in 1909) wanted to save not just "'her'" but "'them'" (pp.76-70).

105 Earlier, "'very intimate'" (pp.95-76). Mrs. Costello, disdaining no doubt to get any closer, takes in the couple "through her eye-glass." Winterbourne, loyal to Daisy, in both editions scoffed at there being any intrigue in an "'affair that goes on with such peculiar publicity.'" Albeit loyal, he became an "embarrassed young man," and made the more disparaging comment already noted. Both aunt and nephew are in 1909 more interested in the "affair," for to a reference to Mrs. Costello's re-examination of the pair "with her optical instrument," James added that Winterbourne "recognised in this a further illustration — than that supplied by his own condition — of the spell projected by the case" (pp.95-76).

106 pp.105-84.

Towards the climax of the decisive Colosseum scene[107] (and a moment before Daisy again brings up the question of his belief in her being engaged) he hustles Daisy back to the carriage, fearing that she may have exposed herself to the dread Roman fever.[108] Casually and matter-of-factly, in 1879 he "kept looking at her" but in the revised passage, although he "tried to deny himself the small fine anguish of looking at her...his eyes themselves refused to spare him...."[109]

The effect upon Winterbourne of the denigrations of Mrs. Costello and Mrs. Walker cannot be measured, but it must have been considerable. James, when he first wrote Daisy, had only scorn for this pair, and could not possibly have intended that readers view his heroine through their eyes (the myopic vision of Winterbourne serving as sufficient handicap to any fair-minded reader); he must have felt that no great amount of subtlety would be needed to see that insofar as they condemned Daisy, these two ladies were condemning themselves. Eighty years after the event, it is difficult to believe

107 The first pivotal scene is that at the Pincio when, shortly after Daisy's appeal for his opinion on the propriety of her walking in public, he left her in favor of Mrs. Walker. The second (ending Part I in its original form) shows him checking himself and then going not toward the couple seated on the wall, but toward Mrs. Costello's; this is too brief a scene, with no dialogue and no psychological detail. The final pivotal scene is of course the one at the Colosseum, when Daisy's presence there at night with Giovanelli verifies Winterbourne's worst fears.

108 That is, malaria. Identified by no less a critic than Edmund Wilson as a "cold." ("The Ambiguity of Henry James," from The Triple Thinkers [New York, 1938], in The Question of James, p.176). Wilson also feels that "the great popularity of [Daisy] was certainly due to [James's] having somehow conveyed the impression that her spirit went marching on" (ibid.).

109 pp.110-88. The "small fine anguish"— James here puts

that James's readers could have proved him so wrong in his overestimate of their discernment. For the New York Edition, James made Daisy's two chief critics[110] more reprehensible even than before, perhaps venting no little spleen as he did so.[111]

Mrs. Costello, who saw all manner of evil in such parvenu as the Millers, never emerged far enough from the exclusive mustiness which enveloped her to insult Daisy in person (after the manner of

---

to good use his descriptive words. His characteristic employment of them, especially during the major phase, is an identifying trait of his style. Frequently he inserted adverbs in his stage directions; often in this way gaining the effect of an allusion to the preceding speech (see note 88): (1909) "he then judged"; "the girl declared afresh"; "she meanwhile asked"; "she then grimly returned"; "the courier hereupon importantly announced." Besides "hereupon" and "meanwhile," favorite adverbs of James's include "presently," "thereupon," and "none the less." Typical of James is (1909) "to make the so interesting excursion yourself" (italics mine). Typical, too, but not so typical as the anti-Jacobites would have us believe, are such locutions as "the elder lady then unexpectedly hereupon broke out," "yet she now none the less immediately rose," and "but she none the less resignedly, after a little, dropped to the bench."

110 The foreigners of whom Mrs. Costello spoke — the Romans, that is — were not above reproach by James either. Winterbourne was given the thought, after the Colosseum scene, that after Daisy's return to the hotel, there would have been (1879) "an exchange of remarks between the porter and the cab-driver"; the word "remarks" was changed to "jokes," giving to the passage quite a different tone. The fact of Daisy's "having been there" (to the arena, appropriate enough in itself, whether any symbolism was meant or not) was changed, with evident irony, to the "scandalous adventure." James added in 1909, to the statement that people knew of the "adventure," "with a dozen vivid details." The author's judgment is more apparent in "These sources of criticism abounded still further" than in the earlier "These people had serious information to give..." (pp.112—89-90, all citations).

111 Of the discussion in Venice (see note 76), James wrote, "As for the original grossness of readers, I dare say I added, that was another matter — but one which at any rate had then quite ceased to signify" (Critical Prefaces, p.270).

Mrs. Walker), but to her nephew she abounded in insults of the girl, derogations that were uniformly more scathing in the revision. In Rome, Daisy did not "'go'" about alone, but "'tore'" about, and with "'foreigners'" (that is, Romans), inferior beings who were (1909) "'unmistakeably low,'" "men of evil design, "'fortune-hunters'" (added in 1909, "'of the inferior sort'").[112] Putting reliance again in the related devices of amplification and qualification, James further revised the eruptions of Mrs. Costello. In 1879 Daisy took this rag, tag, and bobtail to "'people's houses,'" but in 1909 to "'such houses as she may put her nose into.'"[113] On the same theme, and repeating the technique, was the change of "'when she comes to a party'" to "'...a party— such a party as she can come to.'"[114] The expatriate colony deemed its ostracism of Daisy as only fair and right, for had not her behavior gone from "'abnormal'" to "'quite monstrous'"?[115]

Actions so "monstrous" as Daisy's must have been traceable to some ultimate source even in 1879, before the emergence onto the scene of such detectives as the psychologist and the social scientist. Mrs. Costello, although she lacked detachment, solved the problem: this "'young person,'" so "'very common,'" came, appropriately enough, from a "'very common'" family, a family thrice-damned (innocence apparently being a mark of depravity), since it was not only "'innocent and ignorant'" but "'utterly uncivilised.'" James, who knew how to make strong statements stronger, retouched these of Mrs. Costello, having her speak of this "'little abomin-

112 pp.59-45, 59— 45-46, 59-46.
113 pp.59-46.
114 Ibid.
115 pp.101-80.

ation'"[116] as one who was "'of the last crudity,'" "product as she was of a "'horribly common'" family, one not merely "'bad enough to dislike'" but— most important for showing the snobbery behind the ostracism of Daisy— bad enough "'to blush for.'"[117]

Winterbourne would have noticed Daisy's shortcomings, including those indicative of poor breeding, even without the repeated gratuities of his aunt, but they must have prompted in him even more reservations about the girl.

He saw unaided, and in 1879, that it was the mother, not Daisy, who was to blame. But with the help of James's revisory touches, his awareness became more searching and more analytical in the pages of the New York Edition.[118] Originally if Daisy "looked another way when he spoke to her, and seemed not particularly to hear him, this was simply her habit, her manner"; the expanded passage tells us that it was "simply her habit, her manner, the result of her having no idea whatever of 'form' (with such a telltale appendage as Randolph where in the world would she have got it?) in any such connexion."[119] Daisy had received no basic training in the rudiments of "form" because whenever matters of propriety or convention made it necessary for Mrs. Miller to hand down a decision, she (1879) "was invisible" (she "goes away"); openly scornful, James wrote in 1909 that at such strategic moments she "wholly sur-

116 In 1909, Daisy received an added epithet, that of a "'horror'" (pp.34-25).
117 pp.57-44, 32-23, 31-23, 59-46, ibid.
118 His later designations of her as "uneducated" rather than "uncultivated" seem, however, a bit softer (pp.33-25, 82-64).
119 pp.17-11.

rendered to her genius for unapparent uses..." (she simply "melts away").[120]

In order to substantiate Winterbourne's comment (added in 1909) that "taste wasn't the strong point of the Millers,"[121] James liberally sprinkled their dialogue with new "ain't's" and "dont's" (for "doesn't") and made such Millerisms as Randolph's "'without the moon's right up.'"[122] The crudity of the Millers, however, had

120 pp.112-90, 81-64. In both versions, the shrinking, unmilitant quality of Mrs. Miller is stressed. At the first meeting with Winterbourne, she did not let him see her give him even surreptitious glances; instead of "turning" her attention to the lake, she "kept" it there (pp.43-32). Instead of looking "at him an instant askance," she looked "at him an instant with a certain scared obliquity" (pp.45-35).

121 Physically, too, she lacked charm. Her "very exiguous nose" and her "high forehead" became her "scarce imperceptible nose" and her "unmistakeable forehead" (pp.41-31). Mrs. Miller came into her own, however, when physical ailments (especially her own) were under discussion. To his statement that "This talk of dyspepsia... seemed to soothe her" James added "by reconstituting the environment to which she was most accustomed" (pp.62-48). Dr. Davis was her Godhead: in 1879, "'I'm sure there was nothing he wouldn't try....But I wrote to Mr. Miller that it seems as if I couldn't get on without Dr. Davis.'" In 1909, there was nothing he wouldn't try, "'and I didn't care what he did for me if he only brought me relief... But I couldn't help writing the other day that I supposed it was all right [here] for Daisy, but that I didn't know as I could get on much longer without Dr. Davis'" (pp.63-49).

The ineptness of Mrs. Miller is to be seen in Daisy's tell-tale appendage, Randolph, who in the revision sits up until two in the morning, rather than midnight (pp.44-33). Sarcastically in 1909 James wrote of "the all-efficient Randolph" (pp.112-90). Frankly he wrote of "an obstreperous little boy" rather than "a little boy" (pp.30-22); liking his term, he changed "'And a courier?'" to "'An obstreperous little boy and a preposterous big courier?'" (ibid.).

121 pp.82 — 64-65.

122 pp.112-90. Daisy with more spirit calls the young ladies of Italy not "'them'" but "'such stupids,'" and comes out with such locutions as "'...if she didn't mind looking like a fright,'" and "'I don't believe a speck of it'" (pp.89-70, 40-30, 56-42).

In his more routine changes for realism of dialogue, James occasionally used italics, and very frequently inserted (at the start of a speech) for emphasis but generally for a more natural speech rhythm, such words or phrases as "at least," "you know," "nevertheless," "really," "certainly," "altogether," "just," "always," "then," "indeed," "moreover," "none the less," "at any rate," "quite," and "rather."

its serious side, for inevitably it led to appraisal of the morality of Daisy. It should be repeated that Winterbourne alone of the Europeanized Americans appreciated the natural simplicity and the essential fineness of Daisy, for although in the revision he remained shocked that she should permit herself to be seen with Giovanelli "in broad daylight and in the most crowded corner of Rome,"[123] the qualifying "if" was added before "he had assented... that she was 'common,'" and "'Common' she was" was softened to "'Common' she might be...."[124]

Most serious of all to Winterbourne was Daisy's lack both of knowledge and instinct[125] in matters of urgency and importance. Besides the two additions meant to emphasize Daisy's poor breeding, there is in 1909 a change designed to stress her lack of instinctive discrimination. With disappointment amounting almost to disgust Winterbourne saw that she "did not feel at all" her ostracism; to this was added "and didn't know."[126] She was in fact (also added) "ignorance incarnate."[127] Daisy's ignorance, her having had no

123 pp.75— 58-59. At first a sign of her "extreme cynicism," such promiscuity in 1909 was indicative of her "vulgarity."

124 pp.52-40, 41-31. There was, on the other hand, an addition concerning Daisy's "crudity"; instead of wondering "how far her eccentricities were generic, national, and how far they were personal," Winterbourne wondered how far her "extravagance was ...crudely personal" (pp.102-81).

125 In a rather light vein, James had Winterbourne notice (1879) when he met Daisy that her face "was not at all insipid, but it was not exactly expressive," but (1909) that it "wasn't at all insipid, yet at the same time wasn't pointedly— what point, on earth, could she ever make?— expressive..." (pp.17-11). This is reminiscent of the nearby "tell-tale appendage" passage (see note 119).

126 pp.101-80.

127 Ibid. In 1879, "Sometimes it annoyed him to suspect that she did not feel at all. He said to himself that she was too light and childish, too uncultivated and unreasoning, too provincial, to have reflected upon her ostracism, or even to have perceived it."

proper training or guidance, [illegible] deemed by Winterbourne adequate excuse for her inability to sense the truth about Giovanelli; she should have had a fine, high instinct in this matter— her lack of it was in 1909 "deeply disgusting."[128] There was no allowance that could be made (1879) for her "not knowing" that he was a spurious gentleman; definitively, "something in her [should have] instinctively discriminated against such a type."[129]

Ironically, it was Winterbourne's own lack of "instinctive discrimination" (and his unimaginative literal-mindedness— "stiff" had always been Daisy's great word for him),[130] made more glaring

---

In 1909, he "sometimes found himself suspecting with impatience that she simply didn't feel and didn't know. He set her down as hopelessly childish and shallow, as such mere giddiness and ignorance incarnate as was powerless either to read or to suffer."

128 pp.74-58. In 1879 he "felt a superior indignation at his own lovely fellow-countrywoman's not knowing the difference between a spurious gentleman and a real one." In 1909, "it was deeply disgusting to Daisy's other friend that something in her shouldn't have instinctively discriminated against such a type."

129 Ibid.

130 In the Colosseum scene, 1879: "...she asked him why he didn't speak."; 1909, "...why he was so stiff— it had always been her great word" (pp.111-89). "Winterbourne" became in 1909 "Miss Miller's cold compatriot" (pp.103-82). Once he is referred to as "the friend it would have been such mockery to designate as [Giovanelli's] rival" (pp.102-82).

He had no more instinct about women than he credited Daisy with having anent "spurious gentlemen." In his obliviousness to her high regard for him, and in his stolid seriousness that prevented his seeing that when angry at his obtuseness Daisy engaged in hyperbole, Winterbourne seems to have "lost the right sense" for any "young tone," American or otherwise. A redeeming sense of humor would have enabled him not to take at face value Daisy's "'I am all improper!'" (italicised in 1909, pp.80-63). He could not see that while Daisy wanted him to understand her, she could not force herself to do the explaining.

for the Scribner edition, that led him to a gross overestimate of the potential dangerousness of Giovanelli. When Winterbourne sees Daisy and her cavalier sitting on the wall, "the couple with the parasol" becomes to him (1909) something infinitely worse, "the couple united beneath the parasol."[131] The reader (who normally sees him through the eyes of Winterbourne) knows Giovanelli to be a mere "man of straw,"[132] but Daisy's stiff friend does not,[133] even though it is he who dehumanizes[134] the Roman:

1879	1909
He had a handsome face, an artfully poised hat, a glass in one eye, and a nosegay in his buttonhole. Winterbourne looked at him a moment, and then said, "Do you mean to speak to that man?"	It had a handsome face, a hat artfully poised, a glass in one eye and a nosegay in its buttonhole. Daisy's friend looked at it a moment and then said: "Do you mean to speak to that thing?"[135]

A characteristic of this "thing," this "third-rate Italian fortune hunter" was its (his) brilliance. Perhaps because the glow of a brilliant object is not sufficiently sinister, perhaps because the term lacks subtlety, James in revision normally avoided it, preferring to have the Roman "glossy" or "glowing."[136] But he hit upon

131 pp.84-66.
132 The term used by Miss Dunbar ("Revision of Daisy," p.316).
133 Or else he feels Daisy incapable of recognising the fact.
134 In a manner reminiscent of a passage in Twain's Life On the Mississippi (Chapter XI): "...one or two jeans-clad, chills-racked, yellow-faced male miserables roosting on the top rail...."
135 pp.72-56. Less amusingly, but nonetheless realistically, Winterbourne (to Daisy) called Giovanelli "'not a gentleman'" but "'only a clever imitation of one.'" As the reader has by now learned to expect, James revised this to read "'anything but a gentleman'" and "'isn't even a very plausible imitation'" of one (pp.74-58).
136 The "brilliant little Roman" became the "glossy" one, who in 1879 once "wore an aspect of even unwonted brilliancy" but in 1909 "glowed as never before with something of the glory of his race." More amusingly yet, the "little Italian" became the "shiny—but to do him justice, not greasy— little Roman" (pp.93-74, 102-82, 96-77).

an actual symbol for Giovanelli, that of the coxcomb.[137] What reader could ever, as Winterbourne did, consider him as a threat to virtue, when (with the alliteration of which James was so fond) "the inevitable[138] Giovanelli" is designated as "her coxcomb of the Corso"?[139]

Persistent in his attentiveness, and clever enough to seem to enjoy his uncoxcombical role of subservience and obsequiousness, Giovanelli was more fawning than truly meek. A highly sensitive human barometer, he was ever alert to the attitudes of those around

137 Employing the new symbol, and ridding his work both of the term "brilliant" and some archaic phrasing, James changed "he had a brilliant smile, an intelligent eye," making it read "[he] seemed to shine, in his coxcombical way, with the desire to please and the fact of his own intelligent joy" (pp.73-57).

138 Not wishing the reader to lose sight of the inevitable quality of Giovanelli (as this revision alone would otherwise do), James made an insertion to the statement that "Giovanelli was [of course] at her side," elsewhere referring not to "that handsome Italian" but to "that Italian who was always round." James had only momentarily lost his earlier reference to Giovanelli's handsomeness, for twice on one page he changed "the Italian" to "the handsomest of Italians." (Similar use of the superlative for irony is illustrated by the reappearance of the terms "brilliant personage" and "the young girl and her cavalier" as "paragon" and "the exemplary pair.") To return to the ubiquitous Giovanelli: James did give up one such reference, but with a considerable gain in irony, when he changed the rather flat "Daisy's companion" to "the gallant Giovanelli" (and "your companion" became "your gallant companion") (pp.102-81, 113-91, 86-68, ibid., 67-52, 95-75, 84-66, 103-82).

139 pp.94-75.

him; to the flat statement that he was "in the drawing-room with Daisy alone," James added (1909) "serene in success,[140] but not unduly presumptuous."[141] Indeed, he never presumed (but neither did he volunteer to Winterbourne the truth about Daisy until too late), and if Daisy wished to consider him her puppet, she could. She did wish to: at Mrs. Walker's party she in 1879 purported to have "a high admiration for his singing," but in 1909 she professed herself "his musical patroness or guarantor."[142] A sentence

140 It was necessary for James to invest Giovanelli (besides other qualities) with urbanity. It was noted in the case of M.de Mauves that James once had a tendency to overuse the term itself; here the word is avoided but its meaning made more clear when the "extremely urbane" Giovanelli is described rather as having the "best possible manners," and instead of being in his "urbanity...apparently imperturbable" he is seen to raise "his neat shoulders and eyebrows to within a suspicion of a shrug" (pp.73-58, 114-92).

What the Latin conceives of as his urbanity is not always so charitably interpreted by his Northern brethren. James had Giovanelli once laugh not "agreeably" but (1909) "irresponsibly," and described him once as "decorating himself with his almond blossoms" but, by revision, as "still titivating with his almond blossom." Giovanelli was also (1879) designated as "a little Italian with a bouquet in his button-hole," but (1909) as one "who sports in his button-hole a stack of flowers" (pp.79-62, 105-83, 99-79). Direct reference inevitably is made to racial differences so often found in the work of James: in 1879 Winterbourne "reflected on the profundity of Italian cleverness which enables people to appear more gracious in proportion as they are more acutely disappointed"; in 1909, there is open reference to the Northern races, when "Winterbourne reflected on the depth of Italian subtlety, so strangely opposed to Anglo-Saxon simplicity, which enables people to show a smoother surface..." (pp.74-58).

141 pp.93-74.

142 pp.88-69. He is appropriately grateful; one reads (added in 1909) that in handing Daisy her tea, he offered "Mrs. Walker's slightly thin refreshment as he might have done all the kingdoms of the earth" (pp.90-72).

or two before (and even more obviously the puppet master) Daisy "had given him his orders"; in 1909, she "had set him in motion."[143] Having made countless improvements to his early picture of (the urbane, coxcombical, and puppet-like) Giovanelli without adding appreciably to the length of the story, James probably felt that he had earned one expanded passage. In its reference to his bowing and ducking it resembles the puppet-like allusions, but primarily it illustrates the Italian's vanity, even under the most adverse conditions. Having concluded his singing ("warbling" in 1909— in neither edition did Mrs. Walker know who had invited him to perform) he (1879) "left the piano and came over to Daisy"; in the New York Edition this threat to Daisy's purity (for so he had apparently been deemed by the early readers) "left the piano and his recognition of [the applause which]— a little awkwardly— didn't take place in celebration of [his singing] might nevertheless have been an acclaimed operatic tenor's series of repeated ducks before the curtain. So he bowed himself over to Daisy."[144]

The man whom Daisy would have preferred to have dancing attendance upon her was, as he himself proclaimed, "'incapable of a step'" —he did not understand this dancing girl or her deep, unspoken desire for his esteem until too late. Daisy, on the Pincio, asked, "'Does Mr. Winterbourne think that, to save my reputation, I ought to get into the carriage?'"[145] The girl saw nothing immoral

143 Ibid.
144 pp.91-72.
145 pp.79 and 62. In 1909, the dash rather than the comma was employed.

in walking thus in public, and she hoped that Winterbourne's judgment of the matter would accord with hers. James obviously felt this to be a critical moment, for in 1879 he furnished a multitude of descriptions of her manner; the passage as rewritten in 1909 is briefer, but conveys more movingly her manner, her trusting quality, the value she placed in his opinion. Originally she posed the question "slowly, smiling, throwing back her head and glancing at him from head to foot"; definitively "she put [it] to him with a wonderful bright intensity of appeal."[146] One can understand Winterbourne's cautious expediency — he felt it advisable (1909) that "his charming friend should listen to the voice of civilised society";[147] but one sympathizes with the disappointed Daisy, who, before Winterbourne got into the socially-acceptable carriage, "only took his hand, hardly looking at him." The New York Edition elicits some sympathy for Winterbourne, and shows more movingly the disappointment of Daisy, for in it "she only let her hand slip, as she scarce looked at him, through his slightly awkward grasp...."[148]

Mrs. Walker, "the voice of civilised society" of the Pincio incident, shortly thereafter revenged herself upon Daisy by turning her back on the girl when the latter tried to say good-by after the party. The scene, tableaux-like in its effect, even in 1879 gives a foretaste of some of the most memorable "framed" scenes of The Golden Bowl. The totally-impervious mother is at one side; Winterbourne, at the other, sees it all, and sharply rebukes the "hostess" for her cruel insult.[149] Although the revision remains concise al-

146 pp.79-62.

147 In 1879, that "Daisy Miller should have taken Mrs. Walker's advice" (ibid). An engineering student could have written the earlier passage; an accomplished writer penned its revision.

148 pp.80-63.

149 In both editions he was "greatly touched" and told her, "'That was very cruel.'" James comments significantly in 1909, through the addition that "this lady's face [like her heart] was

most to bareness, James, using a word he habitually employed for pathos, achieved quite a poignant effect. Winterbourne saw (1879) that "Daisy turned away, looking with a pale, grave face at the circle near the door...." In 1909 he watched the girl as she "turned away, looking with a small white prettiness, a blighted grace, at the circle near the door...."[150]

The Colosseum scene, carefully revised by James, is full of added forebodings of Daisy's death,[151] which, while it was not caused by Winterbourne, held no terrors for the girl after she learned that he felt her to be sullied. Late one night Winterbourne came upon Daisy and Giovanelli, sitting on the steps at the base of the great cross.[152] Daisy was the one who broke the silence; of her speech James wrote in 1879 that "These were the words he heard, in the familiar accent of Miss Daisy Miller." The reader, if he feels any interest at all in Miss Daisy, would be unable to formulate any opinions, either rational or emotional, as to her morality, although he would concede that, maritally-

---

also as a stone" (pp.92-73).

150 Ibid. An announced dissertation by Henry L.Terrie,Jr. (Princeton) should prove of interest: "The Pictorial Method of Henry James."

151 One had occurred earlier: Daisy (1879) laughingly referred to not doing "'anything improper,'" but (1909) to "'anything that's going to affect my health— or my character either!'" (pp.68-54). The scene itself contains four such new forebodings on one page, where the "flattering moonlight" became the "sinister silver radiance"; "the evening," "such hours"; Winterbourne's fear for her "from a sanitary point of view," his fear "on the grounds of exposure and infection"; and his "'Roman fever,'" a "'bad attack of Roman fever'" (pp.109-87). More solicitude, surely, than Mrs. Walker would feel.

152 James would not appreciate this perhaps, but one cannot help being reminded of Hardy's Tess (A Pure Woman).

speaking, she was a maiden. The reader of the revised passage (although not excessively long, this is the most extended metaphor in the Scribner text), with its beautiful image of purity, cannot fail to feel that Daisy is unspotted: "These words were winged with their accent, so that they fluttered and settled about him in the darkness like vague white doves. It was Miss Daisy Miller who had released them for flight."[153]

Winterbourne, however, does not share the view of the reader. In the revision he is more relieved than before to be able to know once and for all what he should think of Daisy— the note of finality is stronger. It becomes more clear what had been meant by "behavior" and "riddle"; the term "perversity" is introduced, in a much-expanded sentence, and stress put upon the fact that Winterbourne need not have bothered to be so charitable as to try to see a favorable "shade" of this "perversity." The "foolish puzzled gentleman" phrase catches, in brief compass, the young man's self-analysis, while the "head or heart" one (as well as the term "poor girl") indicates his stronger emotional involvement in the past. Finally, an entire sentence is added relative to her perversity, that "black little blot." The comparative passages:

1879	1909
Winterbourne stopped, with a sort of horror, and, it must be added, with a sort of relief. It was as if a sudden illumination had been flashed upon the ambiguity of Daisy's behavior, and	Winterbourne felt himself pulled up with final horror now— and, it must be added, with final relief. It was as if a sudden clearance had taken place in the ambiguity of the poor girl's appearances and the whole
the riddle had become easy	

153 pp.107— 85-86.

to read. She was a young lady whom a gentleman need no longer be at pains to respect....	riddle of her contradictions had grown easy to read. She was a young lady about the shades of whose perversity a foolish puzzled gentleman need no longer trouble his head or his heart. That once questionable quality had no shades— it was a mere black little blot....[154]

By revision Winterbourne was made to probe deeper his self-directed anger; with increased disgust at himself, he is by implication more disappointed in Daisy, and hence had cared more for her than in the early version. Instead of feeling "angry with himself that he had bothered so much about the right way of regarding Miss Daisy Miller," he (1909) felt "angry at all his shiftings of view— he felt ashamed of all his tender little scruples and all his witless little mercies."[155]

At last, after Daisy's second light, jesting remark, Winterbourne spoke: in 1879, "'How long have you been here?' he asked, almost brutally."; in 1909, clearly showing that he felt her conduct to be a "black little blot," "'How long have you been 'fooling round' here?' he asked with conscious roughness."[156] Neither the foreboding of her death, nor the spirit with which she met his sneer, nor the fact that, clearly, in her anger, she exaggerated, is present in the original version of her response (italics mine):

1879	1909
Daisy, lovely in the flattering moonlight, looked at him a moment. Then— "All the evening," she answered.... [sic] I never saw anything so pretty."	Daisy, lovely in the sinister silver radiance, appraised him a moment, roughness and all. "Well, I guess all the evening." She answered with spirit and, he could see even then,

154 pp.107-86.
155 pp.108-86.
156 pp.109-87.

with exaggeration. "I never saw anything so quaint."[157]

The italicized passage lends additional weight to Giovanelli's testimony, at the funeral, to Daisy's innocence— the rational side of Winterbourne could see, at the time (although emotion swept him along), that Daisy would never beg for the "esteem" that she would have so "appreciated."[158] But she cannot resist at least giving Winterbourne one more chance to show, by a worried concern over the question of her rumored engagement to Giovanelli, some little, hopeful sign of "esteem." Her question, half taunt and half plea, elicits his completely scornful reply— she should be engaged, her indiscretions being what they are. No longer does he have any faith in her innocence, no longer does he put any reservations upon his acceptance of "civilised society's" adverse verdict on Daisy.

1879

"Did you believe I was engaged the other day?" she asked.

"It doesn't matter what I believed the other day," said Winterbourne, still laughing.

"Well, what do you believe now?"

"I believe that it makes very little difference whether you are engaged or not!"

1909

"Did you believe I was engaged the other day?"

"It doesn't matter now what I believed the other day!" he replied with infinite point.

It was a wonder that she didn't wince for it. "Well, what do you believe now?"

"I believe it makes very little difference whether you're engaged or not!"

He felt her lighted eyes fairly penetrate the thick

157 Ibid.

158 In response to Winterbourne's tongue lashing (delivered in French in the revision, perhaps so that the girl will not know the danger to her health?) for having brought Daisy to this den of malaria, Giovanelli in both editions asked rhetorically when she was ever "prudent" (pp.110-87). James did not, in revision, insert the "she did what she liked" explanation until the burial scene.

> He felt the young girl's pretty eyes fixed upon him through the thick gloom of the archway; she was apparently going to answer.
>
> gloom of the vaulted passage— as if to seek some access to him she hadn't yet compassed.[159]

She did finally have "access" to him, he did finally understand her fully— but only after she was dead, and Giovanelli, too late, had testified to her innocence. Clearly, Winterbourne in the Colosseum scene was not yet ready to "esteem" Daisy,[160] with the result (and it appeared in the 1879 edition as well as the revised one) that her next words, the last he was to hear from her, were, "'I don't care whether I have Roman fever or not!'"[161]

"Daisy's grave was in the little Protestant cemetery...." with more poignancy in 1909, "A grave was found for her" there.[162] Winterbourne tried to avoid him but a pale Giovanelli (1879) "seemed to wish to say something," and (1909) "had visibly something urgent— and even to distress— to say, which he scarce knew how 'to place.'"[163]

159 pp.111-89.

160 Winterbourne may have rejected Daisy, but of course he was deeply interested in her during her illness. Originally he "went often to ask for news of her and once he saw Mrs. Miller," a rather cryptic way of expressing his concern, and one improved in 1909, when he "constantly attended for news from the sickroom, which reached him, however, but with worrying directness, though he once had speech, for a moment, of the poor girl's physician and once saw Mrs. Miller...." A more sympathetic passage, certainly (pp.113-90).

161 pp.111-89. Her regard for Winterbourne is emphasized by the revision of her death-bed message to him, relayed by her mother: in 1879, "'Daisy spoke of you the other day....she told me to tell you that she never was engaged....Anyway, she says she's not engaged. I don't know why she wanted you to know; but she said to me three times, "Mind you tell Mr. Winterbourne."'"; in 1909, "'Daisy spoke of you...quite pleasantly....She wanted you to know....Anyway, she wants you to realise she ain't engaged. I don't know why she makes so much of it...'" (pp.113-91).

162 Ibid.

163 pp.114-92.

After his declaration (in both editions) that Daisy was "'the most beautiful young lady I ever saw, and the most amiable,'" there is a pause, for he, and he alone, holds the key to her character. Finally, in 1879 "'...and she was the most innocent.'"[164] This passage immediately follows; the italics are mine for the revision that indicates so strikingly Winterbourne's remorse for having failed to understand and appreciate Daisy:

1879	1909
Winterbourne looked at him, and presently repeated his words, "And the most innocent?"	Winterbourne sounded him with hard dry eyes, but presently repeated his words, "The most innocent?"
"The most innocent!"	"The most innocent!"
Winterbourne felt sore and angry. "Why the devil," he asked, "did you take her to that fatal place?"	*It came somehow so much too late that our friend could only glare at its having come at all.* "Why the devil...?"[165]

Giovanelli answered Winterbourne's question, far more satisfactorily to the character of Daisy, and far more epigrammatically, in the revision. Originally he explained that "'she wanted to go,'" which reveals little of her stubborn forthrightness, her habit of following her own inner voice, her own sense of right and wrong; in 1909, Giovanelli— echoed a moment later by Winterbourne — succinctly characterized the much maligned Daisy. "'She did what she liked!'"[166] But, perhaps "seeing again" the "exaggeration" that had marked her assertion in the Colosseum, and certainly recalling her final words after failing to find "access" to him there, as Winterbourne remarked to his aunt in 1879, "'She would have appreciated one's esteem.'"[167]

---

164 In 1909, "'Also — naturally! — the most innocent'" (ibid.).
165 pp.115-92.
166 Ibid.
167 pp.116-93.

The long history of Daisy Miller has been full of ironies. After being pirated in James's neighboring city of Boston, it quickly brought to its author unexpected fame; after more than a decade of writing that was appreciated by an intelligent but small public, James suddenly found himself widely-read by the populace— but not widely-bought, for he made very little money from Daisy, and not intelligently read— what were interpreted as the heresies in Daisy seem to account largely for the tremendous interest it excited. So James had not really found the fame he always craved; indeed, a few years afterwards, a steady decline in his popularity set in, lasting into the 1890's.

Fame having thus turned to dust in his grasp, James understandably showed little interest in revising Daisy (even forgetting, when he wrote its New York Edition Preface, that he had dropped its subtitle, A Study, in 1892); one even questions, many times, whether it was the author or the printer who made some slight revisory touch to an interim edition. Years went by and James turned out The Portrait of a Lady, The Bostonians, The Princess Casamassima, The Tragic Muse, "The Lesson of the Master," "The Real Thing," "The Altar of the Dead," The Spoils of Poynton, "The Beast in the Jungle," and his "big three," The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove, and The Golden Bowl. Despite this impressive shelf, Daisy remained the work most naturally associated with James, and— perhaps bitterest irony of all— a practically unrevised early Daisy rather than the beautifully revised version found in the Scribner New York Edition, a version in which (besides countless improvements in literary craftsmanship generally) key

scenes are made clear and telling, and the characterisation of Daisy so carefully re-touched that she should never again be misunderstood. Scribner's, unfortunately, has never re-issued its revised Daisy in an inexpensive, easily accessible volume; Macmillan's of London is part of a 35-volume set, now out of print; Secker's (of London), last reprinted in 1924, is highly inaccurate; Eyre and Spottiswoode, printer in 1947 of a definitive Daisy, is also a London house; Henry Holt's Daisy (1946) is probably unknown in this country outside the college classroom. The public has reviled him, reprint houses have persecuted him; but since the recent revival of the gospel according to James, many others of his texts have been resurrected from the Scribner Bible. Let us bow our pedagogical heads in prayer that some American Gideon will do likewise for Daisy.

CHAPTER VI

THE REVISIONS OF "A BUNDLE OF LETTERS"

"A Bundle of Letters" was one of James's most successful efforts at popular writing, enjoying nine printings in four years. First published in the Parisian for December 18, 1879, it reappeared three times in 1880, three in 1881, and twice in 1883. Of these nine early editions, I have been able to examine five—the 1880 volume published by Loring (Boston)[1], the Harper (New York) editions of 1880 and 1883[2], and the Macmillan (London) versions of 1881 and 1883.[3] It is regrettable that the initial "Bundle" could not be compared with the first editions in book form, but one suspects that collation of the other three texts[4] would have thrown no new light on the development of James.

1 64 pp. According to LeRoy Phillips, A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James (New York, 1930), p. 18, this edition of "A Bundle" was "Reprinted from the Parisian."

2 The Diary of a Man of Fifty and A Bundle of Letters, No. 135, in Harper's Half-Hour Series, pp. 69-135. "The Diary of a Man of Fifty" first appeared, simultaneously, in Harper's Magazine and Macmillan's Magazine, July, 1879.
Daisy Miller: A Study, and Other Stories, in Harper's Franklin Square Library, No. 303, pp. 47-56. Besides Daisy Miller and "A Bundle of Letters," this volume included An International Episode and "The Diary of a Man of Fifty."

3 Washington Square, The Pension Beaurepas, A Bundle of Letters, II, 204-270. Volume I contained most of Washington Square, which originally appeared in the Cornhill Magazine, June—November, and in Harper's Magazine, July-December, 1880.
The Madonna of the Future, A Bundle of Letters, The Diary of a Man of Fifty, Eugene Pickering, pp. 47-89. This was the thirteenth volume of the fourteen-volume Collective Edition of James issued by Macmillan in 1883.

4 Walter Besant and James Rice, Sweet Nelly, My Heart's Delight [and] Henry James, Jr., A Bundle of Letters (New York, 1880), in Seaside Library, No. 702.

There are a few—very few—actual textual changes among the five early editions studied, so that one again faces the problem; which of the slight deviations in typography, punctuation, and mechanics (and consistency is not always kept) are those of the printer following the rules of the house of Loring, or Harper, or Macmillan, and which are the work of Henry James? The other anticipated problem recurs, that of a publisher normally following its own earlier version rather than the intermediate (and improved) one of another house, but at times adopting the other's punctuation or mechanics—this type of change seems to indicate the hand of James the revisionist.

The Harper edition of 1880 is generally more modern (that is, more simple) and consistent than the Loring one of the same year in matters of capitalization, italics, abbreviations, hyphens, and numbers.[5] Whereas all of these differences should perhaps be attributed only to the printer, James himself probably made the improvements by which (in the Harper version) in four instances one sentence appears more effectively as two, "graisseux" is correctly spelled "graisseuse," and the addition of the word "not" makes

---

Washington Square, The Pension Beaurepas, A Bundle of Letters (Leipzig, 1881), in Collection of British Authors, Vol. 1978. Ostensibly the same text as the Macmillan 1881 edition (see note 3).

Washington Square, The Pension Beaurepas, A Bundle of Letters (London, 1881). Macmillan's one-volume edition of (ostensibly) its two-volume edition of the same year.

5 In the Harper edition, the "Channel" is capitalized, "West Cedar Street" is written out, dates appear as "January 7" rather than "7th," "menage" and "salon" are italicized, "la Belle

sensible in context Miranda's wish that "she would not keep on so."[6] The greater simplicity and consistency of punctuation, as well as the number of punctuation changes, point both to authorial revision and a slightly later date for the Harper edition. At this time in James's development (circa 1880) whichever of two editions is simpler in its use of the comma and the comma dash is almost invariably the later one; the Harper version omits nearly twice as many commas (52) as it adds (31), and in forty-four instances uses the dash in preference to the older comma dash[7] found so frequently in the Loring edition. There are fifteen other types of punctuation alterations (4) changes in

---

Madame Hulut" appears without quotes and with "belle" not capitalised, and "Pere Goriot" and "Les Parents Pauvres" receive quotes rather than italics. Although "New-Yorker" and "coaching-place" are hyphenated in the Harper edition, "extra private lessons," "indoors," "bedroom," and "headquarters" are written thus. The Loring edition misprinted "you" as "yon."

6 The "not" could of course have been in the original Parisian version and omitted through oversight by the Loring printer. The Harper change of "feels towards Mecca," rather than "toward" it, might well have been James's, not the printers. For this Harper edition, James added (italics mine) "at Berlin, in Unter dan Linden," but the New York Edition omits the "in." Recalling a bit hasily Goldsmith's "The Deserted Village" James had had Violet Ray compare her father to the "parson" who "could" argue still; in this Harper edition, he "would" argue still. The parson did not correctly become the schoolmaster until the New York Edition, where, incidentally, the "could-would" problem is avoided: "...'e'en though vanquished,' he always argues still." It is easy to see why James's memory tricked him: "Lands he [schoolmaster] could measure, terms and tides presage/And ev'n the story ran that he could gauge. In arguing too, the parson own'd his skill/For ev'n though vanquished, he could argue still" (11.209-212).

The use of the comma rather than the dash in the Loring edition makes the agreement in this passage somewhat dubious: "... it is only the drapery, the skirts and furbelows (that is, I mean in the young lady who has her mother), that are abundant." The dash in the Harper edition made the correctness unquestioned: "... it is only the drapery—the skirts and furbelows...her mother)—that is abundant."

all),[8] enough in variety to make these deviations from the Loring edition seem to be the work of James, not the Harper printer.

Although occasionally its punctuation differs from that found in both the Loring and the Harper editions,[9] and despite the forty-six instances where it accords with the Harper version in its avoidance of the comma dash,[10] the 1881 Macmillan (London) edition of "A Bundle of Letters" follows that of Loring rather than Harper. In its avoidance of commas, and in its more careful paragraphing, this Macmillan edition shows itself to be the latest of the three,

---

7 Parenthetical material is, without exception, punctuated more effectively in the Harper edition; in the "Bundle," as printed by Loring (and Macmillan, in both editions), "some of it really most pressing" was preceded by a dash and followed by a comma, and "though these are often rather curious" was preceded by a comma and followed by a semicolon, but in the Harper version, dashes are used to separate these parentheses.

8 Semicolon (in Harper) for comma (in Loring)(12), for colon (2), for comma dash (1), for dash (1); comma for semicolon (6), for comma dash (1), for dash (6); colon for semicolon (3), for comma dash (1); dash for semicolon (2), for comma (3), added (2); parenthesis-comma for comma dash (1), parenthesis for comma (1); exclamation point added (1).

9 Semicolon (in Macmillan, 1881) for comma (in Loring, 1880, and Harper, 1880) (2), for colon (2); colon for semicolon (2); comma for semicolon (2). This later edition also changed one sentence (in both earlier ones) to two.

10 Generally of course the comma dash was replaced by the dash; the Harper version had also replaced it (once each) by the colon, the semicolon, the comma, and the parenthesis-comma.
This Macmillan edition also resembled that of Harper in its substitution of a comma for a semicolon, and a semicolon for a colon, its addition of one comma (and omission of six), as well as in its spelling of "<u>praisseuse</u>," the dropping of the hyphen in "extra private lessons," the failure to abbreviate "West Cedar Street," and the absence of quotes around "la belle Madame Hulot."

for although it added (for clarity and correctness) five commas not found in either of the 1880 versions, it omitted sixteen superfluous ones that had appeared in both,[11] and it added paragraphing (felicitously) ten times.[12]

Again one finds changes that he should perhaps attribute to the printer,[13] and again, several revisions by James. For correctness, naturalness, or emphasis, the author replaced "or" by "nor," "seen" by "visited," changed the exclamation "don't want to" to "never want to," and had the Englishmen consider Leverett not a "mad gentleman" but a "madman." James also deleted a sentence that had been completely out of context, Léon's encomium concerning Violet, "Non, elle est bien gentille." Miranda Hope, in Paris, pointing out its superiority, conversationally and intellectually, to Bangor, Maine, had written that "it seems as if, over here, there was less to express." She had obviously meant "over there" (Bangor); James made the correction for the 1881 edition.

11 The revisions that James made to "The Madonna of the Future" in the early 1880's also show the care with which he added commas where clarity or correctness demanded, but removed them when possible.

12 And twice more for the New York Edition of 1909.

13 Leverett, reacting to the iridiscent buttons that adorned the back of Evelyn Vane's dress, wonderedecstatically (in both editions of 1880) what there was about them "to make one dream—to donner"; these omissions of "à rêver" may have been oversights of the printers—the 1879 Parisian may have printed the passage correctly. But in book form, at any rate, it was not until this 1881 edition that the full idiom, "donner à rêver," appeared. And James, not the printer, was probably responsible for the correction, since the 1881 Macmillan edition seems to follow the 1880 Loring edition.

With somewhat more confidence, one attributes to the Macmillan printer the dropping of capitals for the expletive "heaven knows," the spelling of "bourgeois" without the final "e," the

Names and ages were (as usual) scrutinised more closely by James. Léon, the little Parisian *poulevardier*, had already become Léon Verd*ier* in the text of the 1880 Harper edition, while remaining Verd*i* in the caption of his letter (a discrepancy repeated in the 1883 version), but in the 1881 Macmillan edition he was consistently Verd*ier*. A "Miss Thompson" referred to by Evelyn became "Miss Johnson"; more interestingly, in the same letter, "Miss Philpotts" became "Miss Turnover."[14] According to Léon, Madame Maisonrouge was fifty years old, while confessing to thirty-seven (in the New York Edition, thirty-eight); her daughters, aged twenty-seven and twenty-three, had admitted being twenty-two and eighteen, but in this 1881 edition, they posed as twenty and seventeen. Perhaps James feared that the sensibilities of some of his gentle readers would be offended at the Madame's having had a child at the tender (confessed) age of fifteen. Besides these name and age changes and those in paragraphing already mentioned, in the New York Edition the datelines (for the letters) are September or October rather than January or February, and "Rudolf"

---

appearance of "schoolmistress" without the hyphen, the hyphenating of "table-manners" and "abnormally-developed" and the printing of "for ever" as two words. (Inconsistencies should be noted: "dare say" of earlier editions appeared variously as "dare say" and "daresay" in 1881, but consistently as one word in the 1883 Macmillan edition; "indignation-meeting" was first hyphenated in 1881, but again printed as two words in 1883.)

Different "house rules" may be observed in the captions to the letters. Macmillan in 1881 used italics except for the names of persons, but in 1883, capitals of uniform size; Harper used capitals, with the first letter in a proper name large; Loring used italics. For the salutation,

"Mother:-" was used by Loring,
"MOTHER,-" by Harper, and
"MOTHER-" by Macmillan.

14 For no apparent reason, James in the New York Edition changed a reference to "some Russians and Hungarians" being expected at the Pension Maisonrouge, making it read, "some Spaniards and some Hungarians"; for humorous effect (also in 1908) he added the information that "three Tahitians" were also expected. (Paul

appears as "Rudolph"; one is surprised at Dr. Lucas's asseveration that the "changes in spelling and pronunciation exhibit nothing new, and there are no alterations in name or form."[15]

The 1883 editions of "A Bundle of Letters" issued by both Harper and Macmillan follow almost without change their own earlier (1880 and 1881) editions.[16] Both versions now adopted (inexplicably) the incorrect spelling of "big blonde man"; the Macmillan edition now printed "bedroom" and "the Channel" as they had first appeared in the 1880 Harper version, replaced a comma that it had removed in 1881, and omitted fourteen found in its earlier edition.[17]

One concludes from the foregoing that "A Bundle of Letters" generally, though not consistently, improves with each succeeding edition. The Loring volume of 1880, earliest of the five texts examined, is the weakest. The Harper edition of 1880, better than Loring's, is also superior to Macmillan's of 1881 in those instances where the latter followed Loring instead of adopting a felicitous revision introduced by Harper. Normally, however, the

---

Gauguin died in Tahiti in 1903.)

15 John S. Lucas, "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories" (Chicago, 1948), p. 87. Léon Edel has noted, in James's manuscripts of the dramatic version of The American, "such inconsistencies as Newman's alternately referring to 'Valentin' and 'Valentine'" (The Complete Plays of Henry James, Philadelphia and New York, 1949, p. 820). See also the "Note on the Text" in The Notebooks of Henry James, edd. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock (New York, 1947, pp. xxi-xxiii).

16 The Harper edition dropped two commas, and gave a date as "the third" rather than "the 3d." (But see note 5.)

17 One of these commas had been added (to the Loring edition which it followed) in 1881; four of them had been omitted earlier in the Harper edition of 1880.

Macmillan version is more satisfactory than Harper's, since in addition to making its own helpful changes in paragraphing and in diction, it adopted the more important improvements in punctuation made by Harper. Of the two editions of 1883, Harper's is disappointing, failing as it did to benefit from the intermediate 1881 Macmillan version, or even to correct its own errors of 1880; of the five editions examined of "A Bundle of Letters," Macmillan's of 1883, improving slightly over its earlier version, is the best of the lot.

Although some of the variations in punctuation and mechanics are doubtless attributable to the printer, the majority of the improvements and corrections made to the "Bundle" in its early appearances seem likely to have been the work of James the revisionist.

The stir caused by Daisy Miller was to James in 1879 a source of satisfaction (not unmixed with rue, since so many readers had failed to understand Daisy), and he felt prompted to try his hand at other treatments of the American girl, especially the American girl abroad. One recalls that the only female compatriot of Christoper Newman had been Mrs. Tristram, a minor figure, and that in the earlier Roderick Hudson Mary Garland and Christina Light had been neglected by James. A more ambitious treatment than that of Miss Caroline Spencer ("Four Meetings," November, 1877), who spent only thirteen hours in Europe, was the story of Gertrude Wentworth, who encountered The Europeans (July-October, 1878) in her native land. Six months after Daisy Miller came An International Episode (December, 1878 - January, 1879), which presented

Bessie Alden in scenes laid both in Newport and in England. By this time, the adverse criticisms of Daisy had spurred James on to a complete mental picture of Isabel Archer, and, by his own account, he had actually written a part of The Portrait of a Lady by the spring of 1879. Urgently he desired to delineate an American girl with (unquestioned) charm and character, one who would silence the loud detractors of Daisy. As he worked along on the Portrait, James wisely experimented, in matters of technique and conception, with modest treatments of the American girl, hoping to reap a profit thereby in the final form of his more ambitious novel. In April, 1879, appeared "The Pension Beaurepas"; its Sophie Ruck seems an anticipation of Violet Ray; its Aurora Church, on the other hand, has no money, and is constantly being shunted from one cheap pension to another by her widowed mother, who hopes to find for her a wealthy match. In August, two months before the "Bundle" was written, the novel Confidence began its serialization (August, 1879 - January, 1880); here, clearly, is an answer to the denigrations of Daisy, for Angela Vivian (who lived abroad with her mother because it was cheaper) had both charm and capability, but she was misunderstood and misjudged by Bernard Longueville, who was obviously and unquestionably stupid. (Winterbourne was intelligent, but had been too long in Europe, and unwisely gave ear to Mrs. Costello and Mrs. Walker.) Five months after the final installment of Confidence, Washington Square began to appear (June - November, 1880); beyond any question the best novel (of its scope) James had yet done, it pointed directly to his first major masterpiece (prepared for by his practice-pieces, as it were, just mentioned), The Portrait of a Lady (October,

1880 - November, 1881).[18] Before magazine readers had taken final leave of Catherine Sloper and her "morsel of fancy work," they met Isabel Archer.

One of the practice-pieces for the Portrait was "A Bundle of Letters,"[19] in which contrasting types[20] are represented by Miss Miranda Hope, lean, angular down-Easterner, and a wealthy

18 Other short treatments of the American girl of course were still to follow. In the spring of 1881, while in Washington, D. C., James began "The Point of View," which was "a short imaginary correspondence after the pattern of the...'Bundle of Letters'" (The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur, New York, 1934, p. 213). In it Aurora Church, still unmarried, reappears, and there is one Miss Sturdy, who makes some delightfully astringent comments on the American scene. "The Point of View" was not printed until December, 1882; (in Volume XIV of the New York Edition it immediately follows the "Bundle," perhaps because in it, besides Aurora, Louis Leverett reappears.)

In June, 1884, Pandora appeared. Pandora Day, unlike many heroines, is a self-made girl, full of quick wits and a bold charm. (Pandora was made a companion piece to Daisy, which it immediately followed in Volume XVIII of the New York Edition.)

19 In Paris James met his friend, Theodore Child, who in the fall of 1879 was "fondly carrying on, under difficulties, an Anglo-American periodical called 'The Parisian.' He invited me to contribute to its pages, and again, a small sharply-resonant street off the Rue de la Paix, where all existence somehow went on as a repercussion from well-brushed asphalt, lives for me as the scene of my response. A snowstorm of a violence rare in Paris raged, I recollect, for many hours, for the greater part of a couple of days; muffling me noiselessly into the small, shiny, shabby salon of an hôtel garni with a droll combinational, almost cosmic sign, and promoting (it comes back to me) a deep concentration, an unusual straightness of labour. 'A Bundle of Letters' was written in a single long session and, the temperature apart, at a 'heat'" (Critical Prefaces, pp.212-213). The idea of using letters to tell a story had occurred to James early in the year; the notebook entry for January 27 suggests "a story told in letters written alternately by a mother and her daughter and giving totally different accounts of the same situation" (The Notebooks of Henry James, p. 11).

According to Richard Nicholas Foley, "Most critics... all but ignored the collection, The Diary of a Man of Fifty and A Bundle of Letters. Still aware of the beauties of the style, they objected to the obsession with psychological study seen in the

...w York society girl with the amazing name of Violet Day. Mirande ...urope unchaperoned, questing for the "rail o "general culture"; the presence in Paris of Violet, the snobbishly sophisticated *nouveau*, was inevitable, Paris being the fashionable haven for money-spoiled American girls and their mothers. ...lthough neither Mirande nor Violet had the charm and beauty ...Daisy Miller,[21] as types they probably ar... ...curate ...y drawn.

---

vivisection of character, and lamented the fact that he seemed unable to write books more commensurate with his unusual talent. They believed, nevertheless, that he was capable of writing a great novel if he would stop experimenting and write one that would have life as well as art" (*Criticism in American Periodicals of the Works of Henry James from 1866 to 1916*, Washington, D. C., 1944, p. 26). Foley states further that "It was generally agreed that he had mastered the technical side of writing, that...'long experience and nicety of perception' had secured for him an immunity from failure. *Scribner's* thought that of the contemporary novelists only Thomas Hardy had brought to his task so complete a training and so fine a hand as James..." (*ibid.*, n. 21).

20 Some description has been given of Sophie Kuck, Aurora Church, Angela Vivian, and Pandora Day; Catherine Sloper and Isabel Archer are too well-known to require comment here. James had, indeed, as Isa Cornelia Pulsifer Kelley has noted, a bewildering array of types from which to choose: "daughters of the newly rich, daughters of the poor, some who came to Europe for clothes, others who came for culture, and still others who came for no particular reason, but were alert, eager, inquisitive, ready for anything that might happen. The problem grew complex. There were many American girls, and they were not all Daisy Millers. Some were less attractive, some were more, but all these intensely alive individuals were most interesting..." (*The Early Development of Henry James*, Urbana, 1930, p. 272).

21 Wilson, whose braggadocio prevented him from being a reliable source, distinguished the two by calling Mirande "the tall one" (in revision, "the big bouncer") (pp. 51-52).--The first page cited is to the Loring edition of 1880, the earliest text examined for this study. As it happens (except for occasional differences in punctuation or mechanics), none of the Loring edition passages to be quoted are among those that were slightly altered in Harper or Macmillan versions; thus only the two editions, Loring and Scribner,

The "Bundle" is not a story but (to a far greater degree than Daisy Miller) a study, or a series of sketches,[22] in which representatives of four nationalities—German, French, English, and American—write letters to their friends and relatives back home, analysing and describing quite candidly, even remorselessly, the other three racial types. Epistolary with a difference, then, the "Bundle," unlike Pamela, has six distinct and important correspondents; and, unlike The Moonstone, the several points of view result not in a slowly revealed (but eventually complete) plot but in full and varied characterization. Writing from the Pension Maisonrouge, each American reacts differently to each European (and to his compatriots), in this way characterizing himself as well as the intended subject. For a framework device, James used only the opening and closing letters (I and IX) from Miranda to her

---

will be cited hereinafter. The second page cited is to The Novels and Tales of Henry James (New York, 1908), XIV.

Originally Léon described Miranda as "tall and rather flat," but definitively as "too tall and too flat" (pp. 55-524). And Leverett went so far (1908) as to alter his picture of her—"straight-waisted"—to the more frank "narrow-chested" (pp.28-501). Léon did, however, make more attractive her "bright, keen, inquisitive eyes"—in 1908 they were "wonderfully far gazing eyes" (pp. 55-524). Violet's physical appearance was virtually unchanged; from "a little too thin" she became to Léon "a little too immaterial" (pp. 54-523).

22 James referred modestly to the "Bundle" and "The Point of View" as "mere ingenious and more or less effective pleasantries" (Critical Prefaces, p. 213).

mother, Mrs. Abraham Hope, of Bangor, Maine (Letters II and V also went to Mrs. Hope). Violet wrote to Agnes Rich in Letter III, and the other American (or rather, Bostonian) Louis Leverett, to Harvard Fremont in IV. The European points of view appear in the latter part of the study, Evelyn Vane's correspondence to Lady Augusta Fleming at Brighton being Letter VI, Léon Verdier's to Prosper Gobain at Lille, VII, and Dr. Rudolph Staub's pedantic report to Dr. Julius Hirsch at Gottingen, Letter VIII. It may be assumed that James derived his usual delicious satisfaction from naming his creations.

Perhaps impelled by his greater urbanity, perhaps to avoid triteness and undue repetition (since the idea could be conveyed without the use of the terms themselves), and certainly to keep the emphasis on people rather than geographical locations, James in revising for the New York Edition carefully avoided his early over-use of "local color," "point of view," "local," or "national." When he did choose a synonym for one of these excised terms, it was (more correct, anthropologically) generally either "racial" or "native." Dr. Staub, who had come to Paris expressly to study the French people, found himself in an hotel kept by a Pomeranian and staffed, in its dining room, entirely by waiters "from the Fatherland"; ruefully he wrote (1880) of not finding the hotel "sufficiently local and national," but in the definitive edition he found it lacking in "real matter."[23] And Leverett, the aesthete,

23 pp. 56-525.

disappointedly discovered that the society at Madame Maisonrouge's was not (1880) "so local, so characteristic, as I could have desired"; in 1908 it was not "so richly native, of so indigenous a note" as he could have wished.[24] One suspects that the mature James winced whenever, in re-reading his early work, he came across the term "local color"; Leverett's further revelation to Harvard that Madame had been compelled by reverses to open her pension to travellers[25] "who have the sense of local color" was not allowed to stand. In its place, Leverett, who had James's strong sense of the past (but who was far more the romantic than James), wrote in 1906 of travellers "who are weary of the beaten track, who shun the great caravanseries, who cherish the tradition of the old French sociability."[26] Reading further, Harvard learned in 1880 that these appreciative, sensitive travellers came from all points, for Madame's pension was (italics mine) "not <u>local</u> at all; but on the other hand, it is cosmopolitan, and there is a great advantage in that.... I am much interested in the study of

24 pp. 26-500.

25 Léon explained the matter more interestingly, writing (1908) of "that <u>grande belle femme</u> who, after having married, <u>en secondes noces</u>—there had been, to tell the truth, some irregularity about her first union—a venerable relic of the old noblesse of Poitou, was left, by the death of her husband, complicated by the clash of expensive tastes against an income of 17,000 francs, on the pavement of Paris with two little demons of daughters to bring up in the path of virtue.... Three years ago she had the thrice-blest idea of opening a well-upholstered and otherwise attractive <u>asile</u> for the blundering barbarians who come to Paris..." (p.520).

26 pp. 25-499.

national types; in comparing, contrasting, seizing the strong points, the weak points, the point of view of each. It is interesting to shift one's point of view— to enter into strange, exotic ways of looking at life."[27] (It is not unusual for Leverett to speak for his creator, and here, except for the tone of genial satire, he is doing so.) In revising this passage for the New York Edition, James replaced "local" and "national" by "native" and "racial" and substituted for "the point of view of each," "the sharp keynote of each." Indicative of the richer wisdom of the mature James are his added references to hypocrisy and prejudice.[28]

Bearing in mind that James wrote the "Bundle" about a year and a half after Daisy Miller, one may expect that the original analyses of the American girl abroad will sharply resemble some of those in Daisy. And recalling too that the "Bundle" was revised years after the acrimonious discussion brought on by the misconceptions of Daisy's true character, one expects (as in the revision of Daisy) a clearing-up of any possible ambiguities[29] regarding the morals and the personality of the American girl.

27 pp. 26-27.

28 In the New York Edition, Leverett found the place "not native at all; though on the other hand it is furiously cosmopolite, and that speaks to me too at my hours.... I'm much interested in the study of racial types; in compering, contrasting, seizing the strong points, the weak points, in identifying, however muffled by hypocrisy, the sharp keynote of each. It's interesting to shift one's point of view, to despoil one's self to one's idiotic prejudices, to enter into strange exotic ways of looking at life" (p.500).

29 It may have been, however, that James regarded as too open an appeal for sympathy Leverett's 1880 reference to Miranda

Leverett of course frequently disparaged the "American types" he met at the pension, but the reader must bear in mind that he was a snob.[30] The chief reason for Leverett's objection may be seen in an addition that occurs in the New York Edition: contrasting Miranda unfavorably with Evelyn Vane, the British girl "with eyes as shy as violets and a voice as sweet!" he went on in 1908 to write of "the difference between the printed, the distributed, the gratuitous hand-bill and the shy scrap of a billet-doux dropped where you may pick it up."[31] Leverett was fond of his image; he had used it (again, 1908) only the page before, while trying to define the similarities between those compatriots, Violet and Miranda. In 1880, in an analysis marked by fairness, not extravagance, he had called them "both specimens of the emancipated young American girl,—practical, positive, passionless, subtle, and knowing, as you please, either too much or too little. And yet, as I say, they have a certain stamp, a certain grace; I like to talk with them, to study them." James, in revising Leverett's rather cryptic statement, avoided the "emancipated .." cliché, and alluded to the plenitude of such types in Europe

---

as "a little figure in which, after all, if you can get the right point of view, there is something rather striking." He deleted the passage in 1908 (pp.29-502).

30 Replacing his 1880 comments that the "types" were not "so interesting as they might be" and were "exclusively feminine" were the 1908 observations, more cutting and snobbish, that they did not "make a strong, or rich affirmation" and that they were "wholly negative and feminine" (pp.27-500). Leverett also superciliously alluded not to the "young girls" but to the "easy products," and remarked not that the "young girls are rather curious types" but that the "inevitable creatures are more or less in the picture" (pp.30-503; 27-501).

31 pp. 29-502.

circa 1880. And in expanding the passage, James was careful add Leverett's cherished image for the girls' lack of mystery, a well as (probably with the reception of *Daisy* in mind) the kind references to their "fineness" and their "spontaneity"; Violet and Miranda were now (1908) "both specimens of the practical positive passionless young thing as we let her loose on the world--and yet with a certain fineness and knowing, as you please, either too much, or too little. With all of which, as I say, they have their spontaneity and even their oddity; though no more mystery, either of them, than the printed circular thrust into your hand on the street-corner."[32]

Leverett, for all his snobbery, was, like Miranda (and James), a New Englander, and while he may have underrated the charm and the appeal of one born, like himself, into a new-world background, he saw with absolute clarity the innocence and purity of Miranda's character. Besides speaking of "that strangely serene self of hers" rather than that "stiff, slim" one, he though of Miranda not as a "strange type" but as a "rare white flower."[33] One passage in particular found in the 1880 version of the "Bundle" (and revised in 1908 only in matters of punctuation)[34] could equally well have appeared in the pages of *Daisy Miller*, but would no doubt have been overlooked by those feminine readers who regarded *Daisy* as a blasphemy upon American womanhood; Miranda, Leverett wrote, "looks at everything, goes everywhere, passes her way, with her clear

32 pp. 28-501.

33 pp. 28-29-502; 28-502.

34 No comma after "way"; semicolon after "open," "them," and "robe" (p.502).

quiet eyes wide open, skirting the edge of obscene abysses without suspecting them, pushing through brambles without tearing her robe, exciting, without knowing it, the most injurious suspicions...."[35] This early, Loring version concludes, "always holding her course, passionless, stainless, fearless, charmless!" More effective rhythmically, and with increased emphasis on Miranda's purity, the definitive version ends with "always holding her course—without a stain, without a sense, without a fear, without a charm!" [36]

Léon, as much a coxcomb as Giovanelli,[37] gloated to Prosper about his "private lessons" (later "extra-private" ones) with Miranda;[38] and described the way she looked (1880) as "the most finished piece of impertinence I ever beheld." Although he obviously could not begin to understand the girl, he wrote (1908) that the way she looked combined "apparent innocence with complete assurance in a way I've never seen equalled."[39]

35 p. 29.

36 pp.29-502.

37 He wrote Prosper in 1880, "But I needn't remind you that women are always for something in the happiness of him who writes to thee..." but, more emphatically in 1908, "But I needn't remind you for how much women have always been in any happiness of him..." (pp.50-520).

38 pp. 53-522.

39 pp. 55-524.

evidence the skill of James's characterisation that Dr. Staub, who has only contempt for all Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Americans, collectively or singly, is more unkind than before in his documentation. Originally he had contented himself with noting down that Miranda had "elaborated complete system licentious behavior." Such was his interpretation her unchaperoned search for culture. For the New York Edition James careful to have Staub make more explicit his slanders: here Miranda "worked out complete scheme of experimental dventure, that is of personal/ license, which she is now engaged in carrying out."[40]

"For general culture, of course the languages and to see Europe for myself.'"[41] This, Mrs. Graham Hope read, was Miranda's unvarying answer to those Americans abroad (not Europeans) who expressed surprise at her travelling alone.[42] can share with James his benevolent attitude of sympathetic appreciation of the zeal and the ardor which Miranda brought to her search for "general culture." (And one certainly envisions James decade older than when he wrote A Passionate Pilgrim.)

40 pp.61-530.

41 1908, 483.

42 With an adroit touch, James had Miranda confess to her mother that gentlemen on the Continent were "attentive" but (1908) "almost oppressively attentive" (pp.8-483). The question was again underscored farther on in the latter when Miranda wrote of being (1880) "always treated with the politeness, which, as I told you before, I encounter everywhere." Additional evidence that the furore caused by Daisy Miller led James to revise with the utmost care his references to the morality of Miranda appears in the 190, revision of this assertion, for now Miranda writes of the "politeness, which, as I've mentioned—for I want you to feel happy about that—I encounter everywhere from the best people" (pp.12-485).

Miranda, exhibiting the normal impatience of the beginner in a foreign language, complained that the "teachers always keep you tottering over the verbs"; discouraged at "not making much progress with the French" language, she moved to the Pension Maisonrouge,[43] where "a quantity of conversation is thrown in," there being other foreigners there "for the same purpose as myself." The pension delighted her—here she was "able to do much good work," and here she met Dr. Staub, who shared her "great desire for information." Writing even more ironically, but still one believes smiling sympathetically, James for the New York Edition revised Miranda's intense comments, putting into service a recurring image. Miranda now (1908) reported regretfully to her mother that "over here in Europe teachers don't seem to think it's <u>really</u> in their interest to let you press forward. The more you strike out and realise your power the less they've got to teach you." Provoked at not "pressing onward quite as I dreamed with the French," Miranda went to the pension, where there was "a chance to press onward," since her fellow-boarders were "all also bent on pressing onward." Ten days later Miranda confirmed her fondest hope: "I <u>am</u> able to press onward." And how pleasant to have as companion Herr Staub, who also "wants to push further and further all the time"![44]

43 Her hotel reminds one of Dr. Staub's, for here too all the waiters were German. And her chamber-maid was Irish.

44 pp.13-469; 9-484; 14-486; 14-469; 31-504; 41-513. James used imagery somewhat similar when he had Miranda think not that she "should gain all I desire" but that she will "come out where I want" (pp.8-483). Then there was the unnamed American who in praising a pension as a place to learn French said (1880) "You've got to understand them, you can't help yourself." but (1908) "You've got to understand them or perish—so you strike out in self-defense ..." (pp.12-487). This same American, whom Miranda overheard

Miranda's sense of urgency never flagged, and was, indeed, strengthened by revision.[45] Her journal, she was resolved, would be (1880) "a splendid thing," but in 1906 "a splendid picture of an earnest young life,"[46] for it would contain not (the somewhat perfunctory) "a great deal of information" but instead, "a great many remarkable facts."[47] And "that hotel" where she had first stayed became "that nice hotel where there was no struggle—some fond struggle being my real atmosphere."[48] Her determined efforts to learn the language permitted her, at the close of her stay in Paris, to anticipate eagerly "the most correct French letters" that she would write Léon; these potential missives became in 1908 "the liveliest and yet the most elegant French letters."[49] But as Miranda told her mother, she wanted to learn French for its own sake; in 1908 she added, "'Art for art,' they say; but I say French for French."[50]

---

between the acts at the Palais Royal, had colorlessly remarked in 1880 that to learn French one must "'look out for a family.'" Persuasively and passionately in 1908 he advised his companion to "'look out for some family that has got—and they mostly have—more of it than they've use for themselves. How can they have use for so much as they seem to have to have? They've got to work it off. Well, they work it off on you" (pp.12-486-487).

45 She kept reminding herself that she had (1880) "only got a year in Europe," but (1908) "only got about a year left, all told" (pp.31-504).

46 pp. 6-481.

47 Ibid. To which was also added, "I guess we don't know quite everything at Bangor." Although aware of Bangor'd limitations, Miranda remained loyal. With pardonable pride, she felt in 1880 that her achievement, her growth, "only shows what a little energy and common sense will accomplish." In 1908 her forward strides only prove "what a little Bangor energy and gumption will accomplish wherever applied" (pp.5-6 -481).

Fearless intellect in others appealed strongly to the now less-provincial Miranda. "Miss Maisonrouge (the eldest daughter of the lady of the house)" was the original—and very American—designation made by the tourist from Bangor; one reads later, however, of "Mlle. Maisonrouge—the elder daughter...and the intellectual one; she has a wonderful fearless mind...."[51] And Leverett, the product of her revered Boston, impressed her with his "remarkably interesting" conversation. Aware of her growth, and proud of it, Miranda in the definitive edition praised his conversation much more fully: it "leads you right on—they do go so far over here: even our own people seem to strain ahead in Europe, and perhaps when I get back it may strike you I've learned to keep up with them." [52]

---

48 pp.9-484. Miranda in her enjoyment of struggle and her love of competition transcended her usual down-East typing, and represented all of America. Originally she feared that at the pension "our conversation will be rather mixed" but in 1908 she wondered "if we'd make a regular class, with 'moving up' and 'moving down'; anyhow I guess I won't be at the foot" (pp.14-489).

49 pp. 63-532. For, as her compatriot had said at the Palais Royal (added in 1908), "You've got to [correspond in French] to make much real head." (pp.12-487).

50 pp. 13-488.

51 pp.32-504-505. And elsewhere "she" became "this bright-minded lady" (pp.7-483).

52 pp.33-506. Straining at the shackles of her New England reticence, Miranda asked (1880), "...isn't it more sincere to come out with things than to conceal them?" More clearly and more persuasively in 1908 she asked if it were not more sincere "to come out with things than just to keep feeling of them in your mind—<u>without giving anyone the benefit</u>?" (pp.33-506. Italics mine.)

Evelyn Vane, the typical young Englishwoman, had no fearless intellect, nor did she seem to strain ahead, and while Miranda admired greatly Evelyn's manner of speaking,[53] she adamantly refused to forgive her (and her compatriots) for not having become emancipated. "The position of woman," as Miranda reminded her mother in her first letter to Bangor, was a point on which she felt "very strongly."[54] Margaret Fuller would doubtless have shared Miranda's delight that the position of woman in France was "very encouraging" (in 1908, Miranda learned that "on the whole there's hope").[55] But about woman in England Miranda could not be so sanguine. She had observed that there they had (1880) "a kind of depressed and humiliated tone, which made me want to give them a good shaking"; in 1908 they seemed to her to have "a kind of down-trodden tone, a spiritless and even benighted air, as if they were used to being snubbed and bullied and as if they liked it...."[56] Miranda came to refer to Evelyn not as "this poor young girl," but as "this charming but abject creature,"[57] and in typical American fashion, she appealed directly to Evelyn for information; she was told that in England "the position of a lady depended on the rank of her father, her eldest brother, her husband, etc." For this careless "etc." James substituted (not until 1908) "_____all on somebody else; and they [men], as to their position, on something quite else (than

53 Originally Miranda wrote, enthusiastically, "It isn't the things they say, but it is in the way they pronounce and the sweetness of their voice." James revised this to read, "It doesn't come out in the things they say, but in the sweet way they say them and in their kind of making so much, such an easy lovely effect of saying almost anything" (pp.37-509).

54 pp. 4 and 480.

55. pp. 7-482.

56 pp. 4-480.

57 pp. 40-512.

themselves) as well."[58]

Consciously proud (even at times to the point of superciliousness)[59] of her recent cultural enrichment, Miranda was also troubled by the uncertainties that seem inevitably to accompany intellectual growth.[60] Where she had written (1880) of the "gain to me, so long as that is what I came for" she wrote less positively in 1908 of the gain to her, "since it's about the same as what I came for";[61] and although originally she "learned from

58 pp. 39-511. Leverett originally was wont to speak "of a real Corot day, etc." The "etc." was omitted in 1908 (pp.21-495).

The stubborn insularity of Evelyn may be observed in her old-fashioned dress, which Leverett called the "costume of the future," but Miranda and Madame Maisonrouge, that of the past. Specifically, Leverett liked her sage-green robe, "all embroidered with subtle devices and flowers, and birds of tender tint" (1908, "...flowers, with birds and beasts of tender tint") and the "strange, clinging, clutching, pictured raiment!" (1908, the "strange, clinging clutched pictured raiment!") Léon, however, saw Evelyn as "decorated all over with beads and bracelets and embroidered dandelions" (1908, "...hung all over with beads and bracelets and amulets...embroidered all over like a sampler or a vestment"). Miranda noticed that, thanks to her garb, she was "ever so much looked at," but (1908) "ever so much more looked at than what I'd have thought she'd like" (pp. 38 and 510; 29-502; 30-503; 52-521; 38-510).

59 Besides writing, in the revision, not of "the opera" but of the "comic opera," and not of "two English people" but of "two English pensioners, as they call them," Miranda expanded her original report that she and Léon had visited "all the galleries in Paris together": with considerable more pride, she mentioned self-consciously that they had been "visiting the galleries successively together and taking in the schools in their order—for they mean by 'the schools' here something quite different from what we do" (pp.32-505; 14-489; 32-505).

60 Miranda felt some misgivings (in the revision) as to the capacity of her down-East friends to understand her. She had (1880) written her mother in glowing terms of the speeches of Léon, and she promised that when "I return to Bangor I will tell you" what he said. More tentatively in 1908 she promised that when "I get down in Maine again I guess I'll tell you" what the boulevardier had said (pp.32-505).

61 pp. 36-509.

studying French..." in the New York Edition "I seem to have learned here from studying French...."[62]

Nor would Miranda ever be lured away from the stern, but rewarding, regimen of plain living and high thinking; this is especially noticeable in the definitive edition. The awed girl in 1880 found the conversation in the pension's parlor during the evening "often remarkably brilliant"; with more discernment and exhibiting a salutary side of provincialism, she reported in 1908 that it "ranges over many subjects—I sometimes feel as if it really avoided gossip...."[63] In an earlier letter home she had written (1880) that she "wanted to know everything; and yet there are some things that I think I don't want to know."[64] The clearest statement in the original "Bundle" of Miranda's dislike for too great a freedom in conversation, and her conviction that the reticence of Bangor was preferable to the candor of the Continent, was her forthright comment that "they appear to talk about things here that we never think of mentioning at Bangor, or even of thinking about." In revising this passage, James made clear that a mere impersonal (and hence somewhat vulgar) baring of one's more private thoughts does not warrant comparison with the deep bonds that united the Bangor folk; in 1908 people on the Continent talk of things "that we never think of mentioning at Bangor, even to ourselves or to our very closest; and it has struck me that people are closer— to each other—down in Maine than seems mostly to be expected here."[65]

---

62 pp. 33-506. 63 pp.32-505.

64 With a bit of wistfulness added, this became the confession that (1908) she had wanted to know "most everything; and yet I guess there are some things that don't count for improvement" (pp. 7-483).

65 pp.7-482-483.

Each in his own way, Miranda and Leverett responded sensitively to the intangible but none the less appealing Gallic graces. Miranda in the early versions wrote approving of "a French lady," "a French family," and "some French family"; by the simple technique of adding a modifier,[66] James in 1908 strengthened the girl's appreciation: "a real French lady," "a regular French family," and "some nice French family."[67] It has been pointed out that while Miranda could revel in her new milieu, she also learned to evaluate it with objectivity and shrewdness; in the New York Edition she is a keener judge of racial types, for here to qualify her original description of Léon as "remarkably handsome" she added, "in the French style."[68] And the female bookkeeper at the hotel, once "very pretty," became "very handsome, though in the peculiar French way."[69]

The élan of Leverett is pure poetry contrasted to the forthright but prosy outbursts of Miranda; already the reader has seen how he so beautifully vibrated in his responses to the Parisian mise-en-scene. The acûte observation has been made that Leverett is both the "supreme sketch anywhere in James of the intellectual snob" and an anticipation of Lambert Strether,[70] whom James was to

66 Once in revision James dropped the word "French" but managed to increase the sense of Miranda's appreciation: "this French lady" became "this charming woman" (pp.8-483). To avoid repetition perhaps, James, after expanding "in their way" to "in their French way," had to change elsewhere "in their French way" to "in their wonderful French way" (pp.32-505; 13-488).

67 pp.7-482; 31-504; 11-486. 68 pp.32-505.

69 pp.7-482.

70 Lucas, "Revisions of Short Stories," p. 93.

create a generation later. Reverently the Boston aesthete refers to Balzac, and to "dear Théophile Gautier,"[71] to whom he owes so much. Excitedly he sprinkles his letter with French idiom—he

71 The "dear" was added in the definitive edition (pp. 24-498). While Balzac always was to James a "Gulliver among pygmies," and despite his great imagination and his memorable and unbelievable settings and characters, there was, unfortunately, in this titanic Frenchman a deficiency in charm and taste, for Balzac was morally obtuse, or at best morally superficial—he was, to James, neither poet nor novelist. As for Gautier, whose essays on Italian cathedrals James generally admired, he had a perfect style, and intellectual passion, but he knew people only on the surface, he treated only "the epidermis" of men and women (but this, one might add, he knew too well—James strongly objected to the frankness of Gautier's treatment of the human body). "His real imaginative power [James found] is shown in his masterly evocation of localities, and in the thick-coming fancies that minister to his inexhaustible conception of that pictorial 'setting' of human life which into[illegible] superficia[illegible] found in O[illegible] seen in his stories, which "are always the measure of an intellectual need to express an ideal of the exquisite in personal beauty and in costume, combined with that of a certain serene and full-blown sensuality in conduct, and accompanied with gorgeous visions of uph[illegible] gre[illegible] for an immense prose epic and reducible enough for a report or a chart. To allow his achievement all its dignity we should doubtless say also treatable enough for a history, since it was as a patient historian...that he regarded himself and handled his material. ...he saw his subject in the light of science as well, in the light of the bearing of all its parts on each other, and under pressure of a passion for exactitude, an appetite...for all kinds of facts. We find I think in the union here suggested something like the truth about his genius, the nearest approach to a final account of him. Of imagination on one side all compact, he was on the other an insatiable reporter of the immediate, the material, the current combination, and perpetually moved by the historian's impulse to fix, preserve and explain these" ("Honoré de Balzac," Notes on Novelists with Some Other Notes, New York, 1914, in The Art of Fiction and Other Essays, ed. Morris Roberts, New York, 1948, pp. 26-27). Besides Roberts' Henry James's Criticism (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), Lida B. Penfield's dissertation should prove interesting: "Henry James and the Art of the Critic" (Boston, 1938).

would be capable de tout; he yearns to say qu'on a vécu; but in Boston on ne peut pas vivre (after all, in America, nous ne savons pas vivre); he longs to do things naïvement, au grand jour; au coeur du vieux Paris[72] he is enchanted—and so it goes for eight pages (always, in the manner of the seventeenth-century, he translates, and always, as in Dickens, there is the parenthetical "as they say here"). Rapturously, but vaguely, he quotes from Arnold ("or is it Swinbourne or Pater?").[73] It would seem to be Pater, if one may judge from the hard, gem-like flame with which Leverett burned. He reminds Harvard of his "natural tendency to enter into the French way of life" (in 1908, "...their so supremely fine exploitation of the whole personal consciousness");[74] for are not the French "so aesthetic, so sensuous," to which was added in the revision, "so entirely living"?[75]

72 Apposite to this is his change of "this strange Old World" to "this strange rich elder world" (pp.22-496). All six of the above idioms appeared in the early editions.

73 1908, p. 498. James had admiration and respect for Arnold, but, in the search for truth, would go even farther in putting intelligence over feeling. Swinbourne James had little use for: he was not a true critic, being too moved by the picturesque, and trusting an overbundance of imagery to hide a deficiency of thought; what was even worse, Swinbourne did not understand human nature and he had no moral insight. Pater, albeit gifted with admirable sensitivity, was too much the impressionist for James, who put cardinal faith in objective qualities, and who was highly analytical.

74 pp. 23-497.

75 pp. 24-498.

It is natural that the young James in his delineation of Leverett would use the terms (versatile as he then felt them to be) "tone" and "picturesque." Some years before, the Johnsons (who were "too didactic," and, in 1908, "too eternally didactic")[76] made Leverett lose many opportunities in Paris, for with them "the whole tone was gray and cottony...." In 1908, James explained what he had meant by "tone": with the Johnsons "the whole outlook or at least the whole medium—of feeling, of appreciation—was grey and cottony...."[77] Twice James's revisory pencil removed "picturesque." Evelyn Vane, the Rossettian young Englishwoman, had been "deeply, delightfully picturesque," and the Boulevard Haussman, "less picturesque" than au coeur du vieux Paris, but in 1908 Miss Vane "exhales association and implication" and the newer part of Paris was "a compromise."[78]

But to return to Leverett's eminent Victorians, Arnold, Swinbourne, and Pater: there was indeed in Leverett some Pater and some Swinbourne, for the young man wrote of his "artistic temperament" (1908, his "love and...need of beauty"),[79] and looked upon his beloved Gautier as the apostle of "beauty" (but later, of "that religion").[80] Nor may Arnold be overlooked (and though he did not mention him, Carlyle), for rhetorically Leverett asks "What is life but an art?" (1908,"...the finest of arts?") and fervently he exclaims that the thing is "to make people believe you!" (in 1908, added, "—to make above all one's self").[81]

76 pp. 25-498.

77 Ibid.

78 pp.30-503; 25-499.

79 pp.24-498.

80 Ibid.

81 pp.25-498; 23-497.

Much of this is rather affecting to the reader (as one may be sure it was to James) and yet (even at the risk of iteration) Leverett was a snob. If his remark about the Johnsons would not show it, or his unwarranted preference for Evelyn Vane over Miranda, his (1908) allusion to Boston as "poor dear little Boston"[82] would reveal it, along with his remark on being select. About the pension, he informed Harvard, "there is something distinguished, something aristocratic." In place of this he wrote, in the New York Edition, "I don't quite know how the machinery of selection operates, but we unmistakeably feel we're select."[83]

The "Bundle" would have been a superficial and pale study if James had included only the responses of Miranda and Leverett to the French. In unity there is strength but not, perhaps, interest. The irony of the "Bundle" derives from the contradictory (and self-revelatory) viewpoints. Violet Ray, moneyed and haughty, levelled at Madame Maisonrouge irreverent eyes that would have shocked her two compatriots, for what she saw was "what they call here a <u>belle femme</u>, which means that she is a tall, ugly woman, with style. She dresses very well, and has a great deal of talk." No doubt James in revising looked quizzically at Violet's unqualified admission that Madame dressed "very well"; he took pains to qualify it for the New York Edition, as well as to augment it amusingly throughout. Agnes Rich learned in 1908 that Madame was "...<u>a grande belle femme</u>, which means that she's high-shouldered and short-necked and literally hideous, but with a certain quantity of false type. She has a good many clothes, some rather bad,

82 pp. 28-502. 83 pp. 26-499.

but a very good manner—only one, and worked to death, but intended to be of the best."[84]

Violet's claws remained bared in the definitive edition, for whereas she had originally (somewhat tamely) allowed herself to be "transported" from the hotel "to the establishment" (the pension) only under violent protest, she went there in 1908 "as in chains."[85] There are surfaces, though, where cracks appear in the sardonic, mocking facade of Violet; at first she wrote that "the place is very well managed" and that the "French are so clever that they know even how to manage a place of this kind" but later (more acidously, but, one feels, amusedly) that "the place seems to scramble along" and that the "French spirit is able to throw a sort of grace even over a swindle of this general order."[86]

Dr. Staub's opinions of the despised French race will be examined presently; those of Evelyn Vane (whom Leverett considered so sweet and mild) become, like Violet's, more unfavorable in the final edition. Léon, "extremely nasty" in 1880, was in 1908 "a horrid low cad";[87] two additions made Madame "tremendously pretentious and of course not a lady" and some of the food "rather nasty."[88]

Evelyn, as she appears in the New York Edition, also looked with jaundiced eye at her American cousins. Both she and her brother Harold (whom Leverett regarded as "a beautiful fair-haired grey-eyed young Englishman...purely objective, but...very plastic"[89] branded the Bostonian "a dreadful little man,"[90] and they were more

84 pp. 19-494. Leverett saw in his hostess (1880) "a great charm; a little artificial, a little fatigued" and (1908) "a great charm—though a little artificial, a little faded and jaded" (pp.26-500). In both editions he felt that there was a "suggestion of hidden things in her life."

85 pp. 18-492.

86 pp.19-494; 18-493.

87 pp. 48-518.

88 pp.47-517; ibid.

positive than before that he was deranged (after all, he would hold forth for [illegible] an hour [illegible] out the Devonshire turf, "such a very extraordinary subject");[91] Harold (1950) "says he is mad" but in the definitive edition "firmly believes him mad,"[92] and even went so far as to voice a desire "to kick" Leverett.[93] (Inevitably, both brother and sister seem more real, more alive, in the New York Edition.) Leverett's "shy scrap of billet-doux" now (1908) guessed Miranda to be not "a kind of school-teacher," but "a middle-class school-mistress—sacked perhaps for some irregularity,"[94] and reached the conclusion that living under the same roof with these crazed and vulgar Americans was not "strange" but "rather horrid."[95]

---

89 1908, p. 503. 90 pp.47 and 517.

91 Ibid. In the early editions of the "Bundle," Staub made this unfair but none the less incisive estimate of Leverett (unchanged in 1908): "He's an illustration of the period of culture in which the faculty of appreciation has obtained such a preponderance over that of production that the latter sinks into a kind of rank sterility, and the mental condition becomes analogous to that of a malarious bog" (pp.60 and 528). Miranda differed from Leverett (1880) in that her "faculty of production, of action, is...less inanimate...." In 1908, in that "the state of affirmation, faculty of production and capacity for action are things...less inanimate" (pp. 61-529).

92 pp. 47-517. And Miranda, "mad" in 1880, is "mad too" in 1908. In similar fashion, Mrs. Bay, from "rather vulgar" became "awfully vulgar" (with the added epithet, in 1908, of "objectionable") and Miranda, who had been "rather vulgar, too" was levelled as "awfully vulgar herself" (pp.48-518, all citations).

93 47-517.

94 pp. 48-518. Her earlier admission that Miranda was "rather clever" became the grudging concession that she had "a supply of the most extraordinary big words" (ibid.).

95 -517.

Violet, like Evelyn, disparaged Miranda more sharply in the revision; where this "specimen of artless Yankeeism" had been "too horrible," later this example of "self-complacent provinciality" became "too horrible and too humiliating."[96] But it might be well at this point to report how a trained observer reacted to the snobbish Violet. Dr. Staub wrote (1880), after having first anatomized Miranda, that "There is another young lady here who bears the stamp of this peculiar [American] combination of incompleteness and effeteness." Bearing in mind that Staub was writing to a "dear brother in science,"[97] James (1908) added the image of the garden, and otherwise expended the description: "I have here before me a second flower of the same huge so-called democratic garden, who is less abnormally developed than the one I have just described, but who yet bears the stamp of this peculiar combination of the barbarous and, to apply to them one of their own favourite terms, the _ausgespielt_, the 'played-out.'"[98]

96 pp. 21-495; _ibid_.

97 It is interesting to notice the slight revisions which in their total effect make Staub even more the scientist, and the scientific observer, than before. He was more positive: "to observe," "think," and "it seemed to me" were changed to "to catch in the fact," "hold," and "I saw." He refers more frequently to the documentation of the scientist: "I fancied myself at Berlin, Unter den Linden" became "I might as well have sat down with my note-book Unter den Linden," and instead of mentioning his "having taken the serious step of visiting the headquarters of the Gallic genius," he speaks of "having come here for documentation, or to put my finger on the social pulse." The scientist in him causes him to remark not "of placing myself in relations" but of "getting a near view," to refer more accurately not to "irrepressible activity" but to "activities and intermittences." He had written that Frenchmen think of Germans as "something disagreeable"; more redolent of the laboratory is the 1908 phrasing, "something disagreeable and disconcerting, an irreducible mass." Finally (Staub had been ridiculing the French for not seeming to hate him so soon after the Franco-Prussian war) there was the addition of this heavy-handed Teutonic wit: "A further proof, if any were needed, of that vast and, as it were, fluid _waste_ (I have so often dwelt on to you) which attends the process of philosophic secretion" (pp.59-527; 59-528; 56-525; _ibid_.; _ibid_.; _ibid_.; _ibid_.; 59-528; 59-527-528).

The reader of the New York Edition feels no conviction that the tartness of Violet is "played-out." Originally the "theories" of her "poor father" had annoyed her, along with his lack of tact, which was "especially marked"; by revision, his lack of tact was made "flagrant," and "poor floundering father" was enslaved to his "blind theories."[99] Like most of James's American fathers whom the reader never meets, Mr. May had returned to New York on urgent business, but not before laying down some strict injunctions to his wife and daughter[100] on "economy" and "economizing"; Violet never forgave him for this, and wrote heatedly (1908) decrying their "pinching and saving," their manner of "depriving [themselves] of the commonest necessities."[101]

Violet's arrogance increased in proportion to her own estimate of her ability as a linguist. Her mastery of French was in 1880 "quite as perfect as I want it to be," but in 1908 a more supercilious Violet judged it "much better than that of most of our helpless compatriots, who are all unblushingly destitute of the very rudiments."[102] So destitute were they (and the two Vanes) that Violet felt a surge of sympathy for poor Madame Maisonrouge, commiserating (1908) that she "must be furious at having to pass her time grinning at specimens of the stupid races who mumble broken French at her."[103]

---

98 pp. 62-530.

99 pp. 16-493; 19-494; 15-490.

100 Again typical of James, his only daughter.

101 pp. 17-493; ibid. Leverett caught the essence of Violet, and gave the reader a more accurate picture of her than her own excited references to povery would furnish, when he pictured her not as "all elegance, all expensiveness, with an air of high fashion," but as "all elegance, all 'paid bills' and extra-fresh gants de Suede" (pp. 28-501).

The more vigorous and colloquial quality of Violet's speech may be observed elsewhere in the New York Edition,[104] along with that of Evelyn,[105] Léon, and Miranda—the speech of Staub and Leverett, in keeping with their personalities, was not made any less formal. In order to make Léon a more convincing Frenchman,

---

102 pp. 17-492. (This is as Jamesian-sounding a passage as one finds in the "Bundle.") Self-consciously Violet uses her French: instead of "I should not be living in the Faubourg St.-Germain," she wrote that she "should not be Yautres" there (pp. 16-493). And she alludes not to "the genders and the idioms" (and "my genders or my idioms") but to "the circumflex accents and the genders and the idioms" (as well as "my genders or my subjunctives or my idioms") (pp. 17-492; 16-493).

103 James probably felt that the earlier passage seemed to refer only to Evelyn and Harold Vane, rather than to all the pensioners except the peerless Violet;"...must be bored to death at passing all her time in the midst of Stupid English people who mumble broken French at her" (pp.20-494; italics mine).

104 Her father, she had written (1880), was "very easily amused"; in 1908 he "can be put off with any imposture" (pp.19-493). He had been always "talking about" economy; this became, always "harping on" the subject (ibid.). But he always won when the two women were "quite worn out"; in 1908, this reads "quite worn to the bone" (16-491). And Violet, instead of wanting to "perfect" her French, wanted to "pick up more French" (pp. 17-491).

Occasionally, though, James made her speech less earthy, less slangy. Violet's accusation that Mr. Ray always "fusses" was softened to always "goes on"; his preachments on economy, originally "all humbug," became "positively cruel"; he "na g," but Violet hastened to add, "as we used to say at school" (pp.17-493; ibid.; 16-491).

105 Evelyn writes of "exams" rather than "examinations," exclaims "Fancy that rot..." instead of "Fancy a girl wanting to follow the hounds...." and complains not that "it takes half an hour" before the servants come but that "it takes ages" (pp.45-516; 44-515; 47-517).

...s replaced ...ew idioms that he perhaps felt would not be known to his readers,[106] and added several.[107] The use of the subject-verb contraction in revision heightened the naturalness of all the letters (even those of Staub and Leveratt); there are at least 224 such contractions in 1908, 16 (the least) for the scholarly Rudolph, and 86 (the most) for Miranda.[108] Indeed, James lavished considerable care upon the letters of "middle-class school-mistress," making them more chatty and natural—and more Sangor-like.

At the hotel, the French lady wanted to talk to Miranda in English, "(for the sake of practice, too, I suppose)"; to which was added in 1908, "—she kind of yearned to struggle too; we don't yearn only down in Maine."[109] A sampling of others of Miranda's locutions follows: "usually" ("mostly"); "in the evening" ("evenings"); "seem to" ("kind of"); "until" ("till"); "like" ("take to"); "almost" ("most"); "to learn" ("to get the hang of"); "a great deal" ("lots of").[110] More vividly yet, Miranda instead

106 "Concurrentes" became "competitors"; "The idea lui a porté bien..." became "The idea has brought her luck..."; "Celle-ci don't keep me waiting, par exemple!" was changed to "They...please believe" (pp.53-522; 51-521; 53-522).

107 The Maisonrouge daughters, from "rigidly virtuous" became "ferociously gagos"; "this little one" was changed to "cette petite"; the "language" (of Voltaire and Zola) was replaced by the "dernin";"decidedly, I am happy" gave way to "j'ai de la chance"; "Prosper" or "my dear Prosper" normally became "mon vieux" or "mon gros" (pp.51-520; 54-523; 51-521; 49-519; 53-524; 54-523). (In the case of Staub, the only such change was that of "female element" to "feibliche" [pp.56-526]).

108 Another device used by James to achieve colloquialism was the dropping of "that":"They say (that) the heat is intense"; "I only regret (that) I should not"; "natural (that) she should be"; "wish (that) you." There are at least fifteen such excisions. Similar in nature to this is the dropping of the repeated subject or predicate (or both): "or else (I) play the piano"; "and (I) have experienced"; "climate (is) remarkably cheerful"; "waiters (were) German"; "but (it is) very celebrated." There are eight

of "don't care" said "don't care a speck," and rather than "I would be delighted with them," "I'd fall in love with them." Finally, "I am bound to find out" became "I'll die if I don't find out."[111] The latter remark, incidentally, refers to the mystery of Violet's snubbing Miranda. The explanation, as the hurt, bewildered girl learns in time to give it in the closing letter, is that "I said one day at dinner that I admired to go to the Louvre."[112]

The young James disliked Germany; it was a considered judgment, some time in the making, and James felt relief when he became convinced, beyond any doubt, of his antipathy.[113] His distaste for the Teutonic peoples remained, because it was founded upon his understanding of them—in 1879, he analysed Germany with more penetration than some statesmen in 1938, one world war and half a century later.[114]

---

such omissions. (pp.44-515; 22-496; 40-512; 32-505; 7-482; 6-481; 5-480; 11-485; ibid.)

109 pp. 9-10 - 484-485.

110 pp. 6-482; ibid.; 33-506; 38-510; 33-506; 41-513; 37-509; 7-482. Instead of "trying to learn" French she wrote of "going for" it, and she found people not "crowded" but "crammed" with refinement (pp.37-509; 39-508). Instead of fearing that Léon's speeches were "not always sincere," she feared that "it wouldn't always do to pin one's faith on" them (pp.32-505).

111 pp. 14-489; 13-488; 35-507. More emphatically too, instead of merely hanging "up" she wrote of hanging "right up" (pp.36-508).

112 pp. 63 and 532. Instead of feeling "hurt," Miranda felt "as if it kind of wronged me" (pp.33-507).

113 Writing his father and mother from Heidelberg on September 15, 1872, young James declared that he "would give a thousand N.'s [Nurembergs] for one ray of Verona" (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York, 1920, I, 32). "To me [wrote James] this hasty and most partial glimpse of Germany has

Rudolph Staub represents Germany as James understood it. In the early versions of the "Bundle," Staub arrogantly and belligerently states his desire to make the other pensioners uncomfortable by his presence.[115] James in 1908 saw no need to revise the 1868 admission that "My determination to take up my abode in a French interior was largely dictated by the supposition that I should substantially disagreeable its inmates."[116] Scientific that he was, Staub wished to observe the different forms that irritation at his presence would take, but he had to confess ruefully (1882) that his "expectation of rough usage, in consequence

---

been most satisfactory; it has cleared from my mind the last dints of uncertainty and assured me that I can never hope to become an unworthiest native grandchild of the fatherland. It is well to listen to the voice of the spirit, to cease hair-splitting and treat one's self to a good square antipathy—when it is so very sympathetic! I may 'cultivate' mine away, but it has given me a week's wholesome nourishment" (ibid., p. 33).

114 As Mr. Lucas put it, "Bismarck behind, the Kaiser just ahead, James's lifelong preoccupation with the international situation in all its aspects had equipped him as well for the role of prophet as for that of interpreter" ("Revisions of Short Stories," p. 98). For further proof of James's hatred of European "potentates who amuse themselves with sitting on people," one should read the letter of Marcellus Cockerel (Letter VII) in "The Point of View" (1882).

115 James, says Clifton Fadiman, "saw back of the ludicrous pedantry of the German, back, back, back, to the paranoia on which it rests" (The Short Stories of Henry James, New York, 1945, p. 60). Fadiman, ex lainin why in 1914 James renounced his American citizenship to become a British subject, declared that the author "knew that the struggle, underneath all the superficialities of power politics, was between civilization and Mr. Staub. For him the choice was clear, and he made it. We have not yet done so"(p. 61).

116 528-9 and 527.

of my German nationality, had proved unfounded. No one seems to know or to care what my nationality is...."James by revision made this second sentence appreciably more accurate and, in the first, underscored his arrogant Teutonism: "...my expectation of rough usage in consequence of my unattenuated even if not frivolously aggressive, Teutonism was to prove completely unfounded. No one seems either unduly conscious or affectedly unperceiving of my so rich Berlin background...."[117] One feels sure that Staub did make himself "substantially disagreeable" to his fellow-boarders, and especially so in the revised edition, if one may judge from his more scornful analyses of them in his letters, not to mention his more insistent gloating over the recent war, or his more heavily-Teutonic jibes about Léon, of whom Staub wrote in 1880 that "The remaining figure is a man, but I hesitate to classify him so superficially"; the bludgeon is more apparent (and the rapier still nowhere to be seen) in 1908, when Staub jested that the "remaining figure is ostensibly that of a biped, and apparently that of a man, but I hesitate to allow him the whole benefit of the higher classification."[118]

Although the French members of the establishment were passed off thus lightly, Staub gave serious thought to the English and American boarders. America, he felt, had been a phenomenon in history, having gone from "crudity to rottenness, without the interposition of a period of useful (and ornamental) ripeness."[119]

117 pp. 58-527. In 1880, the French seemed not very sure "that there are any Germans"; 1908, "that there are, concretely, any Germans" (pp.59-528).

118 pp.58-526-527.

119 pp. 61 and 529.

Despite the fact that they were so different in many respects, each of the three Americans whom he was studying had "assured me secretly, that he or she only is the real, the genuine, the typical American."[120] This point, noted so incisively by Staub, was one that Evelyn and Harold Vane, in their blind British insularity, had not seen. In 1908 James made an important addition to highlight Staub's awareness of this insularity; in the same passage occurs the striking explanation of what had been meant earlier by "general pervasiveness" (italics will be mine). Despite the superiority of the later sentence, even the 1880 version would make good required reading for those critics who have insisted on interpreting James as one who lived totally aloof from, and oblivious to, the swirl of major events around him:

1880	1908
Add to this that there are two young Englanders in the house, who hate all the Americans in a lump, making between them none of the distinctions and favorable comparisons which they insist upon, and you will, I think, hold me warranted in believing that, between precipitate decay and internecine enmities, the English-speaking family is destined to consume itself, and that with its decline the prospect of general pervasiveness, to which I alluded above, will brighten for the deep-lunged children of the Fatherland!	Add to this that there are two young Englanders in the house who hate all the Americans in a lump, making between them none of the distinctions and favourable comparisons which they insist upon, and for which as involving the recognition of shades and a certain play of the critical sense, the still quite primitive insular understanding is wholly inapt, and you will, I think, hold me warranted in believing that, between precipitate decay and internecine enmities, the English-speaking family is destined to consume itself, and that with its decline the prospect of successfully organised conquest and unarrestedincalculable expansion, to which I alluded above, will brighten for the deep-lunged children of the Fatherland! 121

---

120 pp. 61 and 530.

121 pp. 62-530-531.

"A Bundle of Letters," written by James in "a single long session in October, 1879, enjoyed nine printings in four years, but received nothing more than slight revisory touches until it was polished for the New York Edition. One of several experimental treatments of the American girl theme (the much read but generally misunderstood Daisy Miller had appeared the summer before, 1878), it was a tentative groping that helped lead ultimately to James's first great novel, The Portrait of a Lady (November, 1880—December, 1881). In the "Bundle" James pictured two American girl types, besides the Bostonian aesthete, and representatives of England, France, and Germany.[122] Since the character of Daisy Miller had been so generally misunderstood, James's initial very careful handling of the morals of Miranda Hope is interesting to observe, and the revisions relating to this same question (for James was fated never to get away from Daisy) none the less so. (The furore over Daisy being what it was, it makes interesting reading to go through the several American girl stories written by James in the years immediately after 1878).

Miranda Hope, the pivotal character (or type) in the "Bundle," quests for European culture with a zeal that never flags. Emancipated herself, she brings almost a religious fervor to the question of the "position of women." But neither her freedom nor her new vistas nor her lessening provincialism can lead her into a trap—she never repudiates the solid truths and values from which her

122 In order to keep the emphasis on people rather than geographical localities, in revising he normally removed such terms as "local" and "national," replacing them (when he did replace them) by the designation "racial," or "native."

character and personality grew. James in revision polished these (potentially) antithetical facets of Miranda.

Louis Leverett, while obviously meant by James to be subordinate to Miranda, is the character in whom I most delighted (and James liked him well enough to bring him back in "The Point of View," 1882). Often he seems to be James speaking, but just as frequently he represents the superficialities and the false point of view that James always found intolerable. In the New York Edition, Leverett became both more Jamesian and more Pater-esque.

The charm of this study, however, lies not so much in the characterizations per se as in the interplay of characters, with their conflicting and strikingly contradictory opinions of each other. Miranda likes Dr. Staub; he denigrates her. Leverett rhapsodizes over the Genes; they consider him demented, fit only for kicking. Léon ridicules the American hands that feed him. Miranda admires Leverett for his culture and sensitivity; he speaks of her only with supercilliousness. And so it goes, each letter throwing new light on the writer as well as the subject, and revealing to the reader not simply racial traits of Staub, Evelyn, Léon, and Miranda, but also some amusing yet penetrating insights into human nature wherever found.

CHAPTER VII

THE REVISIONS OF THE SIEGE OF LONDON

The Cornhill Magazine, in whose pages Daisy Miller had made her auspicious debut, early in 1883[1] favored its readers with another - and a far different - Jamesian history of the American "girl" abroad. This nouvelle, so foreign in spirit and tone from Daisy, relates the martial and marital tactics and strategy of the aptly-named Mrs. Headway, as she engaged in The Siege of London. Osgood of Boston (two editions) and Macmillan of London (in its early "Collective Edition" of James) published The Siege later in 1883,[2] and the following year it appeared on the Continent, under the Tauchnitz (Leipzig) imprint.[3] Ignored for a generation, in 1908 it took its place in the New York Edition;[4] two years after this carefully revised Siege appeared, Houghton Mifflin reprinted the Osgood version(s); in 1912, following seven years of intermittent negotiations, M. Auguste Monod brought out

1 XLVII (January, February), 1-34, 225-256.

2 The Siege of London, The Pension Beaurepas, The Point of View, pp.41-135. The first of these other two stories in the Osgood volume initially appeared in the Atlantic Monthly (April,1879); "The Point of View" was first printed in the Century Magazine (December, 1882). Both Osgood editions, and the 1910 Houghton Mifflin (Riverside) edition, are exactly the same.
Madame de Mauves was the companion-piece in Macmillan's thin volume. The Siege occupied the first 104 pages.

3 In Collection of British Authors, Volume 2234, pp.11-125. "The Point of View" and A Passionate Pilgrim were its companion-pieces.

4 The Novels and Tales of Henry James, XIV, 145-270.

La Conquête de Londres for James's French readers.[5]

5 On November 1, 1905, James wrote Monod that he is "afraid your proposal to offer Madame de Mauves and The Siege of London to French readers happens to encounter on my part a good deal of mistrust and detachment (in respect of the two productions themselves)." M. Monod judges too kindly the earlier nouvelle, which James disparages as "a very early and meagre performance." The Siege, too, James regarded as "also very ancient"; frankly, he did not "care to patronize the revival of such antecedent matters." If M. Monod "should really care to translate something of mine, I should send you three or four of my later and more recent fictions to choose from, and would ask nothing for the job... in the way of conditions" (Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod, ed. E. F. Benson, London and New York, 1930, p. 97.) Three days later, November 4, James wrote Monod again, this time in French, again expressing the wish that he relinquish the idea of translating Madame de Mauves and choose instead from among The Tree of Knowledge (1900), Two Faces (1901) and Paste (1900); to make the idea more appealing, James sent copies of the volumes in which these three stories appear.

A letter of December 17, 1905, somewhat ironically and disappointedly acknowledges the difficulty of translation. More than a year later (April 26, 1907) James's correspondence to Monod indicates that a French appearance of The Siege still is forthcoming. Three months later (July 27, 1907) James wrote, answering Monod's objections to the term "antiquated play," but making the concession, "Mais supprimez - le si vous croyez que cela (le ton de l'illusion) peut suggérer au lecteur français un auteur trop peu avertil" (p. 105). Monod had also questioned a remark of Mrs. Dolphin's ("'It's like the decadence of the Roman empire.'"); the author retorted that "elle a pour but d'aider à caractériser la personne qui parle, d'être in character la sorte de chose qu'elle est assez niaisement sujette à dire....C'est enfin, non pas une parole d'auteur, mais de personnage, et naturelle au personnage" (pp. 105-106). But again James made the concession: "Mais supprimez encore si, traduite, elle risque de paraître ridicule...." (p.106). What happened during the next five years is unclear, but in the Mercure de France (November 16 - December 1, 1912) The Siege (La Conquête de Londres) finally appeared; James is pleased with the quality of the translation. But he is still encouraging Monod to reproduce recent, definitively-revised stories, volumes of which James will be glad to send (letters of November 28 and December 4, 1912, and February 2, 1913).

Except for the usual variations in punctuation,[6] mechanics,[7] and spelling,[8] the original Cornhill version was reproduced verbatim in the Osgood printings, with only one revisory touch (dealing with the age of Mrs. Headway) being made for the Macmillan edition;[9] two of the five slight brush strokes made for

6 Macmillan followed the lead of Osgood in the addition of 11 commas, and the omission of 9 (from the Cornhill original), as well as the change (17 times) of the semicolon to the comma; both book editions agreed also in the 10 changes that involved the comma, the comma dash, the dash, and the exclamation point.

The Macmillan edition differed from the Osgood version in that it added 53 other commas and omitted 28 from the Cornhill version; and in three punctuations (involving the comma dash, the dash, the semicolon, and the period) Macmillan's failed to follow the other two editions.

7 Both Osgood and Macmillan differed from the Cornhill in failing to use the hyphen in "preoccupied," "hunting field," "half an hour," and "demitasses," and in using it in "band-boxes," "lace-work," "door-key," "off-hand," and "Good-day." Also, "Nature," "Conservative," and "foyer" in the magazine appear as "nature," "conservative," and "foyer" in the two books.

Macmillan deviates from the procedure of Cornhill and Osgood in the printing of a few compound words, rendering thus "half right" and "town residence," and "slightly-embarrassed" and "carefully-preserved"; the "&c" of the other two appeared in Macmillan as "etc."; in these five instances (as well as in the case of "demi-tasses," "lacework," and a dash of orthodox length) the Tauchnitz edition of 1884 accords with that of Cornhill rather than Macmillan.

As was noted in the case of Daisy Miller, the periodical was more frequently inconsistent than any of the book versions, printing both "country house" and "country-house" (which reappeared thus however in both Osgood and Tauchnitz), "silver-mine" and "silver mine," not to mention "Southwest," "South-west," and "South-West" ("Southwest" in Osgood and Tauchnitz, "South-West" in Macmillan). Three misprints or errors of unintentional transposition in the Cornhill were corrected in the Osgood edition, and the correction retained by Macmillan (an incorrect comma as a terminal mark, an incorrect question mark where a period was meant, and "that he felt sure then"- italics mine - which correctly became "then he felt sure that"). (The Macmillan printer began a sentence with "she," but the Tauchnitz printer corrected it to "She.")

the Tauchnitz portrait of this aging warrior likewise deal with her age, making it more indeterminate.[10] None of these five passages were adopted in the definitive New York Edition (one

7 (continued)
The Tauchnitz edition, which as we saw above agreed in eight instances with Cornhill, as opposed to Macmillan, a few times was independent of all three others (in its printing of "heir-looms," "mean time," and "newly admitted," and in its use of quotes rather than italics for "Vanity Fair"). Since, however, the only punctuation differences between the Tauchnitz and the Macmillan editions are those involving the comma, it appears likely that the English book edition was the copy used by the Continental printer. To the Macmillan version James or the Tauchnitz printer (perhaps James, in view of the five changes in diction [see notes 10 and 11]) added 26 commas, while omitting 47.

8 Understandably enough, the Osgood edition altered some examples of British spelling, found in the Cornhill, changing "grey" to "gray," "asphalte" to "asphalt," and "embedded" to "imbedded" - but strangely enough, the Macmillan printer used the American spelling of these three words, not to mention "humorous," "reflections," and "incumbrances." The Tauchnitz edition, which seems to follow that of Macmillan, used the latter's British spelling of "uncriticised" and "manoeuvres," but not of "civilisation," "recognise," "minimise," "apologise," "scandalised," "entrusted," and "neighbours," "colour," "candour," "moustache," "honour," "humour," "parlour," "rumour," and "ardour" - these fifteen words were printed by Tauchnitz in their American forms.

9 In expressing admiration for how well Lady Demesne carried her age, Mrs. Headway (in the Cornhill and Osgood versions) was "oblivious for the moment that she was at least as near to the age of the mother as to that of the son"; figuratively, in the Macmillan edition she was "oblivious...that she could scarcely pretend to belong to a budding generation." (Urbanely, the New York Edition informs that she forgot for the moment "that the crown of the maturer charm dangled before her at a diminishing distance.")

10 In the first three editions, Sir Arthur Demesne thought of Mrs. Headway as "five years older" than himself, but in the Tauchnitz edition, as "indefinitely older." And from "several years older" than the baronet, she became (in the Tauchnitz version) "perceptibly older." In both cases, the New York Edition repeats the earlier phrasing.

being written afresh, but the other four agreeing with the 1883 texts),[11] indicating that the Tauchnitz Siege was not the one used in revision. The Macmillan edition of 1883 is the most likely one, and the early one that was used for this study.

Remorselessly stripping her of her (at best rather grotesque) dignity, James in revising The Siege referred often to Mrs. Headway as "Nancy" or "Nancy Beck,"[12] by these designations suggesting to his contemporary (1908) reader[13] the freer, more informal (than in England) spirit of American society, and indicating that Rupert Waterville, the intense young observer, was now only faintly in awe of the heretofore impressive Mrs. Headway. The frequent use of the "Nancy Beck" appelation had other effects: since Beck - not Headway - was her married name when George Littlemore had known her years before in the Southwest, the reader is more forcibly and fre-

11 In the Tauchnitz version, "then" was omitted from "'Do you mean to assist her, then?'" Colloquially, the 1908 version renders this as "'Do you mean then to give her a leg up?'" The New York Edition used the original "this gentleman's visit" - italics mine - rather than the Tauchnitz "that gentleman's visit," as well as the original "couldn't" rather than the Tauchnitz uncontracted form. See note 10 for other two passages.

12 There are at least six such revisions (pp. 57-214, 58-215, 64-222, 77-236, 80-240, 85-247).

13 And unintentionally furnishing the present-day reader with mental pictures of a contemporary, party-giving, female American diplomat, one who according to the recent popular play would be called "Madame."

quently reminded that she has been "enormously divorced," and he has presentiments that her past will prove inescapable. Finally, the reader senses that despite her glittering, expensive facade, she remains basically unchanged - that she is still the Nancy Beck of old.

Another means that James used to divest Mrs. Headway of dignity was to associate her with "back piazzas," which he obviously felt to be peculiarly American and redolent of vulgarity and lack of social form. The early edition of The Siege contains only a few such references,[14] but the New York Edition has them in profusion, so symbolic of crudity did James now consider the Southwest piazza to be. The laconic Littlemore, who could wreck her campaign of marriage to Sir Arthur if he chose to share his knowledge of her operations out West, "had known her as one knew people only in the great South-West"; by revision he had known her "as one knew people only amid the civilisation of big tornadoes and back piazzas" -[15] obviously, the term "civilization" was given an ironic twist. Waterville at first took for granted that her objectionable manner of speaking was typical of people "at San Diego"; again making his favorite substitution, and removing the place name, James had the young man assume in 1908 that people were as vulgar as she "on hideous back piazzas."[16] Similarly, instead of feeling that

14 At the Théâtre Français where the young men noticed her and the older one recognized her, Littlemore originally told a wide-eyed Waterville that he had used to see her "'On the back piazza, at San Diego'" (p. 7. A similar original reference is on page 9.)

15 pp. 27-175.

16 pp. 64-222.

blithely to forget (as Mrs. Headway did) that you had been insulting was the custom "in New Mexico," Waterville in 1908 felt such derelections of memory to be symptomatic of "back piazzas."[17]

The reader has perhaps been stirring restively in his chair, wondering if his Rand-McNally was conveniently at hand, for James had seemingly been locating San Diego in New Mexico.[18] For the definitive edition, James changed "San Diego" to "San Pablo," which satisfies the reader, who feels that scattered throughout the Southwest there are probably a dozen villages so named; Philadelphius Beck (Nancy's estranged husband) continues however in 1908 to edit - in the Southwest - his Dakotah Sentinel.[19] It served James's purpose beautifully in 1908 to think of Texas as the earlier bailiwick of Mrs. Headway, for in his revision he hit upon a new phrase for his militant social-climber - she became "the well-known Texan belle." No other Southwestern state - Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico -in the sound of the name, the connotations of natural, uninhibited behavior, and the sense of far-flung spaces, could possibly match Texas for efficacy in such an epithet. From Galveston to El Paso, from Brownsville to Dallas - to be known everywhere within the bourn of such a land area is indeed an impressive achievement; twentieth century Texas belles have experienced such fame only through the help of the cinema.

17 pp. 69-228.

18 See particularly the last two sentences in the preceding paragraph. The original edition also alludes to Nancy's "fund of California slang," which James changed in 1908 to "Texas slang" (pp.94-246).

19 James resembles his own creation, Waterville, who "had not been aware of the position of San Diego, for...he had been paying a good deal of attention to European geography [and] had rather neglected that of his own country" (pp. 8 and 151).

Waterville for the New York Edition ceased to think about "Mrs. Headway," or "one...from San Diego," or "this little woman" - instead he observed and brooded about "the well-known Texan belle";[20] George Littlemore thought of "his old Texan friend" rather than "Mrs. Headway";[21] newspapers in the Southwest wrote proudly not of "the 'elegant and accomplished Mrs. Beck'" but of "the 'well-known Texan belle.'"[22]

Nancy Beck - back piazzas - the well-known Texan belle - all succeed in suggesting social crudity and ineptness; for the New York Edition, too, James made Mrs. Headway's dialogue appropriate to one so uncultivated and unrefined.[23] Yet there are occasional moments when the plight of Nancy Beck has its poignancy, for she had the will to learn - she wanted to acquire social polish. But she started - she came abroad - too late;

20 pp. 31-181, 41-192, 43-195, 65-223; 43-195; 15-160. Once "Mrs. Headway" became merely "the Texan belle" (pp.81-242).

21 pp. 90-254. In 1908 there is an added reference to "one of her 'Texan' effects of drollery" (pp. 29-176).

22 pp. 15-159.

23 Generously he supplied her with more "aint's" than before (pp.47-201, ibid., 22-169), had her analyse herself as "'mad'" rather than "'angry'" (pp.70-228), and gave her an "'Oh shucks!'" (as he added sarcastically, "out of her repertory") to replace the earlier "'Oh, bother!'" (pp.[illegible]-248). Poor Lady Bemesne is the most deleterious influence on the speech of Mrs. Headway, who instead of being "'furious'" at this gentlewoman "'could have shot her'" (pp. 70-228), and who shrilled not that her ladyship has "'got plenty of places to live'" but that she "'ain't in want of good locations'" (ibid.).

"with a little sigh" in 1883 she told Littlemore that she wanted to be different now, since everything in Europe was so different - more touchingly in 1908, she "bravely pleaded" this to her old friend.[24] Clearly, though, Mrs. Headway will never learn now, and one suspects that even had she reached the temple a generation earlier she would have remained a blundering, insensitive pilgrim. As Littlemore put it, "'...she has begun too late, she will never be more than half right [in 1908, using again an image from music, "'she'll never get on the true middle of the note'"]. However, she won't known when she's wrong, so it doesn't signify.'"[25] Later in the story, the passage of time and the sense of inescapable finality are captured by a revision: in 1883 Littlemore mused that she "talked about her intentions, her prospects, her wishes. But she knew no more about English life than about the molecular theory"; in 1908 (italics mine) she "talked about her intentions, her prospects, her discoveries, her designs. But she had really learnt no more...."[26] At the Gallery of the Luxembourg, for instance, she never knew "when she was wrong." Originally she bestowed "too much attention on the bad copies...being made of several indifferent pictures"; what was worse, in the definitive version, she was taken in by the copyists themselves - she gave too much attention to "the bad copies and strange copyists that

24 pp. 70-228. These flashes of humility, as well as her awe of the older civilization, create some reader sympathy; she likes "'this old Europe'" (more appreciatively in 1908, "'this grand old Europe'") (pp.25-173).

25 pp. 32-181.

26 pp. 66-248.

formed a circle round several indifferent pictures."[27] Striving for social élan, she achieved only affectation: armed (still at the Luxembourg) with the "beautiful gold face-a-main" which James added to her ordnance in 1908, she directed it "to everything at once and to nothing long enough."[28]

Her "flashes" of humility have been mentioned; the qualification was deliberate, since her most compelling urge (besides her hope through marriage to become a Lady) was to be presented at Court. James's revisions made her both more persistent and more calculating in her pursuit of this goal. Jokingly Littlemore tells her (1883) that she already is in society with baronets for her adorers: "'That's just what I want to know!' she said, with a certain eagerness. 'Is a baronet much?'" Her different manner of reply in 1908 is more metallic than before: "'...I want to know - if they are big,' she promptly said. 'Is a Baronet much?'"[29] And a more sarcastic Waterville feigns surprise not that "she neglected this topic'" (her presentation at Court), but (1908) at her "'overlooking [it] for the hour.'"[30]

Nancy still was a great beauty - her eyes especially were charming (and recall to the reader the revisions of Daisy Miller)[31]

27 pp. 45-198.

28 Ibid.

29 pp. 25-172.

30 pp. 56-212.

31 At her first renewal of Littlemore's acquaintance, instead of "looking still" at him (while ignoring a speech by Sir Arthur) she "kept her charming eyes still" on him (pp.10-153). During her final bold stroke, when she had brought Littlemore and Sir Arthur together, and was at the point of daringly leaving them thus closeted, instead of looking "with extraordinary earnestness" from one man to the other, she "looked with wonderful eyes" at each of them in turn (pp.98-264). See text for note 116.

- but she was an American beauty beginning to fade. Meant by nature (a generation earlier) to play the soubrette, she bravely but pathetically strove to be the ingenue, when in a character part she would have been superb. (She did in fact succeed as "'a grand case of the American funny woman.'")[32] Littlemore identified her in his 1883 programme rather colorlessly as "a little Western woman, very pretty and rather queer, who had formerly been a great chum of his," but he more skillfully captured her fading but exotic essence in 1908: "a full-blown flower of the West, still very pretty, but of not at all orthodox salon scent."[33]

In The Siege of London James's typical sensitive young American is named Rupert Waterville. More interestedly and more intensely in 1908, he watches the drama being played before him, "brooding" or "brooding again" as he does so;[34] by additions rather than more revisions in the New York Edition, James sets Waterville to "wondering again" or to becoming "all critical attention again."[35] Almost always in 1908, our young observer responds more emotionally than

32 As she wryly phrased it (1883), "'It's a settled thing that I'm an American humourist; if I say the simplest things, they begin to roar.'" And, in 1908, "'...I'm a grand case of the American funny woman; if I make the least remark they begin to roar'"(pp.82-244).

33 pp. 35-185.

34 Instead of saying to himself what he felt about the essential vulgarity of Mrs. Headway, he "brooded" about it (pp.51-206). Concerning the dilemma which Mrs. Headway had forced upon Littlemore, he spoke "thoughtfully" in 1883, but in 1908 Waterville "brooded again" (pp.54-209).

35 He and Littlemore were talking about Sir Arthur's actions, trying to analyse them. In 1908 James added, "Again Waterville wondered" (pp. 53-208). Learning of Lady Demesne's letter to Mrs. Headway (added in 1908), "Our young man was all critical attention again" (pp. 93-259).

in 1883: he "catches his breath" when revelations occur;[36] he "throbs afresh"; he "throbbingly broods";[37] he is "quite thrillingly in the dark."[38] In order for one to brood and throb as Rupert does, he must have a "cultivated imagination" - James gave him one in 1908, replacing his heretofore "active little imagination";[39] similarly, the merely questioning mind of Waterville, with which he liked "to see the meaning of things" became one able always to "imagine alternatives."[40] Instead of wondering "whether [Mrs. Headway] had asked [Sir Arthur to bring his friends to meet her, in Paris] and he had refused," Waterville (italics mine) "guessed at her having asked him and his having refused."[41] James in 1908 even permitted the young diplomat[42] to play the part of the artful (as well as the imaginative) observer, a role for which his naivety and youthful inexperience had not equipped him;

36 At first "greatly surprised" by Lady Demesne's invitation to Longlands, Waterville later "caught his breath" at it (pp. 59-216).

37 In 1883 Waterville asked himself if Mrs. Headway knew how tasteless it was of her to speak so intimately of Sir Arthur, but in 1908 he "again throbbingly brooded" (pp. 43-195). A moment later, instead of feeling "something like excitement as he asked himself" if Lady Demesne would consent to know Mrs. Headway, he "throbbed afresh" at the question (pp.44-196).

38 About to learn of Mrs. Headway's treatment in New York, he was (1883) "quite in the dark," but (1908) "quite thrillingly" there (pp. 48-202).

39 pp. 76-236.

40 pp. 32-181.

41 pp. 41-193.

42 Waterville (amusingly) regarded himself as a promising career man; in 1883 he had "an idea that he had embraced the diplomatic career," but in 1908 he "nursed the fond fancy" that he had thus committed himself (pp.20-165).

manfully endeavoring to impose the self-discipline of quiet, so that Littlemore, uninterrupted, would furnish some exciting revelations, Waterville was pictured in 1883 as practicing "discretion" but in 1908, "art."[43] So intense is he, however, that to be artful and detached remains difficult: italics were added in 1908 to his query, "'And what did [Sir Arthur] want to know?'";[44] he "sighed" where originally he had merely murmured his sympathy for Sir Arthur;[45] when Littlemore reached a crucial spot in his conversation, instead of "listening," Waterville "assisted at this passage."[46]

The New York Edition presents the young man as more scornful than before towards his native New York - not'"'old-fashioned'" alone, it is now (1908)"quite old-fashioned and rococo'";[47] and England causes less awe than it had in 1883 - its estates had had "family history" but now they had "heavy history."[48] Even in the later edition, however, Waterville does not overwhelm the reader with his sophistication and his social authority. Totally incapable of distinguishing countesses from immoral women, he looks at them all alike, unless told "'that they are not respectable - then your attention acquires a fixedness!'" Littlemore, who

43 pp. 7-149. Two such revisions on the same page.

44 pp. 53-208.

45 Ibid. Waterville was here misspelled Watervale in 1883.

46 pp. 54-209.

47 pp. 61-243.

48 pp. 65-223. Reminiscent of the "dull dinners" in a revised version of A Passionate Pilgrim.

delighted in teasing his young friend, did so more amusingly (and naturally) in 1908: "'...they aren't decent - then your eyes, my dear man, grow as large as saucers.'"[49] Of Waterville's social authority his English friends seemed not unduly in awe. At the Demesnes he (1883) "found himself proceeding to dinner with the wife of an ecclesiastic, to whom Lady Demesne had presented him for this purpose, when the hall was almost empty." The revision made by James seems to be as much a pointing up of the rudeness of the baronial class as it is a more poignant picture of Waterville: now he was "presented" his Anglican trencher-woman (italics mine) "in the desolation of an almost empty hall, when the other couples had flourished away."[50]

Waterville served his purpose well in the delineation of Mrs. Headway, especially in the New York Edition, where he analysed her faults more fully and incisively than originally. Contrasting unfavorably this crude parvenu with his ideal woman, he reached the conclusion (1883) that the latter "would have repose, a certain love of privacy - she would sometimes let one alone." The "love of privacy" phrasing was not only too cryptic - it was inaccurate, failing as it did to say what James had had in mind (that the "ideal" would respect the privacy of others); so, in 1908 Waterville's ideal (more fully and accurately) "would have repose, a sense of the private in life and the implied, even the withheld, in talk; would sometimes let one alone."[51] Mrs. Headway - the actual rather than the ideal - constantly was appealing or accusing, demanding "explanations

49 pp. 5-147.

50 pp. 62-219.

51 pp. 33-182.

and pledges."[52] This Waterville found in early editions to be "slightly fatiguing," but in 1908 it struck him as "distinctly" so.[53] Continuing to anatomize this choice of frontier editors, Waterville in 1883 (in a grudging compliment, but a compliment nevertheless) "was obliged to confess than an element of the unexpected was not to be excluded from his conception of the woman who should have an ideal repose." James in revision spied the slip - the unqualified approval-here, and altered the passage in such a way that Mrs. Headway's surprise element was accorded his censure; in 1908 Waterville (italics mine) "felt a touch of the unexpected, <u>though not indeed an excess of it</u>, to belong to his conception...."[54]

By Part IV of <u>The Siege</u>, no doubt remains in Waterville's mind - Mrs. Headway <u>is</u> distasteful; she becomes increasingly so the more he sees of her. Before revision he "made the further reflection that when one arrived from San Diego there was no end to the things one had to learn: it took so many things to make a well-bred woman." An apt enough statement, but one carrying no particular impact. The revised sentence illustrates one of the effects that James gained from his "Texan belle" epithet - the play he made upon the "well-known" phrasing - for definitively Waterville "also drew the moral that when one was a well-known Texan belle there was no end to the things one had to learn: so marked was the difference between being well-known and being well-bred."[55] When this full-blown prairie flower, so well-known

52 pp. 33 and 182.

53 pp. 33-182.

54 pp. 34-183.

55 pp. 43-195.

and so ill-bred, brazenly shrilled that she wanted European society to run after her (1883), "something in Mrs. Headway... shocked and mortified" Waterville; avoiding her name and substituting for it a description of her, James in revision wrote that "something in such crudities on the part of the ostensibly refined ...shocked and mortified him."[56] Indeed, Waterville reflected that "She was terribly distinct; her motives, her impulses, her desires, were absolutely glary." Putting to advantage the imagery he had but suggested originally, James later wrote that her motives, impulses, and "desires glared like the lighted signs of cafés' concerts."[57] Equally glaring was the vulgarity displayed by the thoroughness of detail and the unshrinking candor which Mrs. Headway brought to her narration of the snubbing she received at the hands of New York society; originally her confidante "could not see what need there was" for her to embarrass him with such a plenitude of details, but in 1908 (italics mine) he "couldn't see the need or the propriety of her overflow."[58] Waterville found Mrs. Headway, in short, embarrassing and wearing. At Lady Demesne's, wondering nervously whether or not he should have his Southwestern acquaintance for a dinner companion, he "hoped, with due deference to this lady's charms, that he should have something more novel." More amusingly in 1908 he "hoped...he might abut on a less explored province."[59]

56 pp.47-200.

57 Ibid.

58 pp.49-203.

59 pp. 61-218. Later at Longlands, she was to insult him, accusing him of having come to spy on her. His response was to call her "'rather rude,'" but (1908) "'grossly rude'" (pp.69-228).

Lady Demesne, as a result of James's too-conscientious underscoring of her reticence, is at first a bit ineffectual and pallid, a faulty stroke in characterization which James erased by his 1908 revisions, slight though they are. Rather than "very tranquil" and "delicate and modest," she appeared in the New York Edition as a refined lady who "lacked effusiveness" and was "modest and aloof."[60] The early reader, seeing her "sweet vague smile, which looked as if it were the same for everything," would with justification underrate her; not so in 1908, when James gave her a "sweet vague smile that could somehow present a view without making a point."[61] Rather perversely, Waterville told Lady Demesne that Mrs. Headway tried to be friendly and pleasant; in the definitive version James added her retort, one in which the reader can almost hear the inflection of spirited sarcasm - "'Indeed she does!'"[62] Lady Demesne's appeals to Waterville and Littlemore are better prepared for, and suspense is heightened, when (in 1908) despite her more forceful personality, she is less confident of spiking Mrs. Headway's guns. After having seen and judged the invader, Lady Demesne (1883) "had determined to break the thing off," but in the revised version she "had determined to stop short and to make her son, if possible, stop."[63]

Living as she did under the oppressive, frightening storm-cloud of Nancy Beck's possible success with her son, Lady Demesne was regarded by James (and Waterville and Littlemore) sympathetically rather than satirically. Her anxiety was wholly justifiable

60 pp.60-217; 101-218.

61 pp. 61-217-218.

62 pp. 76-235.

63 pp.59-215.

and it was distinctly to her credit that she did not lose her self-control and try to out-Nancy Nancy. One step to the left and three to the rear of Lady Demesne pranced Mrs. Dolphin, bearing the guidon of Society - a cup of tea in an arm-length white glove, with a mailed fist couchant on a Burke's Peerage. Littlemore treated his sister satirically, and so did James, deliciously so. Firm in his conviction that the whole affair is the business of Sir Arthur and Nancy alone, George has only scorn for his transplanted sister, who, like Mrs. Costello, defends the code more zealously than if she had been born into it.

To accord with Mrs. Dolphin's perfect knowledge of "what it was proper to do on every occasion in life,"[64] James red-penciled his early phrase, her "sweet quiet manner," and wrote in her "finished manner."[65] Mrs. Dolphin, be it said, "knew as much about English society as if she had invented it"; amusingly expanding and slightly changing the idea, the revisionist in 1908 had her know it "as if she had compiled a red-covered handbook on the subject."[66] Naturally such a knowledgeable person took a dim view of the ambitions of the dauntless Nancy Beck; by revision she was more eager than before to learn the Achilles heel of society's enemy. Instead of going to her brother (who had known Nancy in her Southwestern tour of duty) "without delay," she reported to him in 1908 "in her eagerness."[67] Originally she merely "said" to George, "'I want you to tell me about Mrs. Headway'" - now "she at once began" with her plea for incriminating evidence.[68]

64 pp.83 and 253.

65 pp. 89-253.

66 Ibid.

67 pp.88-252.

68 pp.89-252.

Scornfully Mrs. Dolphin in 1908 referred not to "'Mrs. Headway'" by name, but to "'this person,'" and sympathetically she spoke of Lady Demesne not as "'she'" but as "'the poor lady - such a nice woman herself.'"[69] English society, as well as Mrs. Headway, felt the opprobrium of Mrs. Dolphin, for it had become "'scandalously easy.'"[70] Really something should be done. If the people of standing "'think there's something bad about you they'll be sure to run after you.'" Retaining the idea of the rather exotic animal, James changed the image so as to stress the spotted, impure quality of Mrs. Headway: "'If they can only make out big <u>enough</u> spots in you they'll find you attractive.'"[71]

The leaflet-firing technique of Mrs. Costello is called to mind by Mrs. Dolphin's fear of actual contact with the enemy: "'Last night at Lady Dovedale's I was afraid she would know who I was, and come and speak to me. I was so frightened that I went away.'" This bit of intelligence was plumped out to <u>communiqué</u> size, giving emphasis to Mrs. Dolphin's would-be remoteness; in 1908 (italics mine) she trembled lest Nancy "know who I was and get somehow at me. <u>I believe she'd really have been capable of it</u>, and I got so frightened...."[72] James may be guilty of hyperbole in his assertion that throughout the foregoing Mrs. Dolphin "moved

69 pp.91-255. This outburst of Mrs. Dolphin's was so long and so excited that the pronoun became insufficient identification once she began to refer to both ladies almost in the same breath. James probably made the latter change partly for clarity.

70 pp. 90 and 255.

71 pp. 91-255.

72 pp. 91-256.

from point to point with a calmness which had all the air of being used to have reason on its side," but the reader will forgive him, since the statement was a step on the way to the figure of her moving "from point to point with the temper and method of a person accustomed to preside at meetings and to direct them."[73]

Sir Arthur Demesne, the immediate objective by whose capitulation Mrs. Headway would win her Siege, hovers indistinctly in the background like a general's bashful batman. As a character, he does not come alive for the reader; in the machinery of the plot, James made him a small, unimpressive cog. Although only a type, he seems a type taken from life - he has far more verisimilitude than the stage Irishman or the stage Englishman. The chap is indubitably and extraordinarily British.

His reticence, increased in the revision (where "the baronet" became "this shy adventurer"),[74] is almost hereditary - as a host he had originally "nothing bustling in his deportment," but definitively "he too [like Lady Demesne] neither bustled nor overflowed."[75] James caught in a remark of Sir Arthur's the typically British habit of assigning a vague source for deferentially-offered information, excising the baronet's reference to the "'curious little church of King Stephen's time,'" and putting in its stead (italics mine) his indistinct murmurings about the "'curious little church - they say of King Stephen's time.'" [76]

Earnest and totally humorless, he felt it somehow wrong to enjoy as he did the company of his fair pursuer, who made time pass so

73 pp.91-256.

74 pp.97-264.

75 pp.66-224.

76 Ibid.

pleasantly. Reflection on this phenomenon made him "vaguely uneasy; he was by no means sure it was right the time should pass like that"; using alliteration, some parallelism, and wit, James in 1908 fashioned an epigram - the easy passage of time "rather worried him; he was by no means sure anything so precious should be so little accounted for."[77] His grim-faced, literal earnestness is seen again (italics mine) in his custom of sending "regularly to his bookseller for all the new publications on economical subjects, for he was determined that his political attitude should have a firm statistical basis" (in 1908, that his political "development" should have a "massive" statistical basis).[78]

This earnestness of Sir Arthur's helped to account for his confidence and his sense of propriety. Instead of having only "the manners of a young man...with whom a certain correctness had become a habit" he (in the New York Edition) "carried himself as one...with whom confidence had become a duty and correctness a habit" (italics mine).[79] Sir Arthur deemed himself indispensable "in the scheme [1908, "to the propriety"] of things - not as an individual, but as an institution."[80] Unavoidably, Sir Arthur was provincial: "Though he disapproved of it, it was precisely [Mrs. Headway's] foreignness that pleased" Sir Arthur; by revision

77 pp.39-189.

78 pp.37-187.

79 pp.37-186.

80 pp.37-38-187-188. Reminiscent of the similarly-indoctrinated Harold Vane (of "A Bundle of Letters"), who was equally provincial.

(italics mine) he is made more provincial - "Though he *believed in no alternative to the dignity of the British consciousness*, it was precisely her foreignness that pleased him...."[81]

George Littlemore, who had been so successful at ranching and mining that his "principal occupation today was doing nothing,"[82] enjoyed what many an over-worked pedagogue would term an indulgence of his native indolence. James in revision treated kindly and euphemistically this most noticeable of Littlemore's traits. The young (forty-five in the original, forty-one in the revision)[83] millionaire in 1883 was "always for not doing a thing," but in 1908, more kindly, was "always for not going anywhere";[84] normally his idea of a pleasant evening was to "smoke...in a decent part of the Boulevard" - its implication of at least some mental exercise makes more flattering the 1908 reference to his smoking "in comparatively pensive isolation."[85] James, like the burdened pedagogue, at first termed George's habit of sitting quietly at night, smoking, "dull behavior"; allusively and gently he called it in 1908 "this

81 pp.38-188.

82 pp. 19 and 164.

83 pp.18-163, 20-165.

84 pp.6-148. His "very rarely" caring even to go to the theatre was changed to "seldom," which seems a somewhat kinder allusion to his rather indolent nature (pp.20-166).

85 *Ibid*.

free and even surface offered by him to contact."[86] Perhaps nonchalance would more accurately and fairly picture Littlemore's exterior; at any rate, James by revision heightened and made more consistent Littlemore's nonchalance. Instead of "looking through a dozen newspapers" he was to be seen in 1908 "turning over" a dozen of them.[87] Casual George never (in the New York Edition) seemed to observe his erstwhile friend Nancy: instead of "at this moment...not observing" her, he "at this moment, was characteristically detached"[88](italics mine). This langour of Littlemore, the reader suspects, was in some measure a pose - he did observe keenly, but tried to give the appearance of ennui. Once in 1883 James went too far in his depiction of George's state of pseudo-boredom; in speaking of the interesting question of Sir Arthur and Mrs. Headway, "Littlemore terminated his sentence in a suppressed yawn." Realizing that here he had struck a false note in his characterisation, James in 1908 wrote that "Littlemore let the rest of his sentence too indifferently drop"[89] - but George did not yawn. The fact that his "characteristic detachment" was in part feigned may clearly be seen in a revision to the scene in which Mrs. Headway boldly appeals to him to be uncommunicative when Lady Demesne shall try to learn from him incriminating facts about her past; in 1883 he "listened to this little address attentively" but in 1908 (italics

86 pp.19-164.

87 pp.53-207-208. When not turning over his newspapers, more accurately, considering Littlemore's wealth, he wanders about his "rooms" rather than his "room" (pp.53-208).

88 pp.41-193.

89 pp.82-243.

mine) he "had, however disguisedly, given her every attention...."[90]

With so much stress having been laid on Littlemore's taciturn, unruffled exterior, James saw the necessity of making him more appealing and sensitive than originally, since it is he who has the crucial, all-important decision to make, and it must not appear that it was an automatic one, arrived at coldly and without deliberation. An obvious gauge of Littlemore's sensitivity would be of course his feeling towards the city of light, Paris: originally, one learns that he "had ceased to care about it, or wonder about it, much"; in 1908 he "had ceased to vibrate more than a few times a day...."[91] Obviously not a highly sensitive vessel - not a Lambert Strether or a Louis Leverett - but no barbarian either. The setting for Voltaire's statue in the Comédie Française struck him in 1883 as "conspicuously Parisian," but later, more sweepingly, as redolent of "the finest essence of France."[92] Finally, Littlemore was for the New York Edition more the confirmed Parisian than before; where earlier he had been (italics mine) "on his way back to America," he was now "proceeding to America,"[93] and in London (considering Paris as a possible asylum from the Mrs. Headway problem) he thinks (1883) that he "'will go to Paris'" but in 1908 that he will "'go back to Paris.'"[94]

The Littlemore of the New York Edition was more attractive physically, with an added reference to him as "tall,"[95] and with a

90 pp. 87-88-250.
91 pp.4-146.
92 pp.8-151.
93 pp.57-58-231.
94 pp.94-260.
95 pp.84-246.

more flattering description of his premature grayness. In 1883 he had been "rather a noticeable man, especially since his hair and moustache had turned white," but in 1908 his was "a presence to attract admiring attention," and his hair and moustache had become "so fine a silver" (all italics mine).[96]

Still bearing in mind the laconic, nonchalant, not to say indolent nature of Littlemore, James made a slight revision designed to picture him as somewhat more emotional. Originally he had wooed "a young girl of twenty-three"; in 1908 he had "wooed and won an ardent young girl of twenty-three."[97] By implication, Littlemore too was more ardent than before. So far as the story is concerned, George's scorn for European society is his most important trait; here too he is more emotional, more caustic, in the New York Edition. Instead of telling Mrs. Headway that he cares no more about society than "'about that copy of the Figaro'" he professes no deeper a concern about it than "'about Max's buttons.'"[98] (Max was her impertinent courier.) "European society," George tells Nancy, is "'a very vague phrase'"; using more derogation in 1908, he calls it "'an empty phrase.'"[99] Angrily he tells Mrs. Dolphin, "'I never heard that the British gentry were so unspotted'";[100] still heatedly, and in tones weighed with sarcasm, he

96 pp.19-164.

97 pp.18-163. The wife died after a year of marriage; unlike Mrs. Clement Searle, she left a child. Although remembering to insert the information that this girl was in the keeping of Mrs. Dolphin, James neglected to work her into the story.

98 pp.25-172.

99 pp.26-173.

100 See text for note 71.

declares in 1908, "'It's new to me that your alliances have been always so august.'"[101] The sister stoutly maintains that it is his duty to society to reveal what he knows about Mrs. Headway; scornfully he retorts (added in 1908), "'Society can look after itself.'"[102]

It has been seen that James, for the New York Edition, stripped Mrs. Headway of her at best rather grotesque dignity by referring to her as "Nancy Beck," by associating her with "hideous back piazzas," and by giving her the apt, but mirth-provoking epithet of "the well-known Texan belle." He sharpened his outlines of her as blundering, crude, and insensitive, never able to get quite on "the true middle of the note." What poignancy there is in her case repeatedly dissolves, when acted upon by her shrewdness and her Mrs. Headway-like persistence. Rupert Waterville, whose function in the story is to show how fatiguing the demands and appeals of Mrs. Headway can be, and how vulgar she is, succeeded admirably, especially in the revised Siege, where he became even more than before the intense, responsive observer, endowed with a sensitive imagination, but nonetheless naive. The Demesnes received a few revisory touches from James, enough to make Sir Arthur more shy and more typically British (he is only a type, but an accurate one), and to stress the quiet, reticent quality in Lady Demesne without making her appear pallid and ineffectual. Mrs. Delphin, who served without pay in trying to protect British society in general and Lady Demesne in particular from the dangerous barrage laid down by the Southwest Dreadnought, is treated even more satiric-

101 pp.92-256.

102 pp.90-255.

ally by James in the New York Edition. One wishes that James had not felt such antipathy toward illustrations for his books, and that some Victorian Hokinson could have furnished a few cartoons of Mrs. Dolphin. George Littlemore, in view of his important role in The Siege, was handled more sympathetically by James in 1908: his indolence is alluded to gently; he is more attractive looking; he has quicker sensitivity, his emotions are closer to the surface, and his "detachment" more clearly is only a pose.

"'No, she's not respectable.'"[103] Such was Littlemore's answer to the insistent interrogation of Waterville at the Comédie Française, where the wide-eyed young man had noticed a fascinating woman in one of the boxes. On the second page, then, James sounded the keynote of his story. A moment later, George sat down, not wishing to be seen by the subject of their scrutiny, and explaining that he did not "'want to spoil her game.'"[104] Thus early too is his attitude of non-intervention stated. Both of these statements by Littlemore remained untouched by James, and the original description of the necessary meeting of the quartet in the foyer (Sir Arthur Demesne, "her little British M. P.," being the fourth - and silent - member) received practically no alterations; nor did James make any significant revision to the original (to me overly-comic - italics mine) account of Mrs. Headway's divorces. When Littlemore had last seen her she was Mrs. Beck:

1883

He remembered now to have heard afterwards that she was getting a divorce. She got divorces very easily, she was so taking in court. She had got one or two before from a man whose name he

103 pp.6 and 148. 104 Ibid.

had forgotten [1908, "he couldn't remember"], and there was a legend that even these were not the first. She had been exceedingly ["enormously"] divorced! When he first met her in California, she called herself Mrs. Grenville...,her parental name, resumed after the dissolution of an unfortunate union. She had...borne half a dozen names. She was a charming woman, especially for New Mexico; but she had been divorced too often - it was a tax on one's credulity; she must have repudiated more husbands than she had married.... Nancy had begun very young; she must be about thirty-seven to-day. That was all he meant by her not being respectable. The ["Her"] chronology was rather mixed; her sister at least had once told him that there was one winter when she didn't know herself who was Nancy's husband. She had gone in mainly for editors - she esteemed the journalistic profession.105

This is entertaining, to be sure, but the reader of such a caricature is prone to feel, with Littlemore, that if Sir Arthur wishes to marry such a "tax on one's credulity," that is his business.

James did, however, make a few revisions to his more serious description of Mrs. Headway's character, rendering the passage more ironic:

1883

She was a genuine product of the far West [1908,"wild West"] - a flower of the Pacific slope; ignorant, audacious ["absurd"], crude, but full of pluck and spirit, of natural intelligence, and of a certain intermittent, haphazard good taste ["a certain haphazard felicity of impulse"]. She used to say ["to sigh"] that she only wanted a change - apparently she had found it ["that"] now. . . . . Even at San Diego ["San Pablo"] she had prefigured her little Sir Arthur ["her member of Parliament"]; every now and then a wandering Englishman came within her range. They were not all baronets and M. P.'s ["weren't all Sir Arthur's, like her present acquisition"], but they were usually a change from the editors.106

105 pp.14-15&. The final italics ("who") are James's. The present-day reader notices that Nancy's many divorces by the age of thirty-seven was "all he meant by her not being respectable" and should remind himself that Howells's A Modern Instance, dealing with divorce, and for which the author had to travel to Indiana for source material, was published in 1882, one year before The Siege.

106 pp.15-16 - 159-160. The rest of Section I (pp.17-20 and 161-166) is an omniscient-author treatment of such past history as is necessary of Waterville and Littlemore. To it James made practically no revision.

Having sounded the keynote of the story, given a sufficient account of Littlemore and Waterville, and of the ineradicable past and the hoped-for future of Mrs. Headway, and having brought together all of his main characters except the two antagonists, Mrs. Dolphin and Lady Demesne, James was ready in Section II of The Siege to stage the first of Mrs. Headway's appeals to Littlemore for help in her campaign.

An uncommunicative, over-protecting Sir Arthur,[107] at her sharp, direct request, finally left her in the (to him) dubious company of her belated American caller, Littlemore. For her part she was glad (as she might have said) to "get shut of" her bashful baronet, for although he was a "'gentleman,'" he "'stays too long, and he isn't [1908, "'ain't'"] amusing, [so] I'm very glad to see you, for a change.'"[108] Scarcely the lover's speech of a dewy-eyed maid. Almost at once she frankly makes her bid, calling her hoped-for champion "'Mr. Littlemore'" in 1883, but more familiarly, in the Southwest manner, in 1908, "'George Littlemore.'"[109] She tells him (in both editions), "'...I ain't at all ashamed. I want to get into society. That's what I'm after.'"[110] He reassures her, jokingly, that she already is in it. But, although he did not like society, Littlemore favored keeping the status quo; he believed (1883) in women's "not going down;

107 He refused to make the conversation general, and he thought he "'should oblige [her] by staying'" (pp. 22 and 168).

108 pp.22-169.

109 pp.25-172.

110 pp.25 and 172.

thought it eminently desirable, but held it was much better for society that they should not endeavour, as the French say, to mêler les genres." Expanding this thought in 1908, James made much more emphatic Littlemore's rightist stand - which would militate against his helping her - and enlarged it so as to make clear to his monolingual readers that his references were not to sexes, but to social classes. Now the man to whom she appealed for help in "bridging the chasms" felt it "better for society that the divisions, the categories, the differing values, should be kept clear. He didn't believe in bridging the chasms, in muddling the kinds."[111]

Having reluctantly and grudgingly accepted as truth Littlemore's disclaimers of an influential position in society, Mrs Beck now turned to a plan to use her old friend in two other ways: 1) to enlist the aid of the socially impeccable (and energetic) Mrs. Dolphin; 2) when quizzed by a Demesne, or a representative therefrom, to be uncommunicative. Although George once steered the talk away from Mrs. Dolphin (who "belonged to quite another order of things"),[112] Nancy would not be denied, returning (after a decent interval)[113] to the topic of a sponsor. Groping desperately for an excuse to refuse the introduction, he disparages his absent sister, branding her too "dull"[114] to be interesting to this maverick. Such a clumsy subterfuge throws no dust in the eyes of

111 pp.28-76. Littlemore, who in 1908 was described not, vaguely, as a "very good fellow," but as being "naturally merciful and decently just" (pp.28-172), of course did not tell Mrs. Headway this. But he was on the horns of a dilemma, for he had liking and respect for her, and little for society, yet he realised painfully how different the Southwest was from the Continent.

112 pp. 26 and 173.

113 In print, three pages later (pp. 28 and 176).

114 pp.29 and 177.

the wily and diplomatic Nancy, who repays him in his own coin, pretending to joke. In 1883 she accompanied one of her own sallies with a "pitiless laugh" but in 1908, more ominously, she "gave a laugh that perhaps a little heralded danger."[115]

Switching to her second tact, purposeful Nancy appealed to her old friend not, at any rate, to hinder her. The later manner in which she used her feminine wiles in making her plea reminds one of the revisory touches put upon the charm of Madame de Mauves and Daisy Miller (italics mine):

1883	1908
She gave him her fixed, bright gaze again; her eyes seemed to look far into his.	She continued to give him She continued to give cons him her charming sees conscious eyes, which his seemed to look far into his own.[116]

Trying to jest his way out of making any commitments, Littlemore quips that when Sir Arthur demands to know what kind of woman she is, he will tell the baronet she is the most charming woman in Europe. In both editions this charming woman (with a modest mien matched only recently by another Texan belle - Babe Didrickson) rejoined, "'That ain't a description. Besides, he knows it. He wants to know if I'm respectable.'"[117] Littlemore's response to her softly-murmured thanks shows, in 1883, no great involvement on his part; he answers immediately and, still, jokingly. By careful revision James indicated that Littlemore paused before speaking; his words themselves explain the pause - he is distinctly on her side. Her speech which follows, particularly her "wonderful gay glare," shows more emphatically in 1908 just how anxious she is,

115 pp. 29-177.

116 pp.30-176. See note 31.

117 pp. 32 and 180.

about Littlemore's cooperation, and the baronet's reaction.

1883	1908
"He's very curious!" Littlemore cried, with a laugh. She grew a little pale; she seemed to be watching his lips. "Mind you tell him," she went on with a smile that brought none of her colour back.	"Why should he fuss about it?" Littlemore asked - not at once. ..."Well, mind you tell him," she went on with her wonderful gay glare, the strain of which brought none of her colour back. 118

Littlemore jokingly promises to tell her baronet that she is adorable - she cannot share his humour. "'Ah, you're no use!'" was her tragic rejoinder. Unrealistically in 1883 she "murmured" this; in 1908 "she rather harshly wailed."[119]

Section III of The Siege has little dialogue and nothing that may be called a dramatic scene; James contented himself instead with laying more groundwork, presenting (with varying emphasis) the feelings of the three men toward Mrs. Headway,[120] and underscoring the idea of the Southwest as her proper milieu, one which Littlemore had formerly shared with her.[121]

118 pp.32-180.

119 Ibid.

120 Little revision was made to Waterville's reflections about her, except to have her appear to him not "a very curious type" but a "portentous type," and not "a lady of this ambiguous quality" but one "whose respectability or whose lack of it, was so frankly discussable" (pp.33-181).
James must have felt that the story's interest lay in the past of Mrs. Headway, and the decision of Littlemore, for he seldom went within the consciousness of Sir Arthur. He may have been not interested in his little baronet, or he may have felt it impossible to picture convincingly why he was so drawn to the American - neither reason seems wholly satisfactory. One is gratified to find in this section at least some slight probing of Domesne.

121 By slight revisory touches in the previous section, James had stressed the idea of their having been in the Southwest together, and the vast difference between the two social spheres.

(continued -

The flowering of love in the arid bosom of a bewildered Sir Arthur[122] was pictured figuratively by James in the New York Edition. Striking and amusing as the revised passage is, it is also a bit more concise than its original:

1883	1908
The unfortunate young man was fascinated, though he had not yet admitted to himself that he was in love. He would be very slow and deliberate in such a position, for he was deeply conscious of its importance.	The unfortunate young man was engulfed even while not admitting that he had done more than estimate his distance to the brink. He would love wisely - one might even so love deliberately.[123]

121 (continued)
Littlemore tells her in 1883 that she already is in European society, "'with baronets for your adorers'"; this becomes (1908) "'with the big people <u>over here</u> for your adorers'" (pp.25-172). He muses about his earlier liking for her (1883) under "South Western conditions," a liking which in 1908 is related to "such <u>now</u> <u>alien</u> facts" (pp.27-175).

The idea of these two being in a foreign environment is suggested in the revision of his disclaimer, "'I'm no one, I have no power,'" which was made to read "'I'm no one <u>here</u>...'" (pp.30-178). In the present section (III) Littlemore believed (1883) that "'she cared much more for him than for her Englishman,'" and (1908) that "'she really cared more for him than for <u>any outsider</u>'" (pp.35-185). (Italics mine in all preceding passages.)

122 Slightly more emphatic in his 1908 thought that "She was not at all the English lady," replacing the earlier "she was not like an English lady" (pp.38-188). A bit more urbane in his phrasing, he could see in her "a temper and a tone" rather than that she had "a standard of her own" (<u>ibid</u>.).

123 pp. 38- 188-189. This passage came a bit later, and was unchanged in 1908 except for some comma omissions; here the statement of love is qualified: "If he was in love, it was in his own way, reflectively, inexpressively, obstinately. He was waiting for the formula which would justify his conduct and Mrs. Headway's peculiarities" (pp. 39 and 190). (She, unfortunately, could not provide the formula, because she did not know "how much ground it was expected to cover" [pp.40 and 190].)

Endeavoring to sound this shoal water through which he was uncertainly drifting, peering anxiously through the oppressive gloom for the cheering ray of a reassuring fact, Sir Arthur appealed to his first mate, asking her in 1883 "a good many questions," but, more searchingly (and choosing them with greater care) in 1908 "various questions."[124] Nancy, a veteran skipper for whom this was no maiden voyage, cleverly saw to it that the "subject was illumined [only] with fitful flashes"; she never allowed him to catch all of her past in a "general picture"; [125] introducing yet another figure in the definitive edition, James had her furnish only "mysterious allusions to her past" in 1883, but in 1908 only "odd echoes" of it.[126] Shrewdly she affected an ingenuous openness - even paraded her past - while inwardly despising it and wishing it had never existed.[127]

Continuing in 1908 his use of figurative language, one of the hallmarks of his much-discussed style, James changed his earlier literal statement that she did talk about her past, feeling it better "to make a good use of it than to attempt to efface it. To efface it was impossible, though that was what she would

124 pp. 39-189.

125 pp. 39 and 189, both quotations.

126 pp. 39-189.

127 Not always inwardly, either. In 1883 "She hated her past; she used to announce that very often, talking of it as if it were an appendage of the same order as a dishonest courier, or even an inconvenient protrusion of drapery." By adding descriptive words, substituting more emphatic verbs, and expanding it expressively, James strengthened this passage: "She hated her old past; she often made that point, talking of this 'dark backward' as if it were...a thieving cook or a noisy bedroom or even an inconvenient protrusion..." (pp.36-185, Italics mine.)

have preferred."[128] The metaphor chosen by James for the New York Edition was well-suited for one from the Southwest, a section which to many a reader (especially before the two World Wars when it was so dotted with training camps) was merely a colored space on a map: in 1908 Mrs. Headway deemed her past better "made use of and confessed to, even in a manner presented and paraded, than caused to stretch behind her as a mere nameless desert. She could at least a little irrigate and plant the waste. She had to have <u>some</u> geography, though the beautiful blank rose-coloured map-spaces of unexplored countries were what she would have preferred."[129]

James continued to work thoroughly and unhurriedly in Section IV, still keeping in reserve Mrs. Dolphin and (to quote Mrs. Headway) "'the Honourable Lady Demesne...a Baron's daughter'"[130] he introduced themes or aspects of characterization which would recur or be developed more fully later on.[131] Waterville wondered (more boldly in 1908) why Sir Arthur's friends in Paris had failed

128 Being unable to efface her past, her "dark backward," she was forced to pin a great deal of hope in Littlemore (unless, indeed, she could carry the siege successfully alone and unaided - which is, ironically, what she did do, unless Sir Arthur's refusal to question Littlemore be construed as aid). Despite her sturdy bravery and her stubborn wilfullness, she saw in Littlemore's silence the key to victory. In 1883 (italics mine) he felt "<u>that</u> she clung to him, <u>that</u> she believed he could help her and in the long run would." Using expansion and another typical technique ("how" for "that") in 1908, James had Littlemore feel "<u>how</u> she clung to him, <u>how</u> she believed he could <u>make a great and blest difference for her</u> and in the long run would" (pp.36-185).

129 pp.40-190. She did "irrigate and plant the waste." In 1883 the author commented that we should not examine too closely "the ingenious rearrangements of fact" to which she treated her swain. In 1908, more amusingly, "the more or less adventurous excursions into poetry and fable" (pp.40-191).

130 pp. 44 and 196.

131 One such recurring theme (since Littlemore enjoyed making sport of his serious young dip;best friend, Waterville) was that of Mrs. Headway's desire to be presented at Court when she reached London.

to call on Mrs. Headway - had she asked the baronet, and had he refused?[132] Sir Arthur may have demurred, but Littlemore, quietly and with no fanfare, had tried to solicit friends for her; James economically achieved more than one stroke of characterisation here (and again prepared for the sections to follow), for besides showing the quiet loyalty of Littlemore, he sharpened the outlines of the malicious, vindictive streak in Mrs. Headway (of which more anon) as well as her pose of rigorous fastidiousness and selectivity.[133] For Mrs. Headway, Waterville and Littlemore agreed, would refuse to see one Mrs. Bagshaw - that is (both editions) "'exactly what she wants - to be able to cut someone!'"[134] The final questions raised (with later sections in view) concerned Lady Demesne - would she consent to meet Mrs. Headway? And would she be able to dissuade Sir Arthur from any un-baronial impulsiveness?[135]

132 In 1883 he wondered "whether she had asked him and he had refused," but in 1908 he "guessed at her having asked..." (pp.41-193 - italics mine). Her "pretensions to being an American lady typical even of the newer phases" caused the young diplomat grave concern in 1883. In 1908, in the best Jamesian manner, Waterville wondered how far it was right to countenance her "claim to the character even of the American lady thrown to the surface by the late inordinate spread of excavation" (pp.40-41 - 192).

133 Which had been prepared for earlier (in the 1908 edition, p. 184): her refusal to meet any but the best stemmed from her desire to appear "by no means so neglected as fastidious." She had "a perfect and inexorable view of those she wanted to avoid" (especially other Americans in Paris).

134 pp. 42 and 194.

135 Some added suspense was gained on this score by two revisions, in one of which it was expected by Littlemore and Waterville not that Sir Arthur was "prepared to be very consistent" but that he (1908) was "prepared to go very far" (pp.44-195). The other revision indicates that perhaps the mother will dissuade him. Considering the amount of conservatism and refusal to change or to act hastily that is implied in the term "Tory M. P.," one feels that Sir Arthur is less likely to bolt or rebel when Lady Demesne, called in 1883 "the baronet's mother," was termed in 1908 "the mother of a Tory M. P." (ibid.).

The lull is over; even the most jaded reader finds in Section V alarums and excursions in ample measure. There are two skirmishes, the first won by Mrs. Headway, the other by the besieged Lady Demesne; Sir Arthur girds his loins for a face-to-face encounter with Littlemore, but this contest ended in neither a bang nor a whimper, the baronet leaving the lists with no questions having been asked. The observer now sees more clearly than before that Mrs. Headway's frontal attack on London society is in great measure an oblique, retaliatory blow at the more strict society of New York. The strong ironies of The Siege now become readily apparent - Mrs. Headway will enter British society, but the laxity of British society will make her victory, for which she has striven so mightily, a hollow one.

In the Luxembourg Gardens, the execrable taste of Mrs. Headway's open confessions "shocked and mortified" poor Waterville.[136] Sparing him none of the embarrassing details, she tells how vigorously she had insisted that Sir Arthur bring Lady Demesne to meet her. Freely she parades her revenge motive - those people in New York who had "'grudged me common politeness'" will one day learn that she is "'visited by the British aristocracy.'"[137] Warming to her subject, Mrs. Headway tells Waterville (a native New Yorker himself) that in this city (1883) "'There are plenty of old women!

136 pp. 17 and 200. To the first four pages of this section (pp.45-47, 198-201) James made very few changes, especially in the part that described the gardens and the people there - (a quite different case from that of A Passionate Pilgrim [1871]).

James did however make a revision illustrative of the greater skill and care with which he (in 1908) described his characters' manner of speaking. In 1883: "'Well, I like France!' Mrs. Headway went on, with a little inconsequent sigh. Then, suddenly, from an impulse even more inconsequent than her sigh, she added, 'He asked me to go and see her, but I told him I wouldn't. She may come and see me if she likes.'" Her second speech explains both the "impulse" and the sigh, and shows that neither of them is "inconsequent." In 1908 therefore James wrote, "...from an impulse more conceivably allied to such a sound, she added...'" (pp.46-199-200).

137 pp. 46 and 201.

They decided I was improper. I'm very well known in the West....'" Substituting the idea of gayness for impropriety, expanding the passage, achieving reciness and (through longer sentences) a more natural rhythm, James had Mrs. Headway exclaim in the New York Edition that "'There are plenty of spicy old women who settled I was a bad bold thing. They found out I was in the 'gay' line. They discovered I was known to the authorities. I am very well known all out West...;'"[138] After an impressive pause of appropriate duration (and a covert search for more salt to apply to her wounds) indefatigable Nancy provided some detail concerning how "'all alone'" she had been throughout that disastrous winter in New York: "'They didn't think me proper. Such as you see me here, I wasn't a success! I tell you the truth at whatever cost. Not a decent woman came to see me!'" In revising this confession James again used his "gay" terminology, but instead of expanding the passage, he compressed it by means of a striking effect (that of the cat); he also omitted a faulty stroke of characterization - Nancy as a truth teller. In 1908 the spicy old women "'thought me 'gay,' me gay there on Fifty-Eighth Street without so much as a cat!'"[139]

138 pp.48-202. Unrealistically Mrs. Headway ended this particular outburst (about one-third of which is reproduced above) in 1883 with "a sweet little laugh." Convincingly in 1908 "it rang out for derision" (ibid.)

139 pp.49-203. The completeness of the snubbing is made more convincing by the fact that Waterville had himself been in New York that same winter, and had never so much as heard of her. James in 1883 stated almost to his complete satisfaction (in 1908) Waterville's judgment of the two societies: "European society might let her in, but European society would be wrong [1908, "had its limpness"]. New York, Waterville said to himself in ["with"] a glow of civic pride, was quite capable of taking a higher stand in such a matter than London" (pp.50-204).

By referring in revision not to Nancy's "urgent desire for revenge," or her "revenge," but instead to her "sharp vindictive passion" and to her "rancour,"[140] James made even less exculpatory than before the inner drives that incited her. Consistently too in 1908 he changed this "vulgar"[141] woman's references to "'the faces those [New York] women will make'" when they hear of her social success in London; instead she gleefully anticipates "'the way those women will squirm.'"[142] Not so fortunate as Waterville, the New York women could not witness Mrs. Headway's first victory, scored when Lady Demesne came to see her. Interestingly, only one significant change was made to this scene in which the rival forces meet; seemingly slight, the revision gave to Mrs. Headway more poise and aplomb than before - instead of putting out her "hands as if to draw her visitor quickly closer," a more assured Nancy put out "a hand."[143]

One learns almost immediately however that Nancy's victory was anything but decisive - the action was still "fluid." The mother had consented to meet her only at the son's promise to accompany her to Cannes for three months, out of range of the self-propelled Mrs. Headway. This he had not at first planned to do.

140 pp.50-204, both references.

141 pp. 50 and 204.

142 pp. 51-206. Waterville in the following paragraph (ibid.) felt sure that his mother and sister would make no faces (and, 1908, would not squirm). And when he saw that Lady Demesne had come to Mrs. Headway, he wondered if the ladies in New York were (1883) "distorting their features," and (1908) if they were "beginning to be convulsed" (pp.52-206).

143 pp. 52-207.

Before quitting the charms of Paris for his rustication at the Riviera, Sir Arthur called on Littlemore, the sole person who could tell him whether or not Mrs. Headway was respectable. Afraid of what he might be told if he asks the question, the baronet cannot muster enough courage to do so. In order to make this a bit more clear James revised Littlemore's report to the attentive Waterville: Sir Arthur decided "'not, on the whole to risk it,'" rather than (1883) electing "'to hold his tongue'";[144] originally he "'believes there's something in her past that's hard to swallow,'" but in 1908, more vigorously, he "'believes there's something about her, something in time or space, that may make a pretty big mouthful.'"[145] This British nobleman must have felt that even to ask would be to lose face, since it would be tantamount to an admission of his own doubts of his judgment thus far; further, to receive the answer that he dreaded (and perhaps anticipated) would make it imperative either that he give her up (which he would not want to do) or that he marry her in the face of Littlemore's report, which would make him more the butt than ever. Finally, what British baronet (even one named Demesne) could so demean himself as to solicit advice from an untitled American?

There are in the 1883 Siege three distinct and clear-cut statements by Littlemore that show his loyalty to Mrs. Headway and his desire not to be quizzed - each of them remained untouched in revision, James obviously feeling that he had handled these points satisfactorily twenty-five years before. Littlemore snaps at Water-

144 pp.54-209.

145 pp.53-208-209.

ville, who is beginning to sympathise with Sir Arthur, "'Mrs. Beck's admirers were never pitied.'"[146] The older American wishes to give the enemy forces no aid in the form of information: "'Let him [marry her] then. I've nothing to say to it.'"[147] Nor should Sir Arthur himself insist on any intelligence - when Waterville broods that he is probably afraid of what Nancy's past might hold, Littlemore snorts, "'Let him leave it alone then.'"[148] After all, Demesne had no right to ask questions of Nancy's old friend (James in 1908 made only the slightest of revisions to George's statement):

1883

"...he has no business to put things to me on my honour. Moreover, nothing has passed between us to give him the right to ask me questions about Mrs. Headway. As she is a great friend of mine, he can't pretend to expect me to give confidential information about her."[149]

Some six months after the sweet sorrow of farewells in Paris, the paths of James's star-crossed lovers again converge; now it is the Easter season at Longlands, the Devonshire estate of the Demesnes.[150] Here Mrs. Headway is about to make her entrance into British society; so glittering was this occasion that James devoted two sections to it (VI and VII).

146 pp. 53 and 208.

147 Ibid.

148 pp. 53 and 209.

149 pp. 54-209. In 1908, "'any questions,'" "'she's,'" and "'confidential information.'" It may be partly for suspense value that James had Littlemore assert that at times "'it's a man's duty to commit perjury'" (1908, at times "'a man must lie nobly'") (pp.54-210). The reader is fairly sure that Littlemore would not lie - he might, however, remain silent if questioned directly, since he regards it as the business of Nancy and the pursued. When he does make his admission to Lady Demesne, it is too late. The knot has been tied.

150 Much of the first part of Section VI (pp.55-60; 212-216) is given over to an account of the whereabouts of the four chief characters since the previous early autumn in Paris. Sir

(continued -

The last one of the house guests to appear for dinner at Longlands was - Mrs. Headway; Waterville watched attentively as she began the long (three-minute) descent of the staircase. James likewise realized the magnitude of these moments, carefully (in 1908) removing the qualifications and giving emphasis to Waterville's thoughts: instead of feeling "that this was a moment of importance for her: it was virtually her entrance into English society" he sensed "the great importance of the moment for her: it represented her entrance into English society"[151](italics mine). Her possible (and understandable) nervousness is more thoroughly indicated in 1908 when her "charming smile" became her "brave free smile, suggestive of no flutter."[152]

One now comes upon some adroit descriptions of the English society that Nancy was entering, analyses penetrating in themselves, as well as helpful in bringing out again the ironic hollowness of her victory. To begin with, these people were dull; tentatively, as if in awe of his own temerity, James in 1883 had Waterville wonder as he looked "up and down the table...whether some of its elements might not be dull." Ironically and amusingly, with the human element contrasted with the physical setting, Waterville in 1908, looking around the table, "sought to appraise the contributed lustre, the collective scintillae, that didn't proceed from silver,

150 (continued)
Arthur was at Cannes until Christmas, Lady Demesne staying on; Littlemore had had to return for a time to Arizona; Waterville had been working at the Legation in London; Mrs. Headway had sought Italian skies, successfully meeting "half the Roman nobility" (pp. 56 and 212).
James in 1908 more carefully handled the time element, twice adopting the past perfect tense and once inserting "the previous autumn" (pp.57-58-213).

151 pp.61-216.

152 Ibid.

porcelain, glass or shining damask."[153] Dull these people may have been, but they were numerous, and Mrs. Headway was an invader; in both editions "her opponents" comprised a "serried phalanx," and one that represented "a thousand others" who were not there.[154] Since Nancy was a lone invader, camping on their field,[155] James in 1908 changed the point of view of his 1883 comment that "They looked no different from her" (italics mine), making it read, "Her type so violated every presumption blooming there...."[156] It was, quite simply, a case of one type against another, since these people all thought as one, and understood each other perfectly. James analyzed this "serried phalanx" so well originally that (except for comma omissions) he felt called upon in 1908 to make only one slight revision:

All those people [1908,"such people"] seemed so completely made up, so unconscious of effort, so surrounded with things to rest upon; the men with their clean complexions, their well-hung chins, their cold, pleasant eyes, their shoulders set back, their absence of gesture; the women, several very handsome, half strangled in strings of pearls, with smooth plain tresses, seeming to look at nothing in particular, supporting silence as if it were as becoming as candle-light, yet talking a little, sometimes, in fresh rich voices.[157]

153 pp.63-220.

154 pp.63 and 219-220.

155. A few pages before, James had originally pictured "poor Mrs. Headway, arriving in London for the season," changed in 1908 to "poor Nancy, camping on this new field," a revision in keeping with the title (pp.59-215). Nancy was an outsider; indeed, she "looked [1908,"was"] foreign, exaggerated" (pp.64-221).
Earlier in the story, her "stupid...wish to scale the heights" had been alluded to; James retained this phrasing in 1908, but changed "she ought to know how much more she was in her place down below," making instead another allusion to her Southwest background - "she ought to know how much more she was in her element scouring the plain." (pp.33-182).

156 pp.63-221.

157 pp.63-64 - 221.

Nancy's acceptance by such a lot, James made clear, would never set the New York guardians of the caste either to making faces or to being convulsed. With a few rapier thrusts, more flashing in 1908 than before, James showed why: English society, Waterville felt, "was always looking for amusement"—in 1908 it was always "clutching at amusement" (italics mine); his tentative surmise that if Nancy "were amusing enough, she would probably succeed" was stripped of its qualification, and thus made stronger—if she "should sufficiently amuse she would succeed."[158] The opportunity to revise gave James the chance to make Nancy amuse more thoroughly and thus achieve an even more overwhelming success. The group around her, denser than elsewhere in the room, in 1883 "every now and then...was agitated with unanimous laughter." As one turns to the New York Edition he expects to find replacements for the words italicized, and he does find them, for definitively the group "repeatedly broke into gusts of unanimous laughter" (all italics mine).[159] Continuing his emphatic iteration in 1883, James gave Waterville the thought that if Mrs. Headway should amuse them "she would succeed, and evidently she was amusing them." Seeing a chance to avoid undue repetition (of "succeed"), and at the same time to make an ironic stroke, the author had the sensitive observer brood in 1908 that if she should amuse them "she might doubtless get anywhere and do anything, and evidently she was amusing them."[160]

158 pp.65-221, all quotations.

159 pp.65-222.

160 Ibid. People came, she admitted, simply to laugh at her and "to get things to repeat" (pp. 82 and 244). She worked hard to recall the accent and the vernacular of the West, trying (1883) to remember "all the queer stories she had heard out there," and (1908) seeking "to recover the weird things she had heard out there" (pp.83-245). For a poignant side of her victory, see note 32.

The contrast between Mrs. Headway and Lady Demesne[161] strikingly reveals itself in Section VII; pressed into service throughout, the obliging Waterville gives ear first to the besieger and then to the besieged. The irritating assurance, not to say arrogance, of Mrs. Headway, is coupled in the revised version with a more ironic treatment of her self-estimate of her refinement. Loudly the Texan belle confided that at dinner the night before Lady Demesne "'saw I looked pretty, and it made her blue with rage; she hoped I would be ugly'"; deftly (1908) James inserted two references to Nancy's refinement - "'She saw I looked pretty and refined...; she hoped I'd be some sort of horror'" (italics mine).[162] A person of such egocentrism quite naturally saw herself as the focal point of everyone's plans and actions.[163] By revision the author strengthened his earlier statement that Mrs. Headway "preferred to think that she lived in an element of ingenious machination, and that most things that happened had reference

161 Lady Demesne appeals to Waterville for information about the enemy. The reader rightly expects other such scenes, and will get them: Lady Demesne will make a similar plea to Littlemore, as will Mrs. Dolphin; and Mrs. Headway will again solicit the aid of her old friend.

162 pp.70-229. One thinks of a person who is a "horror" as being ill-bred, even more than ugly. Hence my reference to "two" changes. Somewhat similar was the change of Lady Demesne's being "'very friendly'" to being "'well-impressed'" (pp.70-229). Again the idea of refinement is implied.

In connection with the idea of Nancy's refinement is what appears to be a troubled conscience. In 1883 she said that Lady Demesne "'hates me like poison: I don't know what she thinks I've done.'" The enlargement in 1908 makes this self-consciousness of Nancy's more apparent: "'She hates me as if I knew something about her - when I don't even know what she thinks I've done myself'" (pp.71-230).

163 Twice Mrs. Headway rudely accused Waterville of having come to Longlands to spy on her; the third time, she associated his spying with her hostess - Lady Demesne had invited him so as to be able to quiz him. (Here one suspects that Nancy was on target.)

to herself"; compression, removal of the qualifications, and the addition of a verb made Nancy prefer "to see herself in an element of ingenious machination, where everything that happened referred to her and was aimed at her."[164]

Lady Demesne's talk with Waterville was indeed "aimed at" Mrs. Headway. The entire interview was of course painful to a reticent person of her breeding; albeit reticent, even in her silent moments "there was an appearance of design...as if she wished to let him know that she had a certain business with him"; the term "business" carries no poignancy, but the 1908 passage does, for here she wished "to let him know she had appealed to him [for information]...."[165] More obvious yet is the change of her look from "not imperious, almost appealing" to "a pleading look."[166] Disappointedly she says, "'It's very strange. I rather hoped you might explain it.'" Having at first failed to show how Lady Demesne uttered these words, James in 1908 noted that "she had a full pause, a profusion of patience; then she resumed disappointedly: 'It's very strange....'"[167]

164 pp.72-231.

165 pp.74-234.

166 Ibid.

167 pp.76-236. There are in 1908 three similar additions that help intensify the scene and picture more searchingly the reactions of the two. When Waterville told Lady Demesne that Littlemore would be back from America soon, "She [1908] took this in with interest" (pp.79-240). But Waterville warned her not to count too much on him for assistance. Again building up suspense concerning Littlemore's stand, James indicated Waterville pondering the same question. Preceding his warning he (1908) "bethought himself" (pp. 80-240). Finally giving up, Lady Demesne murmured, "'You men have no pity.'" Again James added a stage direction: "she grimly sighed" (ibid.).

Although Waterville felt for Lady Demesne a deep sympathy,[168] his surface actions belied it - when this anxious mother asked outright if he knew anything about Mrs. Headway, he parried the question. Perhaps the "he couldn't give her away" explanation is weak; but in any event James made only one revision (for greater colloquialization) to this passage, which is the most detailed and satisfactory account furnished of Waterville's reasoning:

1883

...he saw the gulf that divided her from a pushing little woman who had lived with Western editors. She was right to wish not to be connected with Mrs. Headway. After all, there had been nothing in his relations with that lady to make it incumbent on him to lie for her [1908, "to hold him down to lying for her"]. He had not sought her acquaintance...And yet he couldn't give her away....[169]

The poignant aspect of Mrs. Headway's success causes only short-lived reader sympathy,[170] sympathy that ends abruptly when

168 In 1883 "he could enter perfectly into the feelings of this tender, formal, serious woman, who - it was easy to see - had looked for her own happiness in the cultivation [1908, "observance"] of duty and in extreme constancy to two or three objects of devotion chosen once for all"(pp.76-230).

Typical techniques of James may be seen in the revision of another passage. In 1883, "he could see [her tone] was a confession of distress." Omission of the second verb gives compression, and accords with the change of observing to experiencing: in 1908 "he could feel the confession of distress." In the following sentence "he immediately felt" that her distress was deep; in 1908, James omitted this needless second reference to the fact that it is the observer who is feeling this - "The distress was deep; it had pressed her hard..." (pp.77-237).

169 pp.78-79 - 230.

170 In 1883 she admitted ruefully that "'They don't care for me; it's only to be able to repeat Mrs. Headway's 'last.'" James enlarged this in 1908: "'They don't really care for me, you know - they don't love me for myself and the way I want to be loved; it's only to be able to repeat Mrs. Headway's 'last'" (pp.83-245).

she calls upon Littlemore (Section VIII),[171] insisting arrogantly that he discuss Mrs. Dolphin, who is (as an economy measure) living with her brother until his return to Paris.[172] "'You're in rather an embarrassing position, ain't you?'" taunts Nancy in 1883. In the New York Edition, with her usual peccant taste, she enlarges upon his alternatives, adding to the original sentence: "'You're in rather a bad fix, ain't you? You've got to be 'good' and mean [and refuse to entertain or to introduce me], or you've got to be kind with a little courage [and face your sister's objections to me].'"[173] Before shouldering her over-worked blunderbuss, Mrs. Headway introduces the two subjects nearest her scheming heart: Littlemore's silence when questioned about her respectability,[174] and Sir Arthur's indecision, especially as it relates to Lady Demesne. Their retorts wax hot, especially in the revised version. Mrs. Headway volunteers that Lady Demesne is "'so afraid her son'll marry me'" (more crudely in 1908, that she is "'afraid of it - of the way he wants me'").[175] Littlemore sardonically counters, "'I'm not (afraid), if he hasn't done it yet'" (more cuttingly in 1908, "'I'm not afraid, if you haven't yet

171 It is to be hoped that his stay in Arizona proved restful, for he had come back to a series of interviews with excited women.

172 Nancy taunts George, suggesting that he invite her to dine with him some evening when his sister is away. The persecution complex of Mrs. Headway shows itself again in her insistence that Mrs. Dolphin hates her; she appealed to George if this were not true - relative to herquestions on this score, James added in 1908 "Nancy persisted" (pp.85-247).

173 pp.85-247.

174 Originally she had a look "which meant that the point was important"; more emphatically in 1908, she had one "that pressed on the point - oh so intensely!" (pp.86-249).

175 Ibid.

brought it off'").[176] Too preoccupied to notice that she has just been insulted, she answers (1883): "'He can't make up his mind. He likes me so much, yet he thinks I'm not a woman to marry.' It was positively grotesque, the detachment with which she spoke of herself."[177] The sarcasm of Littlemore is only on the surface (since he does have more respect for her than for the baronet) when he says (1883), "'He must be a poor creature if he won't marry you [1908, "'take you'"] as you are'";[178] but the added explanation in the definitive edition is cruel enough to show the mixed emotions of her old friend: "'I mean for the sweet sake of what you are.'"[179]

Not until he should return to Paris would poor Littlemore be able to enjoy a pensive smoke or a restful perusal of his favorite newspapers; in London he was boarded in his den, successively, by Mrs. Dolphin, Mrs. Headway, Sir Arthur, and Lady Demesne. He had not built a better mousetrap, but assuredly he was in one.

To his sister (in Section IX) he was close-mouthed because 1) he still felt some liking and respect for Mrs. Headway, 2) he considered that no one had any business interfering with her campaign, and 3) he judged her morals to be about as good as the next woman's. In his thoughts "Mrs. Headway" became "his old Texan

176 Ibid.

177 Strangely enough, this arrogant woman is somehow piteous, a fact which James noted in 1908: "'Well, he can't make up his mind. I appeal to him so, yet he can't quite place me where he'd have to have me.' Her lucidity and her detachment were both grotesque and touching" (ibid.).

178 He tells Nancy that if Sir Arthur asks too many questions, he is not worth marrying.

179 pp. 86-249. She warns Littlemore that Lady Demesne, probably through her solicitor, will question him as to what she is, and then "lay it before Sir Arthur'" (pp.87 and 251). Even though he should have expected it, her parting shot shocked George: "'And if you say a word against me, I shall ["'I'll'"] be lost'" (pp.88-251).

friend";[180] in both editions he regarded her campaign as "none of his business, and he intimated that it was none of Mrs. Dolphin's";[181] Mrs. Headway to him was not "much worse than many other women" - more vigorously in 1908, and more loyally to his old friend, he could not see that she was "much worse than lots of women about the place - women at once less amusing and less impugned."[182]

Although not in the same order, these three points reappeared almost immediately. When Mrs. Dolphin more emphatically made the matter a question of his "saving" Sir Arthur out of a sense of his "duty to society," Littlemore's affinity for the role of observer reasserted itself. It grieved her that her own brother was willing (1883) "to let poor Arthur Demesne be taken in by her!" (in 1908, that he was willing "not to save poor Arthur Demesne" -italics mine).[183] All he had to do, George retorted, was not marry Nancy himself, to which James added for emphasis in 1908, "'I've nothing to do with saving others.'"[184] Tartly Mrs. Dolphin queried if he did not think they had (1883) "'any responsibilities, any duties?'"[185] After sitting through another tirade, the brother asserted flatly that Nancy was quite as good as the Tory M. P.; he did so in more

180 pp.90-254.

181 pp.90 and 254.

182 pp.90-254. In another revision, Littlemore's attention is directed at her morality rather than her social success. The original's "however little satisfaction he might take in this lady's upward flight, he hated to be urged and pushed" was changed to "however little edification he might find in this lady's character he hated to be arraigned or prodded" (pp.90-254 - italics mine).

183 pp.90-254.

184 Ibid.

185 Again for emphasis and clarity, James made an addition: "'...any responsibilities, any duties to society?'" (ibid.).

detail in the New York Edition:

1883	1908
"'But he's a nonentity, and she at least is a somebody. She's a person, and a very clever one.'"	"'But he's a nonentity of the first water, and she at least a positive quantity, not to say a positive force. She's a person, and a very clever one.'"[186]

Stung by this, Mrs. Dolphin snaps, "'How can you pretend that such a woman as that is to be trusted?'" More angrily she asked (definitively) how he could pretend that "'such a flaming barbarian can be worked into <u>any</u> civilisation?'"[187] But in her wrath she had exceeded herself: in both editions Littlemore cut in, reminding her sternly, "'Mrs. Headway isn't indecent - you go too far. You must remember that she's an old friend of mine.'"[188]

Mrs. Headway, during her final private appeal to Littlemore (who had accepted her invitation to call), accused him of not understanding her (Section X). Anticipating an attempt on her part to remedy his shortcoming, he (1883) "smiled, though he was bored at the prospect that opened before him." More logically and accurately, in the New York Edition Littlemore (italics mine) "had a <u>hard critical</u> smile, <u>irritated</u> as he was at <u>so austere</u> a prospect."[189] Towards the conclusion of her long plea that he help her (a plea mingled with bitter reproaches at his not having done do) Nancy tried to move George's sympathies with this tact: "'This was what I wanted; I knew I should find it someday.'" In order to explain what "this"

186 pp.92-256.

187 <u>Ibid</u>.

188 pp. 92 and 257.

189 pp.93-261. If George could smile at such a time, the smile demanded qualifying description; too, he must have felt more

(continued -

and "it" are, James added a sentence in 1908:"'...I knew I should find it some day. I knew I should be at home in the best - and with the highest.'"[190] There is the lurking possibility that the "highest" would, however, feel uneasy in her presence, for a moment later, infuriated at his reiteration that she over-rated his influence, she fiercely hurled a sofa-cushion. Stung, even through his protective armor of detachment, by her most recent accusation of non-assistance on his part, Littlemore leaped to his feet, shouting at her, "'Marry whom you please!'" In 1908, Victoria having been long at rest, and the battle for the "new realism in fiction" (one in which James himself had been a leading figure) having been won,[191] the author permitted Littlemore to shout for his Edwardian reader, "'Marry whom you damn please!'"[192]

The structural parallelism so noticeable throughout The Siege becomes increasingly so in the closing pages: one day Mrs. Headway brings Sir Arthur and Littlemore together and quickly vanishes;[193]

189 (continued)
than boredom at what was impending; finally, the prospect itself seemed to demand further description. It will be noted that in a passage only two words longer than the original, James made all three improvements.

In 1883, immediately following the sentence quoted in the text above, Littlemore decided that Nancy was "a nuisance"; in 1908 he considered her "a dreadful bore" (pp.95-261).

190 pp.97-263).

191 Although Sister Carrie had not yet emerged from the gloom of the Doubleday warehouses.

192 pp.97-264.

193 The reader and Littlemore see that she had invited both men to call on her, Sir Arthur slightly later than the American.

the following day Mrs. Dolphin accompanies Lady Demesne to George's threshold, where she suddenly recalled a prior engagement. Mrs. Headway, who doubtless feared - rightly, one suspects - that Sir Arthur would never bring himself to question Littlemore about her, and who thought that her strategy in arranging this "accidental" meeting of the two (current) men in her life would pass unnoticed, rapturously (and dishonestly) tells Sir Arthur (1883): "'But Mr. Littlemore will tell you; he'll say he has known me for years. *He will tell you whether* he knows any reason - whether he knows* anything against me. He's been wanting the chance;* but he thought he couldn't begin himself.'"[194] Instantly she demurely curtseys her way out of the room. Both men are of course angered by the challenge, embarrassed by the entire situation, and dangerously likely to vent their anger on each other; Sir Arthur (in both editions) felt "shame, annoyance, pride," but at the same time "an intense desire to know."[195] If he had acted upon this latter emotion, James makes clear, Littlemore would have satisfied his curiosity, but the baronet did not ask, despite two brief yet sympathetic invitations from the untitled American. When finally Sir Arthur did speak, it was to say, "'Certainly, I have no question to ask.'" He broke his stubborn, embarrassed silence again only at parting, a moment later. Littlemore tendered Demesne (1883) a

194 * In 1908, "' for ever so long,'" "'if,'" "'if there's,'" "' chance - he'" (pp.98-99 - 265).
One Osborne Andreas informs us, incorrectly, that "on the following day [after the interview of Sir Arthur and Littlemore] the Demesne - Headway engagement is publicly announced" (Henry James and the Expanding Horizon; a Study of the Meaning and Basic Themes of James's Fiction, Seattle, 1948, p. 63).

195 pp. 99 and 266.

"'Good-day, then,'" to which Sir Arthur (ever the phrase-maker) retorted, "'Good-day'"; once again in 1908 James enjoyed his new freedom—"'Good-day then, confound you,'" snapped Littlemore, only to be met with, "'The same to you!'"[196]

The ironic quality of this nouvelle, felt throughout in the hollowness of Mrs. Headway's victory,[197] is underscored here at the close, first by the short but grateful note that Littlemore receives from the winner the following day. The note is a communiqué of victory—Nancy and her little Tory M. P. are secretely engaged; she attributes her success to Littlemore's cooperation (and the flawless daring of her own strategy)—"'...I was bound you should speak!'"[198]

The concluding ironies appear later in the day, when Mrs. Dolphin brings the mother of Sir Arthur face to face with Littlemore.[199] Unaware of course of the contents of his note from her

196 pp. 100-266.

197 The English society that she entered was less strict than that of New York, on which she wanted to avenge herself. The second major irony is that she was accepted for her Southwestern humor and drawl rather than in the way that she "wanted to be loved."

198 pp.100 and 267.

199 And, like Mrs. Headway, instantly bolted. The symmetry of construction (the scene contrived by Mrs. Headway, then the one engineered by Mrs. Dolphin) reminds one again how interested, in the 1880's, James was in the plays he was viewing in Paris. His interest in the contemporary French drama had begun even before his teens, when in 1885 (the same year that Le Demi-Monde was first acted) he saw La Dame aux Camellias (Léon Edel, "Henry James: The Dramatic Years," in The Complete Plays of Henry James, ed. Edel, Philadelphia and New York, 1949, p. 26). In 1870 James first visited the Théâtre Français, viewing a drama by Augier, perhaps L'Aventurière, the same play that Waterville and Littlemore are watching as The Siege opens (Complete Plays, pp. 37,826). (The drinking scene in Augier's play, praised by James in his 1876 essay on "The Théâtre Français," seems to have served as a model for his own in Guy Domville, many years later [1894].)

(continued-

future daughter-in-law, Lady Demesne[200] ultimately asks the question, formerly (but so she thinks, still) of such vital importance - is Mrs. Headway respectable? Suddenly "conscious of the need to utter the simple truth,"[201] Littlemore provides Lady Demesne momentary

199 (continued)
By 1877 James had seen Le Demi-Monde, according to his own count, "several times" (The Scenic Art, ed. Allan Wade, New Brunswick, 1948, p. 279), but following this particular performance, Mr. Edel tells us, he "left the theatre 'agitated' with what he had seen, pacing the streets far into the night..." (Complete Plays, p.38). James's 1877 review of Le Demi-Monde (see Scenic Art, pp.279-281), as well as his remarks in the New York Edition Preface (in The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur, New York, 1934, pp.210-211) explains fully and cogently his reasons for disliking the "morality" of Jalin. In 1878, continuing to demonstrate his interest in Augier as well as Dumas fils, James wrote an essay on the former.

It is not surprising, then, to find James having Waterville and Littlemore (Section IX) make open references to these two plays, and to their partial counterparts therein. The adventuress in Augier's drama is Dona Clarinde, and in Dumas' Suzanne d'Ange; the near-victim in L'Aventurière, unlike James's Sir Arthur and Dumas' Raymond de Nanjac, is an old man, whose son (Don Fabrice) learns from Don Annibal of the adventuress' past. Dumas uses only one man for this function, Olivier de Jalin, a man well-versed in the past of Suzanne (she having once been his mistress), who forces her to reveal her true self to Raymond. The differences between Le Demi-Monde and The Siege continue to pile up, for Raymond breaks with Suzanne. And, as Littlemore said:on the stage one of the "'active parties'" was a close friend of the man in love, the other was his son, but "'Demesne's [1883] nothing to me'" and (1908) "'...nothing at all to me'" (pp.94-259). The most striking difference is that Olivier used all means, fair or foul, to push Suzanne "along the downward path," something to which James strenuously objected (Scenic Art, p.280; see also Critical Prefaces, p. 210).

200 James amusedly echoed the glittering eye of Coleridge's mariner. In 1883 the only near-echo was when Mrs. Headway angrily related her misfortunes in New York: "her eyes, glittering a little, were fixed upon absent images." James in 1908 had her fix her glittering eyes "on memories still too vivid" (pp.48-202).

Farther along in the story, Mrs. Headway warns Littlemore to beware of Lady Demesne: "'...she means to catch you. She has an idea she can fix you....'" Perhaps the word "fix" gave James his inspiration, for in 1908 he wrote: "'She means to hold you with her glittering eye. She has an idea she can - can make you...'" (pp. 87-250). Littlemore apparently dreaded, then, this interview with Lady Demesne, for he had feared that he would not know what to say to one so determined (1883) "to catch him" and (1908) "to hold him with glittering eyes" (pp.86-252).

pleasure: "'I don't think Mrs. Headway respectable.'"[202]

Indicative of the skill and care with which James worked in 1883 is the paucity of revisions to the final two scenes; but, as in the case of Madame de Mauves (1874), the revisionist detected and repaired a faulty final sentence. Waterville, instead of hearing "from New York that people were beginning to ask who in the world was Mrs. Headway" learned of their inquiries as to "who in the world Lady Demesne 'had been.'"[203]

---

201 pp. 102 and 270.

202 pp. 103 and 270. What Littlemore would have retorted if either of the Demesnes had asked the question earlier is problematical; but one feels fairly certain that he would have answered honestly. It is part of the irony of the story that he was appealed to too late; thus he maintained both his integrity and his role of non-interfering observer.

After receipt of Nancy's gleeful little note, he was "almost sorry he hadn't said to Sir Arthur: 'Oh well, she was pretty bad, you know'" (pp. 101 and 267). But Sir Arthur had not asked him. Confronted by Lady Demesne, he felt (1883) "sorry for her," and in 1908, "as sorry for her as he had felt for her son" (pp. 102-269). (There was always, however, his admiration, grudging though it often was, for his old friend: after Lady Demesne had gone, he wished he had [1883] "remarked" to her that Nancy would probably be a "capital" wife; in 1908 he regretted not having "driven [this point] home" (pp.103-270).)

The "relief" that Littlemore experienced after his terse admission to Lady Demesne was only partly because he had been called upon to make it too late; for his spoken judgment, wrote James the humanist, did make a difference "in what was at the bottom of all things—his own sense of fitness" (pp. 103 and 270).

203 pp.104-271.

The Siege of London (1883), was suspended the following year, but in 1908 was marshalled into formation in James's impressive parade of fictions, the New York Edition. In polishing and refurbishing his original warriors, James did what any equally conscientious and equally adroit officer would do: he made his observer, Waterville, more alert and responsive; gave Mrs. Dolphin a thorough dressing-down for encouraging the spread of false rumors and for defending a caste - she, who had been born a mere civilian!; thought of Littlemore with greater kindliness, and with an improved understanding of his natural affection (and scorn) for his erstwhile buddy of that isolated Western post. But as for that brash recruit - that female Martin and Lewis - that Mrs. Headway...! Whenever the opportunity afforded itself, Col. James wounded her dignity, or pointed out with colorful incisiveness and emphasis her faults. But he found her somehow appealing and ingratiating; if Headway had got to the Academy early enough, she would have made a good officer. As it is, she must remain in the ranks; yet she had qualities lacking in many a scion of the regulars.

In 1908 the dialogue heard during The Siege was more rhythmical and vigorous, with a greater colloquial quality than before. Besides a keener ear, the veteran correspondent and analyst had a sharper eye for the human element than his predecessor; manner of speaking and listening, laughter, even the pauses of his conversational campaigners were reported with greater accuracy. He had also acquired a more searching sense of the irony of situation. His style is better, too: frequently he inserts figurative language, giving to his communiqués

a lighter surface, pleasantly etched with epigrams. Yet it must be said, in all fairness, that much of the work of the younger man could not be improved upon - a great deal of the dialogue, many of the analyses or episodes illustrating the loyalty of Littlemore, and the dramatic conflicts that climaxed The Siege.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

On January 14, 1873,[1] when Henry James, Jr. was in Italy, that land of dedicated artists, his father wrote him of "your volume--which Howells says ought to be published forthwith.... under the title of Romances....I can help you if you are disposed to publish a selection of your tales....[2] You have a large number of admirers, that is evident...." A month or so later the parent still was "willing...to bear the expense of stereotyping, and if you will pick out what you would like to be included, we shall set to work at once, and have the book ready by next autumn." On March 24, young James, then in his thirtieth year, wrote to express his gratitude--and to demurr: "Briefly, I don't care to do it just now. I value none of my early tales enough to bring them forth again, and if I did, should absolutely need to give them an amount of verbal retouching which it would be very difficult out here [in Rome] to effect."

1. Too many of us err in associating James (1843-1916) only with the literary climate of the Edwardian and Georgian eras, a climate favorable to Pinero, Jones, Barrie, and Galsworthy, Bennett, Conrad, Shaw, and the indestructable W. Somerset Maugham. But when James was born, Dickens and Thackeray were the reigning Victorian novelists, Balzac was writing his Comédie Humaine, Wordsworth was still living, Victoria was a young queen. Moby-Dick, The Scarlet Letter, the first Preface of Leaves of Grass, and The Origin of Species had yet to appear. James's first accepted work (unsigned reviews) came out during the Civil War; he lived into the period of the First World War. In 1843 A Christmas Carol first appeared; in 1916 Dreiser had finished his Cowperwood trilogy and O'Neill was starting to write.

2 At this time Henry James, Jr. had behind him a respectable body of reviews, travel essays, and tales, most of them reminiscent of Hawthorne. His output was republished in England and on

Also in March "The Madonna of the Future" appeared. Having given an adequate amount of retouching to this tale, two "early ones" (1868 and 1871), and three published in 1874, James in 1875 brought out his first volume, A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales.[3] In making his early revisions James, enjoying his "safe paradise of self-criticism," could see, even without benefit of his wet sponge of later years, that his fresh new canvases were too flamboyant and romantic, with a distracting amount of Gothic foliage and English heaven in the foreground—so much foliage and sky as to obstruct the view of the onlooker and hamper the movement of his characters,[4] some of whom, incidentally, looked too much like romantics and too little like humanists. When in his paradise the Miltonic young artist trimmed his foliage (not to mention some of the hair of his wild-eyed Shelley)[5] he usually, but not always, effaced the effect of his scissors. And when in 1885 (no longer the highly self-conscious, and conscientious, traveller) he covered his canvases for a full

---

the Continent, and occasionally translated. Ironically, his early fictions (to be referred to so nostalgically later by those who objected to the later manner and subjectivity) were denounced by some in 1868 for having too much analysis.

3 Three of these six tales were to be valued enough to be brought forth again, with verbal retouching noted in Chapters II-IV, in the New York Edition.

4 Later romantic visitors to James's studio, notably Van Wyck Brooks and Matthew Josephson, fancied that they saw, Fra Lippo Lippi-like, James staring out at them in the linesaments of Clement Searle; but most of us more pedestrian admirers see James reflected only in the person of the unnamed narrator.

5 James never re-wrote, in the sense of rearranging or omitting scenes or episodes, adding or omitting characters. He changed no character traits, unless his efforts to make Searle less querulous and cowardly (and so, more sympathetic) and his attempts (not until the definitive edition) to add stature to de Mauves by taking it from his sister, may be called character re-writing.

generation, shouldered his easel, and went with wandering steps and slow (on his more and more solitary way) to the salons of Boston and the streets of London, he had learned to paint to his later satisfaction only such scenery as was needed by his characters—he was no longer trying to emulate either Memling or his revered Balzac (mentioned, fictionally, in 1874, and 1873)—rather, he was working more in the manner of the Elizabethan dramatist.

Charles Dickens, who died in 1870, the year before the pilgrimage of Clement Searle, won his wide popularity, Benét's Reader's Encyclopedia informs us, "by journalistic use of the popular devices of sentimentality, melodrama...and familiar characters and turns of plot." May not the reader then look with some charity at James when his early narrator, spied upon by means of a Venetian hand-mirror, snarls such epithets as "sneak" and "villain," when unwed mothers die in the deep snow, and when sensitive amateur poets marry young girls who are "poor and obscure" but "beautiful and proud"? And may we not look at James with some respect for eliminating much of his hackneyed and melodramatic "phrase and circumstance" by 1875, and all of it by 1885? Perhaps Paul Dombey (d.1846)[6] is more lovable than Randolph Miller (aged nine in 1876), but which boy loves candy, has a strident voice, and hates to go to bed?

66 Not to mention Little Dorrit and Little Nell, as well as Little Eva, Little Women, and, in 1886, the year in which The Bostonians and The Princess Casamassima appeared in book form, Little Lord Fauntleroy. Relative to the receptions of James's two novels, see Henry Seidel Canby, "He Knew His Women," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXIV (November 10, 1951), 9-10, 34-36. "The Place of Henry James in the Development of American Realism" (Pennsylvania, 1934), a dissertation by William Andrew Thomas, should prove helpful in a contrast of Mrs. Burnett's baronet and James's scourge of Schenectady.

And are not the deaths and burials of Searle, Theobald, and Daisy[7] more in accord with recent literary taste than the interminable death of Paul?

The foregoing, it is fervently hoped, will not be taken as mere graduate school superciliousness. It is an attempt to show, briefly, where James fits in a Victorian frame of reference; it seems to me that his revisions—and his works themselves—indicate a very poor fit indeed, that he was a twentieth century writer, in the age of Victoria.[8] His Siege of London preceded by ten years The Second Mrs. Tenqueray;[9] in an era of triple-decker novels, his economy was difficult to understand and appreciate; writing primarily for an Anglo-American audience, he was much closer to Flaubert and Turgénieff.

Indicative of James's increase of skill during the 1870's is the fact that the Pilgrim, the "Madonna," and Madame de Mauves continued to be given revisory touches in the years 1879-85[10] (all the flaws not having been mended in 1875—James at this time, one believes, was incapable of detecting them), whereas Daisy (1878),

7 The manner of death of Richard Searle, and M. de Mauves, seems indicative of the age. Nor must we forget the final misstep of Roderick Hudson.

8 Even the early versions of Daisy do not seem to have been written twenty years before people knew the cause of malaria, referred to throughout as "Roman fever."

9 James has been called with some justice, finicky and a prude; he and Mr. Spillaine do not occupy common ground, yet part of the "Madonna" (1873) was never printed, at the advice of James's family—and Howells.

10 It will be noticed that one who collates only the original and the definitive James will frequently not see the true picture of the author's early development (Dr. Lucas's study provides many instances of revisions—especially in the "Madonna" but to a degree in the "Bundle"—that were made quite early, but that he naturally assumed to be typical of James's later development). One

the "Bundle" (1879), and The Siege (1883) seem to have been shelved and scarcely moved for dusting in the years immediately following publication. In these "middle" (1879-85) revisions of the three earlier works, James, while continuing to tone down and delete his emotionalism and his travel writing, was able to make revisions that called for greater skill.[11] Now he gave his characters added (and more convincing) emotion,[12] heightened the character contrasts

---

who collates using not the earliest but an early text misses some earlier revisions (Miss Harvitt's study illustrates this). Even studies of the three early novels are, unavoidably, slightly misleading, since these novels were written during the "formal period" of uncontracted subject-verb, and fail to indicate that in the five years or so just previous James had frequently used the contracted forms.

Some scholars or editors seem indifferent to the question of what edition of James they are using; a few critics misquote him, or quote a later text in proving something about the young author. Mr. Edel warns of the "dangers of 'hit-and-run' scholarship in the case of so complex a writer as Henry James," suggesting that "Scholars working on James would do well to consult all editions and all texts before formulating conclusions" ("A Further Note on 'An Error in The Ambassadors,'" American Literature, XXIII, 130, March, 1951). Dr. Lucas could not have studied all editions for a work of his breadth and sweep, but Edel's injunctions apply to scholars treating narrower subjects.

It is easy for one to become too thin-lipped and stern-faced about the matter of awareness of James's early revisions—perhaps the present writer has been thus guilty. James's publishers were indifferent, reprinting their own earlier edition with little or no attempt to take advantage of improvements made to an interim edition of another house. James himself from about 1879 to 1883 seems to have been little enough interested to allow this to happen. Finally, many stories seem to have been revised shortly after their appearance, but three or four years before their next printing; thus one errs if he lays too much stress on chronology or dates. It may be said, however, that generally the works improved steadily with each succeeding edition.

11 He always, when revising, worked to make his diction less stilted and commonplace; frequently, although this is most noticeable in the "major phase," he added, changed, or amplified figurative language.

12 Their "Hay's," "O's," and "Here I be's" had been relegated to the discard.

and the ironies implicit in them, and increased the poignancy of Searle and Theobald while making harsher and less likeable Richard and the Italian artist. Dramatic scenes were handled with a more deft, poised touch; irony was stronger and the tragic sense deeper.

Both the revisory work and the new fictions, 1878-85, demonstrate a gain in clarity and accuracy, an avoidance of awkwardness, and a marked rejection of grandiloquence, heavy wit, and attempted allusiveness (which, sad to relate, had been only ambiguity). Discipline and new confidence resulted in there being less of the earlier repetition to insure a point's being made. Perhaps calm poise and a decrease of tenseness[13] account for James's now-better ear for prose rhythms[14]—the full value of an added word, put in the proper place[15] for rhythm and for emphasis, was now apparent to him (although the tardy revision of the final sentence of Madame

13 A less tense James meant a less formal James; a more confident author, too, relied more on his own choice of a suitable word and less on the accepted but trite and overused one. Diction became increasingly natural and less self-conscious. Such early favorites as "fancy" and "perceive," "woo" and "tickle," "picturesque" and "local color" (all of them I believe Victorian standbys) James eventually eliminated. He of course developed later likings, among them "beautifully" and "wonderfully," and—for pathos or tragedy—"blighted."

A more confident writer, one less in awe of the purists, James became able to write dialogue that was racy and natural, and appropriate to the speaker: the increasingly bad grammar of the Millers, the provincialism of Miranda Hope, the figures of speech of the scientist Staub, the fewer foreign terms, except for someone like Léon.

14 Descriptive words, which were inserted in narrative passages for improved meaning and greater clarity, were (along with parenthetical expressions) added also to dialogue for better rhythm, and for spirit and emphasis. Greater informality of style (and again, rhythm) were obtained by the omission of unnecessary relative pronouns, and repeated subjects or verbs.

15 Especially at the end of a sentence.

de Mauves is an exception). Yet there remained, too often, parenthetical expressions and qualifying words that drained the strength from the sentences; it is interesting to see how in the later style these same two elements could bring about not only greater refinement and exactness of thought, but frequently more rhythmical and emphatic dialogue as well. Still, the dialogue by 1885 had steadily improved,[16] gaining in spirit (and often, sarcasm), and, now that the "formal period" was safely behind, in informality.[17]

The alliteration of James before 1885 was self-conscious and somewhat forced, reminiscent of mid-eighteenthcentury poetry; that of the "major phase" seems instinctive and organic, never superimposed. To an even greater extent than alliteration, figurative language became a hallmark of his finished style; extended metaphors, occasionally to be found in the early works (even at times in the late manner) frequently occur in the dictated novels, but only rarely in the early stories that were revised (by hand) for the New York Edition. These definitively revised stories, however, do contain many brief figures, some of which make concrete and memorable the original flat, literal statement, others of which improve upon

16 Most—but not all—of the grammatical lapses and other bits of careless writing had been corrected by 1885 also, and paragraphing and sectioning had been carefully improved. There remained however in 1885 some careless shifts of point of view within the sentence, some unfortunate figures of speech, and an occasional jungle of personal pronouns.

Ages will of course remain in a state of flux, and descriptions of mustaches, blushes, and laughter will continue to be changed, sometimes in the interests of allusiveness and avoidance of the obvious. Proper names, for these reasons, and for an avoidance of repetition, will continue to disappear.

17 The formal period occurred, roughly, 1876-81. Besides being very strict in his use of the comma and the subjunctive, James

imagery already present. To a surprising degree, James used ordinary objects for his similes and metephors, or phrased them simply and colloquially; often too, he made them violent and unexpected in nature. Using imagery functionally rather than decoratively,[18] James created identifying images— the innocence of Daisy, the child of nature; the dove-like purity of Miranda; the coxcombical quality of the de-humanized Giovanelli; the back piazza of the Texan belle.

Without changing his characterizations,[19] James made new strokes for emphasis and for sympathy— it becomes clearer that a more charming Daisy is an American flirt but not a European coquette.[20]

---

took some pains to make his characters use the uncontracted form of the subject-verb, although earlier they had been (as they were after about 1881) more colloquial. This interesting use of the uncontracted form is found in both the revisions and the new stories of these years. (But in keeping with his usual more modern and simple punctuation, James eliminated the comma dash at this time.)

18 Having added or changed a figure, James carefully remembered it, repeating it at the appropriate time. His figurative language often improved the dialogue, making it strikingly epigrammatic; it also made for economy, since with an image emotional action could be pictured more briefly.

A recently-announced dissertation should furnish valuable information: Priscilla Gibson (Boston), "Imagery as Structure in the Later Novels of Henry James." W. M. Gibson has shown how James related and expanded seemingly unrelated images, having them recur throughout the novel ("Metaphor in the Plot of The Ambassadors," New England Quarterly, XXIV, 291-305, September, 1951).

19 Except possibly those of Searle and M.deMauves. See note 5.

20 James achieved some fame and popularity as a writer of international stories and novels; attempting another genre (The Bostonians and The Princess Casamassima), although this is not the only reason, he lost most of his following. All of the stories studied here have an international aspect; in his definitive revisions of them, James demonstrates, even more strikingly than before, his understanding

James's relative inexperience, combined with his zeal to be a highly objective realist, had caused too great an air of detachment in the early works; the older artist remedied this flaw. By increasing the sympathy of his narrators,[21] and Longmore and Winterbourne, he made the reader more concerned about the plight of Pearle, Theobald, Madame de Mauves, and Daisy. Further, when there was an appeal made (to the person through whose consciousness the story was seen), both the entreaty and the response[22] were vested with more emotion than before—in this regard, one cannot afford to forget the beautiful eyes of James's heroines.

The sensitive, searching awareness, the responsive vibrations of the highly attuned characters of the later James are well known. Intently they observe; intensely they feel.[23] Frequent additions clarify or expand their silent reactions, or, indeed, picture them for the first time; likewise for their manner of speaking. James

---

of Continental (and expatriate American) types—Mrs. Coventry, Madame Clairin, Mrs. Costello, Léon, the Vanes and the Demesnes, Dr. Staub, Mrs. Dolphin. His long residence abroad (almost unbroken after 1862) weakened no whit James's preference for Americans and his convictions of their innate superiority—the unselfish Pearle; the idealistic artist, Theobald; the stoical wronged wife; Daisy; Miranda; even Mrs. Headway. Readers have misunderstood James's handling of dishonesty in The Golden Bowl; he was highly moral, and (a fact which makes him especially worth reading nowadays) ever the humanist—besides increasing the flagrantly immoral quality of M. de Mauves and Madame Clairin, he twice changed an earlier effect (the loneliness of Madame de Mauves; the success of Mrs. Headway) for one stressing the problem of morality.

21 as well as the sensitivity of his sympathetic characters.

22 Littlemore and Winterbourne become participants rather than mere observers when they feel *how* rather than *that* Nancy Beck and Daisy are appealing to them. And Longmore had more sympathy for the pain suffered by Madame de Mauves.

23 Their more penetrating reactions to each other and to the situation take on a sensory quality, even one of motion.

does not lecture his Beckys and his Rawdons, he does not exhort his gentle reader—and he is not, except for brief expository passages in Madame de Mauves and The Siege, the omniscient author; but the descriptions of the manner of speaking and listening (especially as they appear in the revised stage directions)[24] seem to this reader to be authorial comment—quite subtle and unobtrusive.

Handling suspense and foreboding with a more sure touch, sharpening the outlines of his earlier characters and adding light and shadow to accentuate their contrasts, heightening the drama of his incidents, rubbing over the whole canvas his sponge of irony, preserving his works in the timelessness of his unique style, Henry James, ever given to the terrified revise, re-examined and improved for the New York Edition the earlier (1871-85) fictions (many of them even then well beyond a second edition) of Henry James, Jr. He spared himself no effort, just as years before he had spared none, for Henry James, like Doncombe, was "a passionate corrector, a fingerer of style; the last thing he ever arrived at was a form final for himself."

24 So often seen as mere avoidances of the obvious, or subjects for virtuosity, James's later stage directions often achieved economy, either in actual length or in the vastly greater amount of information they contained (to give a simple example, the combining of speaking with manner; the indication for the first time of manner, or action; or the substitution for the proper noun of the briefer pronoun, or the more descriptive epithet). When not improved, stage directions were usually eliminated. See Chapter V, notes 88-94.

Cleverly James had his characters interrupt each other; adroitly he used dashes and italics to show intonation, or emotional pauses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

of

MOST IMPORTANT WORKS CITED

-I-

The Art of Fiction and Other Essays, ed. Morris Roberts. New York, 1948.

The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James, ed. Richard P. Blackmur. New York, 1934.

A Bundle of Letters. Boston, 1880.

"Daisy Miller: A Study," The Cornhill Magazine, XXXVII, XXXVIII, 678-698, 44-67 (June, July 1878).

Daisy Miller: A Study (Harper's Half-Hour Series, No. 82). New York, 1879.

Daisy Miller: A Study, An International Episode, Four Meetings, 2 vols. London, 1879.

Daisy Miller: A Study, An International Episode, Four Meetings (Collection of British Authors, Vol. 1319). Leipsig, 1879.

Daisy Miller: A Study, and Other Stories [An International Episode, The Diary of a Man of Fifty, A Bundle of Letters] (Harper's Franklin Square Library, No. 305). New York, 1883.

Daisy Miller: A Study, Four Meetings, Longstaff's Marriage, Benvolio (Collection of Novels and Tales by Henry James). London, 1883.

Daisy Miller and An International Episode. New York, 1892.

Daisy Miller (Uniform Edition of the Tales of Henry James). London [1915, 1919], 1924.

Daisy Miller, in Four Great American Novels, ed. Raymond W. Short. New York, 1946.

Daisy Miller, in The Great Short Novels of Henry James (Madame de Mauves, An International Episode, The Siege of London, Lady Barbarina, The Author of 'Beltraffio,' The Aspern Papers, The Pupil, The Turn of the Screw, The

Beast in the Jungle], ed. Philip Rahv. New York, 1944.

Daisy Miller, in Selected Novels of Henry James [The American, The Europeans, An International Episode], ed. Arthur Zeiger (Caxton Library of World's Greatest Literature). New York, 1946.

Daisy Miller, An International Episode. New York, 1947.

Daisy Miller. London, 1947.

The Diary of a Man of Fifty and A Bundle of Letters (Harper's Half-Hour Series, No. 135). New York, 1880.

French Poets and Novelists. London [1878, 1884], 1893.

Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod, ed. E. F. Benson. London, New York, 1930.

The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, 2 vols. New York, 1920.

"Mme. [sic] de Mauves," The Galaxy, XVII, 216-233, 354-374 (February, March 1874).

"The Madonna of the Future," The Atlantic Monthly, XXXI, 276-297 (March 1873).

The Madonna of the Future and Other Tales ["Longstaff's Marriage," Madame de Mauves, Eugene Pickering, "The Diary of a Man of Fifty," "Benvolio"], 2 vols. London, 1879.

The Madonna of the Future, A Bundle of Letters, The Diary of a Man of Fifty, Eugene Pickering (Collection of Novels and Tales by Henry James). London, 1883.

"The Madonna of the Future," in Library of the World's Best Literature, Ancient and Modern, ed. Charles Dudley Warner and others, XX. New York, 1896.

The Notebooks of Henry James, edd. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock. New York, 1947.

The Novels and Tales of Henry James (The New York Edition), XIII [The Reverberator, Madame de Mauves, A Passionate Pilgrim, "The Madonna of the Future," "Louise Pallant"]. New York, 1908.

The Novels and Tales of Henry James (The New York Edition), XIV [Lady Barberina [sic], The Siege of London, An International Episode, "The Pension Beaurepas," "A Bundle of Letters," "The Point of View"]. New York, 1908.

The Novels and Tales of Henry James (The New York Edition), XVIII [Daisy Miller, Pandora, The Patagonia, "The Marriages," The Real Thing, "Brooksmith," "The Beldonald Holbein," "The Story in It," "Flickerbridge," "Mrs. Medwin"]. New York, 1909.

"A Passionate Pilgrim," The Atlantic Monthly, XXVII, 352-371, 478-499 (March, April 1871).

A Passionate Pilgrim, and Other Tales ["The Last of the Valerii," Eugene Pickering, "The Madonna of the Future," "The Romance of Certain Old Clothes," Madame de Mauves]. Boston, 1875.

Portraits of Places [1883], ed. George Alvin Finch. New York, 1948.

The Scenic Art, ed. Allan Wade. New Brunswick, 1948.

"The Siege of London," The Galaxy, XLVII, 1-34, 225-256 (January, February 1883).

The Siege of London, Madame de Mauves (Collection of Novels and Tales by Henry James). London, 1883.

The Siege of London, The Pension Beaurepas, The Point of View. Boston, 1883.

The Siege of London, The Point of View, A Passionate Pilgrim (Collection of British Authors, Vol. 2234). Leipsig, 1884.

Stories Revived: Georgina's Reasons, A Passionate Pilgrim, A Landscape Painter, Rose-Agathe, II of 3 vols. London, 1885.

Ten Short Stories of Henry James, ed. Michael Swann. London, 1948.

Theatre and Friendship; Some Henry James Letters, with a Commentary, ed. Elizabeth Robins. New York, 1932.

Washington Square, The Pension Beaurepas, A Bundle of Letters, 2 vols. London, 1881.

-II-

Andreas, Osborne. Henry James and the Expanding Horizon; a Study of the Meaning and Basic Themes of James's Fiction. Seattle, 1948.

Balzac, Honoré de. The Comédie Humaine, tr. Ellen Marriage, XXI. Philadelphia, 1897.

Barrett, Laurence. "Young Henry James, Critic," AL, XX, 385-400 (January 1949).

Beach, Joseph Warren. The Method of Henry James. New Haven, 1918.

Blackmur, Richard P. "Henry James," in Literary History of the United States, II. New York, 1949.

Bosanquet, Theodora. Henry James at Work. London, 1924.

Canby, Henry Seidel. "He Knew His Women," S R L, XXXIV, 9-10, 34-36 (November 10, 1951).

Cargill, O. and D. Lerner. "Henry James at the Grecian Urn," PMLA, LXVI, 316-331 (June 1951).

Dunbar, Viola R. "The Revision of Daisy Miller," MLN, LXV, 311-317 (May 1950).

Dupee, F. W. Henry James (American Men of Letters Series). New York, 1951.

Dupee, F. W., ed. The Question of Henry James: A Collection of Critical Essays. New York, 1945.

Edel, Léon. "The Architecture of James's New York Edition," MFQ, XXIV, 169-178 (June 1951).

Edel, Léon, ed. The Complete Plays of Henry James. Philadelphia, New York, 1949.

Edel, Léon. "A Further Note on 'An Error in The Ambassadors,'" AL, XXIII, 126-130 (March 1951).

Edel, Léon, ed. The Ghostly Tales of Henry James. New Brunswick, 1948.

Edgar, Pelham. Henry James: Man and Author. New York, Boston, 1927.

Fadiman, Clifton, ed. The Short Stories of Henry James. New York, 1945.

Ferguson, Alfred R. "Some Bibliographical Notes on the Short Stories of Henry James," AL, XXI, 292-297 (November 1949).

Foley, Richard Nicholas. Criticism in American Periodicals of the Work of Henry James from 1866 to 1916. Washington, D. C., 1944.

Ford, Ford Madox. Henry James: A Critical Study. New York, 1916.

Garnett, David. Introduction to Fourteen Stories by Henry James. London, 1946.

Garland, Hamlin. "Henry James at Rye," in Roadside Meetings. New York, 1930.

Gegenheimer, Frank Lloyd. "Early and Late Revisions in Henry James's 'A Passionate Pilgrim,'" AL, XXIII, 233-242 (May 1951).

Gettmann, Royal A. "Henry James's Revisions of The American," AL, XVI, 279-295 (January 1945).

Gibson, W. M. "Metaphor in the Plot of The Ambassadors," NEQ, XXIV, 291-305 (September 1951).

Harvitt, Hélène. "How Henry James Revised 'Roderick Hudson': A Study in Style," PMLA, XXXIX, 203-227 (March 1924).

Havens, Raymond D. "Henry James on One of His Early Stories," AL, XXIII, 131-132 (March 1951).

Havens, Raymond D. "The Revisions of Roderick Hudson," PMLA, XL, 433-434 (June 1925).

The Complete Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. George Parsons Lathrop (Riverside Edition), XI. Boston, 1883.

Passages from the English Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. Sophia P. Hawthorne, I. Boston, 1870.

"Henry James Reprints," TLS, February 5, 1949, p. 96.

Herrick, Robert. "A Visit to Henry James," Yale Review, XII, 724-741 (July 1923).

Howells, William Dean. "Henry James, Jr.," Century, XXV, 25-29 (November 1882).

Howells, William Dean. "Mr. Henry James's Later Work," North American Review, CLXXVI, 125-137 (January 1903). (Reprinted in The Question of Henry James.)

Howells, William Dean. "Mr. James's Masterpiece," Harper's Bazaar, XXXVI, 9-14 (January 1902).

Josephson, Matthew. Introduction, "The Education of Henry James," "A 'Passionate Pilgrim,'" "The Return of Henry James," in Portrait of the Artist as an American. New York, 1930.

Kelley, Cornelia Pulsifer. The Early Development of Henry James (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XV, nos. 1-2). Urbana, 1930.

Kenton, Edna. Introduction to Eight Uncollected Tales of Henry James. New Brunswick, 1950.

Lucas, John Samuel. "Henry James's Revisions of His Short Stories." Chicago, 1948.

Matthiessen, F.O. Introduction to The American Novels and Tales of Henry James. New York, 1947.

Matthiessen, F.O. American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. New York, 1941.

Matthiessen, F.O. Henry James: The Major Phase. New York, 1944.

Matthiessen, F.O. The James Family: Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, Henry, and Alice James. New York, 1948.

McElderry, B.R., Jr. "Hamlin Garland and Henry James," AL, XXIII, 433-446 (January 1952).

McElderry, B.R., Jr. "The Uncollected Stories of Henry James," AL, XXI, 279-291 (November 1949).

McIntyre, Clara F. "The Later Manner of Mr. Henry James," PMLA, XX, 354-371 (April 1912).

Murray, Donald M. "Henry James and the English Reviewers, 1882-1895," AL, XXIV, 1-20 (March 1952).

The Complete Writings of Alfred de Musset, tr. Dr. Edmund Burke Thompson, rev. ed., IV. New York, 1907.

Phillips, LeRoy. A Bibliography of the Writings of Henry James. New York, 1930.

Richardson, Lyon N., ed. Henry James: Representative Selections; with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes (American Writers Series). New York, 1941.

Roberts, Morris. Henry James's Criticism. Cambridge, Mass., 1929.

Sherman, Stuart Pratt. "The Aesthetic Idealism of Henry James," in On Contemporary Literature. New York, 1917. (Reprinted in The Question of Henry James.)

Swan, Michael. Introduction to The Spoils of Poynton, A London Life, The Chaperon. London, 1947.

West, Rebecca. Henry James. London, 1916.

"Why Mr. James 'Revised,'" Literary Digest, XXXIX, 275-276 (August 21, 1909).

Wilson, Edmund. "The Ambiguity of Henry James," in The Triple Thinkers: Ten Essays on Literature. New York, 1938. (Reprinted in The Question of Henry James.)

Young, Robert E. "An Error in The Ambassadors," AL, XXII, 245-253 (November 1950).

Young, Robert E. "A Final Note on The Ambassadors," AL, XXIII, 487-490 (January 1952).

VITA

Name	Robert Adkins Elderdice
Permanent address	21 Welsh Street, Frostburg, Maryland
Degree to be conferred; date	Doctor of Philosophy; January, 1953
Date of birth	January 20, 1918
Place of birth	Salisbury, Maryland
Secondary Education	Wicomico (Salisbury) High, 1929-1934.

Collegiate Institutions attended	Dates	Degree	Date of Degree
State Teachers College at Salisbury	1934-35	----------	Transfer
Western Maryland College	1935-38	A.B.	1938
University of Maryland	1939		
Western Maryland College	1940		
Army University Center No. 1, Shrivenham, England	1945		
Brown University	1946-48	M.A.	1947
University of Maryland 1950-51	1948-49,		

Publications	None	
Positions held	Newsboy. The Salisbury Times.	1929-35
	Packing shed laborer. Quality Products.	1933
	Lumber yard laborer. E. S. Adkins and Co.	1934-37
	Postal employee. Christmas.	1934, 48
	Vacuum cleaner salesman. Airway.	1937
	Hotel employee. Roosevelt, Ocean City, Md.	1938-40

High school teacher.	Howard County	1936-39
High school teacher.	Wicomico "	1939-41
U. S. Army		1941-45
Instructor.	University of Maryland.	1949-51
Instructor.	State Teachers College, Frostburg, Maryland.	1951-