

**References and their Uses:  
Intertexts in the Critical Carpet**

**Maxianne Berger**

**A Thesis  
in  
The Department  
of  
English**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts at  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada**

**May 1996**

**© Maxianne Berger, 1996**



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file    Votre référence*

*Our file    Notre référence*

**The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.**

**L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.**

**The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.**

**L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.**

ISBN 0-612-18375-0

**Canada**

## ABSTRACT

### REFERENCES AND THEIR USES: INTERTEXTS IN THE CRITICAL CARPET

Maxianne Berger

In their meta-literary texts about an author's work or works, critics construct arguments using a variety of texts other than the one they purport to discuss. These "intertexts," by the author under consideration and by others, can be in any genre, fiction or non-fiction, meta-literary or not. Critics identify the intertexts they use in their arguments with various degrees of referencing, from mere allusion to complete bibliographic information. The extent to which critics reference their intertexts serves as an indicator of contemporary institutional practices and assumptions about common cultural knowledge. Using data from forty-seven critical papers published between 1917 and 1990 that address Henry James's meta-critical tale, "The Figure in the Carpet" (1896, 1896, 1909), this thesis classifies the intertexts, considers the deixis of their referencing, and analyzes how and to what purposes twentieth-century critics incorporate these various texts into their arguments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this thesis would not have been possible without the help of a number of people. My first and foremost indebtedness is to my supervisor, Judith Herz, whose questions, quibbles, and comments concerning work in progress helped shape my thinking and its product. But more importantly, I am grateful for her supportiveness when I felt overwhelmed, and for all the encouragement that made me feel this project was worthwhile after all. Each of my readers, in his own way, contributed to orienting my thinking. Robert Philmus pointed me toward discourse analysis and away from neologisms; Eyvind Ronquist guided me towards the rhetoric of argument and supplied the Italian connection. For their ready index fingers, I thank John Gilgun and Robyn Schiffman; for willing legs and eyes, Alan F. Nagel. I salute the memory of Chester Carlson, whose wonderful invention enabled me to retain copies of texts long after I returned the books. Finally, I am grateful to Peter Kom for grumbling solutions to all my software and hardware problems, but mostly and especially, for having the heart to put up with me these long years.

Henry James could still believe that a work of art that must be explained has to some extent failed; our motto seems to be, the more explanation called for, the better.

(Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*)

Il y a plus affaire à interpréter les interprétations qu'à interpréter les choses.

(Montaigne, quoted by Jacques Derrida, *L'Écriture et la Différence*)

"Oh it's all right -- the usual twaddle!"

(Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet*)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION . . . . .                             | 1  |
| 2. | AUTHOR, TEXTS, AND EDITIONS . . . . .              | 7  |
| 3. | OTHER WRITERS: AUTHORS, AUTHORITIES, AND CRITICS . | 33 |
| 4. | THE REPRODUCTION OF CRITICAL TEXTS . . . . .       | 68 |
| 5. | CONCLUSION . . . . .                               | 89 |
|    | ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                   | 94 |

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In the practice of literary scholarship, critics bring to their discussions a variety of texts other than those they purport to address. In this thesis, I analyze a body of twentieth-century critical essays to determine how, why, and to what effect this process occurs. Borrowing the term "intertext" from Julia Kristeva (1969), I label *critical intertexts* all those texts critics draw into their commentaries, whether by citation, reference, or allusion.<sup>1</sup> The actual extent to which critics reference their intertexts serves as an indicator of contemporary institutional practices and assumptions about common cultural knowledge. But by identifying their intertexts, however allusively, critics make the constructions of their arguments transparent, or at least potentially available for the reader. I will focus on the nature of the intertexts and the manner of their referencing both to analyze the structuring of arguments and to explore the development of knowledge and the role played by common cultural assumptions. And through this analysis, I will draft a descriptive "grammar" of critical intertextuality.

---

<sup>1</sup>That I change Kristeva's intended meaning is not unusual. Clayton and Rothstein address the uses of "intertext" by various theorists (1991: 11-25), and Susan Stanford Friedman discusses the very irony in some of the opposition to its "misuse" (1991: 154).

Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, in their essay "Figures in the Corpus" (1991), contrast "influence" and "intertextuality," discussing the histories of the terms as applied by literary theorists to literary texts. They begin with "the generalization that influence has to do with agency, whereas intertextuality has to do with a much more impersonal field of crossing texts" (1991: 4). Where influence is author-centred, intertextuality is reader-centred. In versions of "reader-response," they say:

unless the writer and reader are the same, a given book or idiom that has served to influence the writer can only appear to the reader as intertext, a section of a pattern in terms of which he or she makes sense of what is now read. (Clayton and Rothstein 1991: 16)

Literary scholars are, to a certain extent, professional readers in that one of their work-related activities is to produce verbal records of "readings" for purposes of publication. Whatever the truth of Clayton and Rothstein's dichotomy between "influence" and "intertext," for my analysis of literary criticism I posit that each text weaving its way into a critic's commentary constitutes an intertext, precisely "a section of a pattern in terms of which he or she makes sense of what is now read."

The suggestion that a text is constructed from a variety of other texts is not an original idea. Roland Barthes, in his essay "The Death of the Author," argues for the multiple origins of texts:

We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them



original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. (Barthes [1968] 1977: 146)<sup>2</sup>

Barthes's statement may be more theoretical than practical, but when applied to texts written by literary critics about literary works, I believe its usefulness can be demonstrated. A critical text is "a tissue of quotations," consisting of elements of the literary text it purports to be *about*, and elements of other texts which the critic uses for specific purposes. Critics use certain intertexts to illustrate their arguments about the text or about textuality, to organize their approach, and to contextualize their thinking either generally or locally.

Jerome McGann states emphatically in *The Textual Condition* that "ALL TEXTS ARE PRODUCED OVER TIME AND UNDER VARYING CIRCUMSTANCES." He immediately adds that "ALL TEXTS ARE SOCIALLY AND HISTORICALLY RELATIVE, INCLUDING ALL META-TEXTS SUCH AS SCHOLARLY COMMENTARIES AND EDITIONS" (1991: 93; original capitals).<sup>3</sup>

Applying McGann's ideas about historicizing to the concept of intertext, I hypothesize that the intertexts used by critics in their scholarly papers reflect the historical circumstances within which these critical papers were produced, and that these

---

<sup>2</sup>Kristeva ascribes primacy in this type of thinking to Bakhtin, explaining: "Tout texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte" (Kristeva 1969: 146).

<sup>3</sup>The section of McGann's paper I quote here was composed on April 9, 1985. The entire text was to be delivered orally at a conference of the Society for Textual Scholarship (McGann 1991: 88, 91, 93).

intertexts and their manner of presentation "are historically and socially relative."

The simple truism is that texts can only become intertexts for a professional reader when they become readily available, that is, published.<sup>4</sup> There is, as well, a practical projection of McGann's assertion in my own text. I foreground, in my referencing, the dates of publication of the texts I mention. Wherever feasible, I have returned to the original venues of the texts I discuss. I note the original date of publication where I have been unable to obtain the book or academic journal containing the original. When a major discrepancy between the date of production and the date of first publication of a text is known to exist, I note the information. I note my sources' sources, documenting venues and dates. The effect I hope to achieve through attention to this detail is twofold. Firstly, certain critical practices involving intertexts show up repeatedly; I present illustrations chronologically, and the dates tacitly inform my readers of a certain continuity. Secondly, the availability of some intertexts and the uses to which they are put can be time-sensitive; my dating the texts sets them into their relative historical positions with respect to each other and to my readers' knowledge of changing critical practice. Nor do I ignore the presence and absence of like details in the critical texts I examine: critics do not always locate the works they cite in time and in context, and I address the implications of non-referencing.

---

<sup>4</sup>The obvious exception is when a scholar has access to archival material and manuscripts.

An analysis of twentieth-century literary criticism threatens to be unwieldy, even when restricted to an analysis of critical intertexts. Anyone carrying out such a study might also be accused of choosing texts to analyze by how well these texts illustrate the analyst's preconceived ideas. To avoid these pitfalls, I have confined my own study to forty-seven critical readings of one tale by Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet* (1896; 1896; 1909). These papers thus constitute a *sample* of twentieth-century criticism, included in my study through an external selection process.<sup>5</sup> The restriction I have imposed upon myself serves to limit the scope of my analysis by making it more manageable, but I derive other benefits as well. Notwithstanding the several versions of James's tale, I can suggest that differences between the criticisms reflect deictic aspects of the critic and not of the text. I can discern the tale's critical tradition and in particular examine how and why critics refer to each other. Critical texts, too, exist in more than one version, and I examine some of the implications of their reproduction.

I wish to underline that my own study is not a reading of James's tale, nor does it consider the rightness or wrongness of the critical readings I examine. Just as the works of Hugh Vereker are an absent referent for readers of "The Figure in the Carpet," so James's tale serves as the absent referent for this analysis. That parallelism, however, is serendipitous: any set of critical papers spanning the same period of time should lead to similar conclusions. There is an historical component to

---

<sup>5</sup>The references to these essays are in a separate section of the bibliography. I explain there how I generated the list.

my methodology, and the papers in the sample, all critical receptions of one text, might be seen as the "arbitrary points of time" proposed by Hans Robert Jauss for "cross-section analyses" (Jauss 1974: 35). But my project is not within the realm of *rezeptionskritik* in that my analysis is form-oriented rather than content-oriented.

Terry Eagleton's discussion of zoology textbooks parallels my concerns:

Reading a zoology textbook to find out about giraffes is part of studying zoology, but reading it to see how its discourse is structured and organized, and examining what kind of effects these forms and devices produce in particular readers in actual situations, is a different kind of project. (Eagleton 1983: 205)

Adapting Eagleton's distinction to my own project, I am interested neither in James's tale nor in its critics' conclusions. *The Figure in the Carpet* is my study's independent variable, its critics' intertexts the dependent variables. And time, place, and argument serve as the parameters that most affect how these intertexts manifest themselves, through the manner and extent of their referencing. Although my own project is not so sharply subdivided, in Chapter 2, "Author, Texts, and Editions," I consider the presence of the primary text and other texts by the author in critical analyses; in Chapter 3, "Other Writers: Authors, Authorities, and Critics," I address the involvement of texts by others; and in Chapter 4, "The Reproduction of Critical Texts," I comment on deictic changes in the essays as they are reproduced in new venues. I am concerned with classifying the texts literary critics bring into their discussions, examining how they reference them, and analyzing how they use them in critical discourse.

## CHAPTER 2

### AUTHOR, TEXTS, AND EDITIONS

Critics construct arguments about texts from texts. A privileged group of texts within these discussions are those by the target authors themselves. In my analysis of essays concerning James's "The Figure in the Carpet," I will address two issues: the problem of textual variants in versions of "The Figure in the Carpet"; and the use of other James texts, primarily his Prefaces to the New York Edition.

The works of James have been published in a variety of editions, and there are three sets of recognized "texts": the originals published in magazines, the versions James edited for initial book publication, and those revised for Scribner's New York Edition.<sup>1</sup> In the case of "The Figure in the Carpet," the first version of its text appears in *Cosmopolis*<sup>2</sup> (Jan.-Feb., 1896), and was made more generally available in *Embarrassments* (also 1896). The "definitive" (1909) version of the text appears in volume XV of Scribner's *The Novels and Tales of Henry James* (1907-09), a collection commonly known as the New York Edition (NYE). Publishers and editors

---

<sup>1</sup>"Glasses" (1896) was revised for the Uniform Tales of Henry James (London: Martin Secker, 1916).

<sup>2</sup>*Cosmopolis* was a trilingual literary journal. James's tale was serialized in its first two issues.

of subsequent editions claim *Embarrassments* or the NYE as their copy text. For many years, though, critics had limited access to the original in *Embarrassments*. The 1896 book text of "The Figure in the Carpet" is made available to general readership again in 1964, in volume nine of Leon Edel's chronological edition of *The Complete Tales of Henry James*. Edel chose "the original book form of the story where there was one." He explains:

In that form it had the benefit of revision from magazine to volume; and in that form it was best known to James's generation. It seemed to the editor that in a chronological edition of James's shorter fictions, the New York Edition texts had no relevance. (Edel 1964: 443)

Not only does Edel make available the original book text, he argues for its preference in certain kinds of studies, however minimal the textual variants may be.

Maqbool Aziz has a different view of what was "best known to James's generation." In his edition of the magazine versions, he claims these were better known to James's contemporaries because:

In the first decade of his career, James did not publish any volume and was known to his contemporaries as a writer of magazine stories and novels. He continued to reach a wider audience through magazines even after his work began to be reprinted in book editions, simply because the magazines had a much larger circulation than any of his collections or book editions. (Aziz 1973: xxiii, n. 15)

Aziz's edition of the magazine versions, which includes collations of variants, is still incomplete. The volume to contain "The Figure in the Carpet" has not yet been published. For most studies, critics have had to choose between the 1896 text in

*Embarrassments* and the 1909 text from the NYE. With few exceptions, however, critics rarely evidence any awareness of there being several texts.

Only two critics even mention *Cosmopolis*.<sup>3</sup> Before Edel's edition of the original book version (1964), most critics use the 1909 text for research and quotations; some critics use the 1909 text, but indicate the 1896 date when identifying the tale.<sup>4</sup> The availability of Edel's edition does not eliminate this practice.<sup>5</sup> In some kinds of studies, there might be reasons for choosing one text over another. Mark Kanzer, for example, psychoanalyzes characters in "The Figure in the Carpet," and maps them to James's family situation around the time he wrote the tale, that is, 1896 (1960: 344). But the text Kanzer uses is that of 1909 (in *Stories* [1944]). Wolfgang Iser ([1976] 1978), without explaining his choice of text, uses the 1896 book version (*Complete Tales* 9 [1964]). There may be no variants with the 1909 text in the parts he quotes, but the 1896 text he uses is more appropriate to his project. Iser discusses "The Figure in the Carpet" in terms of what it reveals about the critical approach to

---

<sup>3</sup>These are Labrie (1969: 161) and Rimmon (1973: 199).

<sup>4</sup>E.g. Kanzer (1960: 344, 348); Lainoff (1961: 40, 41-42); and Powers (1961: 224, 226). Kanzer does not identify the text he uses or provide page numbers for quotations from the tale. He quotes from and references Matthiessen's introduction to *Stories of Writers and Artists* (Kanzer 344, 348). I assume he uses the text of "Figure" as it appears in that book.

<sup>5</sup>These include van Cromphout (1968: 139); Lock (1981: 159, 160); and Cornis-Pope (1990: 250, 264). Lock even claims the "final version of the text" was published in 1896 (159).

literature at the end of the nineteenth century. A 1909 text would have a subtle effect on the credibility of arguments concerning the emergence of a new approach to criticism at the end of the nineteenth century. Following Iser, M. A. Williams (1984) and Samuel Weber (1986) use the same edition,<sup>6</sup> but their choice is preferable for different reasons. The central subject of their papers is Iser's reading of James's tale. There are two good reasons to choose the same text used by Iser, one practical, the other scholarly. The practical one, of course, is to be able to locate quickly the quotations Iser uses in his criticism. The scholarly one is to address the analysis and reception of a text by a critic by using that same text. I do not assert that these critics had in mind any of the reasons conjectured, in that none of the three critics explains his choice of text. I do suggest, however, that regardless of possible variants, it makes sense to use a late-nineteenth-century text when addressing how late-nineteenth-century issues manifest themselves through it; and it makes sense to address another "reader's" response to a text through the same text.

In all likelihood, though, most critics would simply be choosing as does Hélène Cixous, on the basis of the text's "commodité" (1970: 35). Cixous's choices are of course limited to what is available in French translation, a situation with a

---

<sup>6</sup>The edition Weber uses can only be determined by the page numbers given for quoted material in section IV of his essay. In section III, quotations from "The Figure in the Carpet" are those from Iser's introduction, and the page numbers given refer to Iser, not James. When Weber initiates his own discussion of James's tale, he does not reference the book he uses, but page numbers provided correspond to Edel's 1964 edition.



different set of textual problems.<sup>7</sup> Among the essays in English, only three critics consider textual variants.<sup>8</sup> Warren Johnson (1988) comments on his choice of text and informs readers he has checked for variants. He addresses both "The Figure in the Carpet" and *The Portrait of a Lady*. For the former, he uses a version of the original 1896 text. For the latter, Johnson notes:

Some critics have preferred the Houghton Mifflin Edition (Boston, 1882), because this preserves James's early style. However, while James made many stylistic changes and substantive additions to several passages from the 1882 edition when he revised the novel for the New York Edition, the passages I cite in this study remained largely untouched except for several minor stylistic changes. (1988: 238 n. 5)

The "several minor stylistic changes" do not affect Johnson's discussion of *The Portrait of a Lady*. As he chooses the 1896 book version of "The Figure in the Carpet," one assumes any revisions in the NYE do not contribute to his argument either. Such variants are important, though, in the analyses of Gerald Sweeney (1983) and Shlomith Rimmon (1973).

Sweeney's thesis statement is that "it is indirectly suggested in the tale that Gwendolen Erme murders her mother, or she permits her to die" (1983: 79). He first documents his arguments with textual variants from two editions of "Figure," that in *Embarrassments* (1896) and that in the NYE whose precise date he does not give,

---

<sup>7</sup>Pontalis considers the effects of translation, if not version. Bolstering his argument with the English from an unspecified source, he states, "Le texte anglais est ici plus fort et plus explicite" (1958: 1687, n. 5).

<sup>8</sup>These are Rimmon (1973), Sweeney (1983), and Johnson (1988).

vaguely referring to the text "as it later appeared--decidedly stronger and more cryptic--in the New York Edition" (1983: 83). Sweeney documents his claim about the implication of the changes through carefully dated entries from James's notebooks: 24 October 1895 and 4 November 1895 (Sweeney 1983: 83-4). Restoring chronology to Sweeney's sources, one finds the absence of an idea, its emergence, its early manifestation, and its later strengthening. For the notebook entries, Sweeney refers to F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock's edition of *The Notebooks of Henry James* (1947). For versions of "Figure," he uses Macmillan's original edition of *Embarrassments* (1896) and Norton's (1958) edition of James's 1909 text. Sweeney's documentation shows a progression. It also shows how literary critics must trust those who reproduce texts. Sweeney relies on Matthiessen and Murdock's accuracy in correctly providing the original dates and texts of James's notebook entries, and on all typesetters for accurately reproducing the texts.

The example of Rimmon (1973) shows how publication information in the reproduction of texts can mislead even the very careful researcher. Rimmon shows an actual about-face in which a negative verb form becomes affirmative. She discusses Vereker's refusal "to tell the narrator what he believes the 'exquisite scheme' (p. 282) to be." Within her argument, Rimmon quotes Vereker: "'I do it in my way ... You don't do it in yours' (p. 284)" (Rimmon 1973: 198-99).<sup>9</sup> This quotation is fully footnoted as to the extant textual variants concerning these very words. These variants can easily alter the interpretation:

---

<sup>9</sup>Page numbers refer to *Complete Tales* 9 (1964; Edel's edition).

This version is based, as Leon Edel tells us, on the first book-form of the tale, appearing in a collection of James's stories under the title *Embarrassments* (London, 1896). The acknowledgment in *Embarrassments* says that the stories in the collection were reprinted from the original magazine-version--in the case of "The Figure in the Carpet," from *Cosmopolis*, January-February 1896.

The New-York Edition (Volume XV, 1909) has it differently: "I do it my way [...] Go you and don't do it in yours" (p. 234).

In a collection of James's' [sic] stories of artists edited by F. O. Matthiessen and entitled *Henry James: Stories of Writers and Artists* (New York: New Directions, 1956), the line reads: "I do it in my way [...] Go you and do it in yours" (p. 289)--which makes better sense than the other two versions. The acknowledgment says: "The texts used are those of the Revised Editions, as published by Scribner's in 1907-1917 and Macmillan (London, 1921-1923", 35 volumes).

The line retains the same form in Michael Swan's edition (1948), but he does not say on what version he based his decision. He mentions *Embarrassments*, says that the stories printed in his edition "comprise Vol. XV of the New York edition of 1909," but does not say whether his text is based on any of these or on another source. (Rimmon 1973: 199, n. 43; original ellipses)<sup>10</sup>

Rimmon provides her readers with textual variants and their venues in chronological order. Her subsequent argument, opposing the ways of artist and critic, subtly relies on the removal of the negation:

---

<sup>10</sup>The New Directions book Rimmon refers to was first published in 1944. The text Rimmon quotes from the 1956 edition is the same as the text in the original edition which I refer to in my discussion.

The artist's way is intuitive, imaginative, inventive; the critic's way, on the other hand, is analytical, interpretative, elucidatory; and the artist is neither willing nor equipped to perform the critic's task. (1973: 199)

That is, the artist is not willing to do the critic's task, but does want the critic to: "Go you and do it in yours." Rimmon's comment, that the line in Matthiessen's collection "makes better sense than the other two versions," gives credibility to that particular phrasing, as if it were James's final intention to have it that way.

Matthiessen's collection, *Stories of Writers and Artists* (1944), gives the stories' original dates parenthetically in his table of contents, and the 1907-1917 Scribner's dates and the 1921-1923 Macmillan dates in specifying the revised versions used in his edition. But claiming that a particular text has been copied does not mean it has been copied without error. In this case, as I will show, the error lies not with Matthiessen and New Directions, but with Macmillan. This can be a problem for those critics who attend to textual variants.

The "Acknowledgment" in *Stories of Writers and Artists* (1944) explains that Matthiessen has used the texts of the "Revised Editions" -- written with initial capitals. The Scribner's publications of 1907-1917, the ones Matthiessen calls "Revised," constitute the NYE. That James made extensive revisions for the NYE is well documented (cf Philip Horne 1990). Matthiessen's "Revised Editions" are in fact the lower-case "r", revised texts of the NYE, which texts were used by Macmillan when they produced their own "New and Complete Edition" of *The Novels and Stories of Henry James* between 1921 and 1923. "According to the advertisement:

The text used in this issue is that of the 'New York' edition, and the critical prefaces written for that series are retained in the volumes to which they refer. While however, many stories were omitted from the 'New York' edition, . . . the present edition contains all the fiction that he published in book-form during his life. (Quoted in Edel and Dan H. Laurence 1982: 167; my ellipses)

It was clearly the intention of the Macmillan publishers to reproduce the text of the NYE for those novels and tales that previously appeared there. They do not, however, use original sheets or original plates to make new sheets. The sentence in question, in Macmillan (1922) reads: "'I do it in my way,' he continued. 'Go you and do it in yours.'" It is printed near the top of recto page 211. The New York Edition's "Figure" (1909), in very different typeface, has its version, with "don't," on verso page 234, two thirds of the way down. The omission of "don't" in Macmillan (1922) is clearly a substantive typesetting error which has since been reproduced in a number of subsequent editions.

Another intermediate edition of *The Figure in the Carpet* further supports the probability of a typesetting error by Macmillan. In September, 1916, Martin Secker's version of *Figure* as part of the Uniform Edition of the Tales of Henry James constitutes the last published version in which James himself was involved. James's concern for the preservation of the text of the NYE is evident in his correspondence on the subject, as reported by Edel and Laurence:

The edition was published with James's sanction "on [Secker's] distinct understanding, please, that he conform literatim and punctuatim to [the New York Edition] text. It is vital that he adhere to that authentic

punctuation--to the last comma or rather, more essentially, no-comma."  
 (Unpublished letter, HJ to J. B. Pinker, 11 September 1914, in the  
 Yale University Library.) (Edel and Laurence 1982: 155)

The first eight tales of the series were published prior to James's death in February, 1916. The Secker edition of *Figure* appeared seven months later, and had not been proofread by James. An examination of the book itself, however, shows that as far as the passage in question is concerned, James's insistence on following the NYE to the letter has been scrupulously adhered to. In the Secker edition, Vereker tells the narrator, "I do it in my way, . . . Go *you* and don't do it in yours" (25).<sup>11</sup> The missing "don't" in the Macmillan edition is not intended by the author.

The textual variant distinguishes between a source in *Embarrassments* (1896),<sup>12</sup> in the NYE (1909), or in the Macmillan edition (1922). It can thus be used as an indicator of any version's genesis. As such, Michael Swan's 1948 edition uses Macmillan 1922, or a text based on Macmillan 1922, as its copy text. Matthiessen's "Acknowledgment," because it has "Revised Editions" with capital initials, creates the illusion that there is a "Revised Edition" published by Scribner's (1907-1917) that is distinct from the NYE.<sup>13</sup> Rimmon's argument rests on a

---

<sup>11</sup>All italics within quotations are in the original, unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>12</sup>An examination of *Embarrassments* (1896: 19) shows that Edel's edition of "The Figure in the Carpet" in volume 9 of *Complete Tales* accurately reproduces the sentence in question from the early source (1964: 284).

<sup>13</sup>James's New York Edition consists of twenty-four volumes published between 1907 and 1909. The 1917 date was added when, posthumously, Scribner's added two

typesetting error. Given the awkwardness of the original construction -- possibly ironic --, such an error is not surprising. It has, in fact, been made elsewhere.

Dorothy Boland (1977), in her orientalist reading of "Figure," claims that, "[w]hile James was not necessarily a Hindu mystic, he does demonstrate in this story a shared perception with oriental thought" (1977: 424). She argues, concerning "Figure," that "[e]ach character has his own particular role by the necessity of his karmic development" (1977: 425). To support this view, Boland compares words spoken by the character Vereker to those of James himself. For Vereker, Boland uses the very same words Rimmon has shown to vary from one version to another.

When Vereker tells the narrator, "I do it in my way....Go *you* and do it in yours" (234), he is, in fact, imparting the "exquisite scheme" (231).

Each character has his own particular role by the necessity of his karmic development. (Boland 1977: 425)

Boland's page numbers refer to the Scribner's NYE. But on page 234 of that edition, the phrase includes the negation: "Go *you* and don't do it in yours." The negative construction in the original phrasing might not have suited Boland's argument, or it might not have mattered. But a reader who looks up the original quotation in the reference Boland provides, and who is not aware of textual variants, may conclude that Boland has altered the original text to suit her argument. One is left to wonder whether she or her typesetter misread the sentence, as did Macmillan's, or whether she has used one text for her research and another for her copy without carefully

---

volumes James had not intended for the project. These were edited by Percy Lubbock.

checking for substantive differences. Both the writer of "Henry James Reprints," an article in the *Times Literary Supplement* (1949), and Aziz (1968) warn critics about the dangers to interpretation when variants in James's fiction are not considered.<sup>14</sup> The problems, as I have shown, can be compounded by inexact publishers's acknowledgments and typesetting errors. Boland's textual problems, however, do not end there.

As previously stated, Boland compares the words of Vereker to those of James himself. Boland quotes from an unidentified source she references, in a footnote, as "Henry James, *The Art of the Novel* (New York, 1934), p. 201" (Boland 1977: 425). It is a "given" that readers will know *The Art of the Novel* to be the collection of Prefaces. One must go to R. P. Blackmur's edition to identify the Preface in question as that to *Lady Barbarina*; one must return to volume XIV of the NYE to find out that the Preface, and a revised "Lady Barbarina," were first published in 1908.<sup>15</sup> Had Boland been curious about "Lady Barbarina"'s original publication date, she would have found the text she consulted wanting: James (or Scribner's typesetter) places it in 1888, when both the magazine and book versions were published in 1884.<sup>16</sup> The detail is perhaps minor, but inclusion of accurate dates, original

---

<sup>14</sup>Aziz indicates that the *TLS* article is by Simon Nowell-Smith (1973: xviii, n. 5)

<sup>15</sup>The Preface was published the year it was written. Horne's study indicates that James posted the Preface to Scribner's on May 20, 1908 (1990: 347).

<sup>16</sup>The error has significance because of how James contextualizes it: "I have placed this composition ["Lady Barbarina"] (1888) at the top of my list, in the present cluster, despite the earlier date of some of its companions" (NYE 14, 1908: x; *The*



context, and textual variants would have complicated Boland's argument. It is more probable that like many other critics, she never considered them.

All texts exist in the present of a critic's writing. When critics reference the texts from which they quote, the date of publication of the book consulted can be the only date to appear in the critic's essay. Dorothea Krook (1988) identifies the texts she discusses as "the famous ambiguous stories" and locates them in "James's late-middle and late periods" (1988: 300).<sup>17</sup> In her paper, she mentions "*The Lesson of the Master*, *The Figure in the Carpet*, *The Turn of the Screw*, *The Sacred Fount*, and *The Golden Bowl*" (1988: 300). She gives no publication dates. She quotes from the Preface to *The Turn of the Screw*, from *The Figure in the Carpet*, and from the Preface to *The Figure in the Carpet* (1988: 302, 304, and 312). The original publication dates, not given in Krook's paper, are 1908, 1896, and 1909 respectively. There is no indication in her paper as to whether she is using an 1896 or the 1909 version of *The Figure in the Carpet*. Any reader of Krook's text presumably knows these dates without needing to be told, because her bibliography refers readers to books published in 1984 (rpt. 1986), 1956, and 1985 (Krook 1988: 315). Krook's

---

*Art of the Novel*, 1934: 203). If "Lady Barbarina" had been published in 1888 rather than 1884, it still seems no reason to comment because the other tales in the volume appear out of chronology anyway: "Lady Barbarina" (1884) is followed by "The Siege of London" (1883), "An International Episode" (1878-9), "The Pension Beaurepas" (1879), "A Bundle of Letters" (1879), and "The Point of View" (1882), in that order.

<sup>17</sup>Krook's paper was originally presented at a conference in 1986.

referencing illustrates a frequent occurrence in James criticism: critics locate the words they quote with varying degrees of detail concerning when James wrote them and in what context. One must assume that despite this referencing practice, critics do not betray James's intended meanings or erase any chronological development in his thinking. The issue of James's Prefaces, as they appear in Boland's and Krook's essays, illustrates a common practice among critics: the use, in their arguments, of other texts by the same author, and the manner in which quotations are attributed.

Contemporary theorists question the notion of "author" in a reader-based approach to texts. In practice, though, the construct "author" establishes a privileged set of texts, a super-text within which literary critics approach any given text by an author. That is, in critical analyses, all texts sharing the intelligence that shaped them can and do serve as witnesses concerning any other text the author has produced. The critics of James's "The Figure in the Carpet" cite his other fictional works, his critical works about others, his analyses of his own texts, his notebooks, his letters, and his miscellaneous prose. Through the time frame of the critical texts I examine, scholars edit and publish books that reproduce James's writings, and critics cite these texts in their arguments.<sup>18</sup> Critics do not read one text by an author in isolation.

---

<sup>18</sup>Beach (1918) quotes extensively from the New York Edition of James's works, both the fiction itself and the Prefaces. Blanche quotes from a letter James wrote to his brother William from Geneva in 1888 (Blanche 1928: 149-50). Blanche does not reference the work from which he obtained the text of the letter, but it is likely Lubbock's edition of *The Letters of Henry James* (1920), a compilation from which Blackmur also quotes (1943: 617). Matthiessen and Murdock's edition of *The*

What occurs in the criticisms of James's tale serves as a concrete example of Michel Foucault's assertion. The author's name

performs a certain role with regard to narrative discourse, assuring a classificatory function. Such a name permits one to group together a certain number of texts, define them, differentiate them from and contrast them to others. In addition, it establishes a relationship among the texts. ([1969] 1979: 147)

The discourse of the James critics in the sample acts out Foucault's observation.<sup>19</sup> A corollary to this is that anything and everything an author has written can be used in a critical paper, and in this sample, most critics, regardless of approach, make use of whatever authorial *bons mots* happen to help their arguments.<sup>20</sup> Quotations from

---

*Notebooks of Henry James* (1947) is available for Westbrook (1953: 136). Lainoff (1961: 125) avails himself of Wade's collection of James's dramatic criticism, *The Scenic Art* (1957). Shapira's *Henry James: Selected Literary Criticism* (1968 [1963]), a collection of articles by James that first appeared between 1865 and 1914, provides Rimmon with a useful paragraph (1977: 45). James E. Miller, Jr.'s edition, *Theory of Fiction: Henry James* (1972), reproduces a letter James wrote to Hugh Walpole in 1913. Sweeney includes part of it in his conclusion (1983: 85).

<sup>19</sup>Even Pelham Edgar, whose "criticism" merely summarizes the tale, does so within the context of James's other tales in "The Literary and Artistic Group" (1927: 166).

<sup>20</sup>I take the liberty of labelling the critical approach of a number of critics, and present the following catalogue. Blackmur is associated with the New Criticism. His article includes references to other fiction by James, the Prefaces, and Lubbock's edition of James's letters (1943: 597, 604, 617. e.g.). Kanzer's approach is psychoanalytic. He uses James's exchange of letters with H. G. Wells and refers to

various editions of James's fiction and non-fiction -- the Prefaces to the NYE, his notebooks, his letters, as they have been published -- are ubiquitous in the sample of critical texts. The decision to use what James has said elsewhere, to provide analogies or suggest relatedness, is independent of critical approach.

Although I will allude in passing to why certain critics call on particular texts, my concern in the following discussion is how critics place the texts they cite within the time line of the author's oeuvre, and how they identify the context of the words they quote. James's novels and tales are not his only writings to exist in various versions. The difference is that many of his non-fiction texts have been published or compiled only after his death. The reproduction of texts in new venues, with and

---

other stories by James (1960: 340-1, 347, e.g.). Todorov's approach is Structuralist. He refers to other fiction by James, and quotes from a letter and the Prefaces ([1969] 1973: 76, 78, 79). Boland's analysis examines the orientalism in James's tale. She refers to other tales for references to the East, and to the Prefaces for passages analogous to verbalizations of karmic law (1977: 425, 429). Miller's discussion is Post-Structuralist. He links to "The Figure in the Carpet" a passage from the Preface to *Roderick Hudson* (1980: 107-8). Part of Sweeney's argument involves genetic criticism. He uses entries in James's notebooks and two versions of the tale to support his argument (1983: 83-4). Halter uses Lacan as his theoretical intertext. To support his ideas about James's approach to narrative, he quotes from a letter James wrote to Mrs. Humphry Ward (Halter 1984: 28). Using Speech-Act Theory, Szegedy-Maszák refers to other fiction, the notebooks and the Prefaces (1984: 233-4, 236, 237, e.g.). Finally, Cornis-Pope reports on a Reader Response experiment involving his students' reception of James's tale. Quotations from the Prefaces and James's notebooks appear in his discussion (1990: 251, 251-2).

without changes by the text's producer, leads to subtle changes in the identification of that text's original context. One outcome is that critics do not always identify that context when quoting. The absence of original dates in referencing could be due to a number of variables. For one, referencing rules require identification of the book's coordinates, but not the text's. In some cases, the critic may assume the reading audience knows when the text was produced and needs no reminder. A third possibility may be the critic's supposition that the text exists as an entity outside of time, making its cultural origins irrelevant. I will explore critics' use of "outside" texts by the author with particular attention to the Prefaces James wrote for the NYE.

Blackmur's edition of James's critical Prefaces, *The Art of the Novel* (1934) is a handy reference book for James scholars, certainly more accessible than the twenty-four initial volumes of the NYE. Blackmur's introduction to the Prefaces was first published in *Hound & Horn* (1934a).<sup>21</sup> At the end of his article in that venue, Blackmur indirectly anticipates this eventual accessibility: he expresses his "deep obligation to Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons for the loan of a set of The New York Edition, without which it would have been impossible for me to compose this essay in any ease" (*H&H* 477). In moving the Prefaces to *The Art of the Novel*, Blackmur has attempted to keep contextual information available. Prefaces do not appear in every volume of the NYE. Therefore, the chapter numbers in *The Art of the Novel* do not

---

<sup>21</sup>I discuss Blackmur's essay in two venues, both published in 1934. To facilitate my readers' recognition of the version I mean, I will add to my local identification "H&H" for the article in *Hound & Horn*, and "Art" for the introduction to *The Art of the Novel*. The essay is also reprinted in Blackmur's *The Double Agent* (1935).

correspond to volume numbers. A heading in each chapter indicates the NYE volume number and names the works discussed. Within each Preface, James identifies which work he is discussing and provides some publication history, though as I have indicated when discussing Boland (1977), James's dates are not always accurate.

In his essay about the Prefaces, Blackmur goes out of his way to provide original contextual information, the exception being the actual publication date of any particular volume of the Scribner's series. Blackmur gives his readers the Scribner's volume number: "for possible convenience in reference I append the numbers and titles of those volumes which contain Prefaces" (*H&H* 457; *Art* xix). Blackmur is careful to indicate which work James is addressing when quoting from a Preface. Initially, he names which work a quotation concerns: "'To criticize,' he [James] wrote in the Preface to *What Maisie Knew*,..." (*H&H* 445; *Art* viii). Later, when discussing major themes, Blackmur references quoted material by volume and page number. The page number changes, though, from the roman numeral pagination of the NYE to the arabic numeral of *The Art of the Novel* when Blackmur's essay moves there from *Hound & Horn*. That is, in *Hound & Horn* where there are no Prefaces, the full reference is to the outside work: e.g. "In X (p.xix), speaking of 'A London Life'" (*H&H* 457). In *Art of the Novel*, where the Prefaces are reproduced, Blackmur alters the system. He identifies the original Scribner's volume number in roman numerals and the arabic page number of the quotation where it appears in the book itself: "In X (p. 132), speaking of 'A London Life,'" (*Art* xix). This care in referencing may be

due to the fact that the essay focuses on the Prefaces themselves. He himself does not exercise the same attention to detail when looking primarily at another text.

When Blackmur writes about "The Figure in the Carpet," he refers to the Prefaces, and although he indicates the actual work of concern when introducing a quotation, it is not otherwise referenced by volume, page number, or original date of publication. Two examples from Blackmur's article, "In the Country of the Blue" (1943),<sup>22</sup> can serve to illustrate the effects of the omissions on his constructed arguments. In the preamble to specific discussions about various tales, "The Figure in the Carpet," "The Private Life," "The Death of the Lion," "The Next Time," and "The Lesson of the Master," Blackmur quotes from a passage apparently written about only the final one: "I give part of the answer as he made it in the preface to *The Lesson of the Master*" (1943: 604). The relationship between *Lesson* and the other tales is not evident, but except for "The Private Life," all are in the same volume. A bibliographic reference would establish this physical relationship and

---

<sup>22</sup>It is interesting to compare the referencing styles of the two essays because they were likely written around the same time despite the nine years between their publications. The "Editors' Note" in *Modern Language Studies* (13.4 [Fall 1983]: 3) states that "In the Country of the Blue," published for the first time in the 1943 *Kenyon Review*, was "a holdover from the *Hound and Horn* issue of 1934." The Blackmur article that actually appears in the 1934 *Hound & Horn* is "The Critical Prefaces," the essay that serves as the introduction to *The Art of the Novel* (1934). Although Blackmur may have revised "Country" prior to its publication in 1943, it was written before his edition of the Prefaces and its introduction were published in 1934.

suggest an intertextual link, one which exists in fact. Blackmur has abstracted "part of the answer" from a discussion in which James answers "to the charge that he ought never to have exhibited in art creatures who never existed in life" (Blackmur 1943: 604). But Blackmur does not give James's own list of these types, "my Neil Paradays [from 'The Death of the Lion'], my Ralph Limberts [from 'The Next Time'], and my Hugh Verekers [from 'Figure']" (James NYE 15, 1909: ix). Without any of this contextual information, Blackmur's readers cannot fully appreciate the value of the testimony because he presents it as being about *The Lesson of the Master*.

Time, too, is a contextual aspect which remains unstated when there are no bibliographic references. Blackmur cites another passage from the Preface,<sup>23</sup> indicating that James's words are about "Figure." Blackmur introduces the quotation with the comment, "In his prefatory remarks, James does nothing to help" (1943: 609). In this case, by not providing historic references, Blackmur has obscured the temporal relationship between the writing of "Figure" and that of its "prefatory remarks" many years later. Although Blackmur considers that James's words in his Preface do "nothing to help" in his own critical concern of the moment, one could also consider that the Preface, because it is written in retrospect, is itself a controlled pose on the part of the author. One critic sees a problem in this retrospect. Perry Westbrook (1953) addresses the discrepancy he sees between the Preface and the tale:

James there [in the Preface] implies that "The Figure in the Carpet" is a fable for the critics--a plea for more intelligent analysis and

---

<sup>23</sup>Though without bibliographic referencing, it is not clear it is the same Preface.



understanding of serious novels. If this actually was his intention, then he has failed wretchedly. (1953: 137)

Westbrook supports this argument by pointing out the temporal relationship between the texts in his conclusion:

This interpretation need not be rejected because it goes counter to much of what James seems to say--for his expression is muddy--in his Preface. The story was published in 1896, the Preface in 1909. (1953: 140)

Both Blackmur and Westbrook identify discrepancies between the tale and what James says about it, but only Westbrook considers how the temporal relationship between texts affects critical interpretation. It seems critics, having all texts by an author available simultaneously, can practice the art of criticism with a sort of godlike omniscience. All the author has ever said being available at the same time, the author's words would constitute a super-work which can be quoted without attention to when, where, and why. As such, the original date is not the only bit of information critics omit. The subjects of James's comments are also frequently elided, James having said something being warrant enough to invoke the words.

Where partial bibliographic information conceals relevance and/or irrelevance of quoted material, some critics provide no reference at all. Jane P. Tompkins, in the introduction to her anthology of critical articles about James's shorter forms, discusses the author's attitude towards them:

James referred to the form as the "blest *nouvelle*," because while it demanded economy, it gave him room to develop the possibilities of his subject. Accordingly, he distinguished the *nouvelle* from the

"anecdote" or short story, which, he felt, narrowly restricted the range of imaginative exploration. (1970: 4)

The quotation marks imply she is using James's own words. Tompkins's readers, however, either have to "know" that her sources are in Prefaces to *The Lesson of the Master* and *The Middle Years*, or accept her take on James's words without any indication of where or when he said them about what. Similarly, Rachel Salmon (1980), when talking about "Figure," states:

Interestingly enough, James employs an unnamed first-person narrator-- a technique he elsewhere disparages because of "the terrible *fluidity* of self-revelation." (1980: 794)

Information concerning Salmon's "elsewhere," where and when James says this, and about what, seem irrelevant to Salmon's argument from her perspective. She does not provide readers the opportunity of evaluating for themselves whether and how statements made in 1909 concerning *The Ambassadors* (1903; rev. 1909) can provide testimony about "Figure."<sup>24</sup>

The exclusion and inclusion of references change a text, and I illustrate the effects of these differences with the following passage from the 1977 version of Tzvetan Todorov's essay on James's tale, "The Secret of Narrative":

---

<sup>24</sup>Without Rosemary Franklin's *Index to Henry James's Prefaces to the New York Edition* (1966), the task of establishing these critics' sources would be impossible. Only intimate knowledge with all of James's writings or a general concordance, however, would identify the exact reference for one of Blackmur's statements concerning James: "As he said of one of his characters in another connection, he was copious with faith" (1943: 596).

James was particularly fond of this indirect vision, "that magnificent and masterly indirection," as he calls it in a letter, and had taken his exploration of the method to considerable lengths. Here is how he himself describes his work: "I must add indeed that such as the Moreens were, or as they may at present incoherently appear, I don't pretend really to have 'done' them; all I have given in *The Pupil* is little Morgan's troubled vision of them as reflected in the vision, also troubled enough, of his devoted friend." We do not see the Moreens directly. (*Poetics* 1977: 150)

Todorov's text tells the reader the first quotation is taken from a letter, and the second concerns *The Pupil*, a tale whose dates are never mentioned. It is not clear whether the second quotation might not be from the same letter as the first. The same segment, in "Structuralism in Literature," published four years earlier and fully-referenced, provides the origins of both quotations in endnotes:

7. Letter to Mrs. Humphry Ward (July 1899), quoted from Edith Wharton, 'The Man of Letters', in *Henry James, A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Leon Edel (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963), p.34.

8. *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, New York edition (Macmillan, London, 1909), vol. xi, pp. xvii-xviii. (*Structuralism* 1973: 102)

Readers of the 1973 version can see how Todorov has grafted comments from two different sources to compose an account of one aspect of James's narrative process. Thus the references themselves lay bare one aspect of the "narrative process" of the critic. The history of the movement of a phrase from source to source is outlined,

though not fully detailed in note 7. Does Wharton reproduce James's entire letter or merely quote from it? Where and when does Wharton's essay, "The Man of Letters," first appear? A reader can only tell that Todorov is referencing Edel, who has anthologized Wharton, who is quoting James. The original date and narratee of James's letter establish the origin of the quotation. The bibliographic reference acknowledges Todorov's source. Original documents are not considered necessary in literary essays. Each critic trusts the one before to have quoted accurately and in context. As well, the grafting of similar comments from two different moments in the author's life (here, 1899 and 1909) illustrates that such practice is acceptable in critical essays. Two sources, where one alone would not suffice, indirectly support the "particularly" in Todorov's statement that "James was particularly fond of this indirect vision." The letter to Mrs. Humphry Ward, however, has a context the critics have tended not to consider, a context which bolsters Todorov's argument.

Peter Halter (1984), following Todorov, cites the same phrase from the same letter and references the same source (1984: 28). Both Halter and Todorov provide a date for the letter. A note in Edel's anthology indicates that the essay reproduced is the "second half of her [Wharton's] article in the *Quarterly Review* (July 1920), pp. 197-202," but the note neglects to mention that Wharton's essay is a book review of *The Letters of Henry James*, selected and edited by Percy Lubbock (Macmillan, 1920). One must return to Lubbock's book to discover that Wharton includes only part of the original letter to Mrs. Humphry Ward. She also omits its date. Clearly Todorov went to Lubbock's edition of *The Letters* to get the date for his endnote.

Halter, who refers to Todorov in his paper, may have obtained the information from Todorov's essay, and not from the original source. And though both Lubbock and Wharton explain that James, when making the comment, is advising Ward about her own novel, *Eleanor*, Todorov does not. If this information were incorporated into his essay, it would strengthen the argument: James felt so strongly about "that magnificent and masterly indirection," he recommended it to Mrs Humphry Ward in a letter concerning her own novel. Todorov, apparently, only needs James's words, not their purpose.

In this chapter I have shown how scholars must rely on the integrity of texts as reproduced by the editors and publishers of the editions they consult. In the case of texts by Henry James this holds true for both his fiction and his other writings. I have also shown, using the criticism of James's "The Figure in the Carpet," how critics can better support their arguments when they provide contextual information concerning the author's words they cite. The unstated converse would be: if contextual information on a quotation casts doubt on its pertinence to a critical argument, perhaps the critic should seek support elsewhere. I have also indicated, though, that critics elide certain publication details from their essays, either because they consider the information of no consequence or because they expect the elided information to be a "given," a fact known to their readers. That is, readers of James criticism "know" certain facts about James's texts. This notion of "givenness" extends to works by others as well: in James criticism, as I will discuss in the next

chapter, critics refer to other authors and authorities, and do so with varying degrees of referencing.

## CHAPTER 3

### OTHER WRITERS: AUTHORS, AUTHORITIES, AND CRITICS

Every scholarly generation has its pool of "givens," its collection of fictional, theoretical, and critical texts which constitute the contemporary canon. Critics refer to texts within this canon without complete bibliographic referencing. With full referencing, readers would be able to fill in all information concerning texts referred to: Who wrote it? When? Where? For what readership? About what? And where did the critic obtain this information? When only partial references occur, critics must assume their readers know the texts alluded to, and must also consider it unnecessary to document their sources. In this section, I will examine the critical practice in terms of how and why critics allude to works, authors and authorities, and each other.

I have already touched upon critics' expectations that certain information about the target author is "known" to their readers. Throughout the sample of criticisms, however, one finds similar examples of abbreviated "references" to other writers and their works. One paragraph in Joseph Warren Beach's discussion (1918) illustrates the possible scope of this practice:

Most novelists seem by comparison all taken up with the pattern. In Fielding and Scott, in Balzac and Zola, in Thackeray and Tolstoi, it is the adventures of the characters that we are bidden to follow. The contrast is the more remarkable when it is the English contemporaries

of James that are brought into comparison. In Meredith and George Eliot, . . . (1918: 148-9)

The proper names, through metonymy, stand for their published works. This same paragraph, in which Beach likens James to "some visionary Platonist," also includes mentions of Rousseau, Voltaire, Bentham, Mill, Benjamin Franklin, Wordsworth, Emerson, Hawthorne, Gladstone, and Bernard Shaw. These authors are mentioned in small groups, the purpose of their presence in the argument summed up in a few words that theoretically encapsulate an entire oeuvre. "Writing in the time of Gladstone and Bernard Shaw, James seems hardly to have given a thought to the political destinies of men or to the practical consequences and bearings of personal conduct." From the point of view of the critic, there is no need to reference works alluded to. Readers are expected to know the author or authority named, and the works their names symbolize. Examples of this type of expectation are present throughout the sample.

The assumption of shared reading experience is explicit in the critics' "implicating we." James J. Sosnoski explains that "in this use of 'we,' the speaker 'implicates' his audience by attributing to the audience a similar intention" (1994: 221).<sup>1</sup> I emphasize its use in these two examples:

If *we* look at the fables Henry James offers *us*, *we* see at once that all these artists are doomed men, as doomed as the characters in Hemingway, but not as in Hemingway by the coming common death. (Blackmur 1943: 599; my emphasis)

---

<sup>1</sup>Sosnoski credits the term to his colleague, LuMing Mao (1993).



His wonderful writers are mere minnows in comparison with the wonderful writers *we* know, from Scott to Balzac, from Dickens to Tolstoy, from Turgenev to Henry James himself. (Robert Lynd 1952: 117; emphasis added)

Blackmur and Lynd include their readers when they say "we," implying the readers are familiar with the writers they name and agree with the assertions about them. But even without the "implicating 'we,'" an implicit assumption of a shared reading experience remains in the unreferenced author:

This particular point of view [first-person restrictive] has grown up with the short story and has contributed outstanding effects to the stories of such writers as James, Joyce, Conrad, and Faulkner. (William Buckler and Arnold B. Sklare 1960: xiv)

Critics also use adjectives derived from the names of authors/authorities: "the grand, Byronic mode"; "the Joycean and Flaubertian artist"; "the Platonic correspondence between idea and appearance."<sup>2</sup> In all these cases, the critic is not suggesting sources or allusions to these authors. They are, rather, examples from what the critic has read of similar aspects of textuality in James. James need not be familiar with the cited authors; in some cases it would be anachronistic. It suffices that critics see some analogy to other authors familiar to them, and that these critics assume their readers to be equally familiar. Where the name of the author stands metonymically for that author's work, the work, by its own name or that of its author, stands synecdochally for that aspect of textuality the critic wishes to illustrate.

---

<sup>2</sup>Labrie (1969: 168); Feidelson (1970: 49); Iser (1978: 13).

Sometimes the author disappears, and only the work or a character is invoked to qualify a critic's comments:

There is, in fact, nothing more exceptional about St. George's counsel to Paul than there is about the very similar advice given by Andrei Bolkonsky to Pierre in one of the early scenes of *War and Peace*. (G. van Cromphout 1963: 135)

Corvick and Gwendolen join forces and pursue their quest textually, for all the world like a modern version of Paolo and Francesca. As they succumb to the desire of the text, their conjoined decoding excludes the narrator. (Lock 1981: 161)

As with authors, the names of characters can serve as eponymic roots for adjectivals:

"If the figure does in fact exist, the Coverdale-like narrator certainly misses it"

(Sweeney 1983: 84). To make their various points about James's texts, these critics have no need to supply specific page references. Van Cromphout's readers know about Tolstoi, Lock's about Dante. And Sweeney's recognize "Coverdale-like" to mean a first-person narrator like the one in Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance*.

In contrast, when a critic cannot assume readership familiarity with a particular text or author, the details relevant to the critical argument must be supplied. Jean-Batiste Pontalis discusses "The Figure in the Carpet" and "The Beast in the Jungle" in a 1958 article published by *Les Temps Modernes*. Pontalis wants readers to understand that they are implicated participants in the reading process, and not innocent bystanders. He illustrates his argument with a short story by Dylan Thomas,

"The Followers" (Pontalis 1958: 1679-80).<sup>3</sup> The story is not sufficiently well-known to Pontalis's readership, though, for him to merely assert that readers of fiction are voyeurs like the two boys in Thomas's story. The critic must and does give a *précis* of the story, with pertinent details, so the point of his using the story as an illustration is not lost on his readers through lack of familiarity. Critics have to decide, for each audience, what must be said and what can be left out. To provide too many details could be interpreted as condescending by some readers -- a case of stating the obvious -- while to provide too few could be seen as the critic's playing up his or her "learnedness" through literary name-dropping -- particularly to a later generation whose cultural canon is different.

Critics bring various authors and their works into their discourse for a number of reasons. I will catalogue some of the uses of these works, and analyze aspects of the critical practices involved. Primarily, the fictional works of others serve as templates against which the critics' readers can compare and contrast the target text and its author's technique.

Beach (1918) refers to many authors throughout his work on James, showing similarities and differences as he goes. That he is comparing and not establishing sources for James is evident from his comments concerning George Eliot and George Meredith, among the most frequent templates in Beach's analysis. "I have pressed the comparison with George Eliot and Meredith because they are the two novelists most like James in procedure so far as the idea is concerned" (Beach 1918: 35-6). He

---

<sup>3</sup>Pontalis does not provide any bibliographic reference to Thomas's story.

adds, in a note, "I do not mean to consider the question of personal indebtedness of James to either of these writers," Beach begins, and concludes the note with the comment that "all we need assume in reference to these three writers so near in time is that likeness of method natural to artists subject to similar influences" (Beach 1918: 36, n. 14). Critics do look to other authors for "indebtedness," however, and despite Beach's assertion, when Seymour Lainoff (1962) cites George Eliot, it is to establish Gwendolen Harleth of *Daniel Deronda* as a source for James's Gwendolen Erme.

Critics not only use the texts of others as general templates for comparison, they also use them to illustrate specific aspects of textuality. Todorov uses descriptive passages from Hugo's *Notre Dame de Paris* and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* to exemplify two approaches to characterization (1969: 17). Sweeney considers the characters in James's tale to be "monomaniacally obsessed with the objects of their pursuit." "Seen in this light," he says, "the questers in 'The Figure in the Carpet' are not essentially different from Melville's Tagi and Ahab or from Hawthorne's scientists" (1983: 79). Hugo, Flaubert, Melville, and Hawthorne are authors with whom James was familiar. Such familiarity, though, is not important in this kind of argument. What is important is the aptness of illustration. This is why Pontalis can use Dylan Thomas's "The Followers" to give readers a visceral example of reading as a form of voyeurism (1958: 1679-80). Mihály Szegedy-Maszák sets James's tale within a particular tradition, and he illustrates the genre through examples his audience can recognize without explanation: "Ring Lardner's *Haircut* and Mark Twain's *The Notorious Jumping Frog* were literary by-products of the tradition of

popular story-telling we have in mind" (1984: 234). Andrzej Zgorzelski contrasts the various characters' styles of approach to literature, and shows how critics of the tale itself are similar to those in the story because of their impotence. "A story, presenting the clash of two epochs in its plot," he explains, "at the same time becomes a clash in itself (as in Ray Bradbury's *The Dragon*)" (1984: 177). Zgorzelski, perhaps recognizing the obscurity of this argument, refers readers to an analysis of Bradbury's story by Danuta Zadworna (1983). Zgorzelski's reference note tacitly acknowledges, in Zadworna, the probable source of his critical idea.

Critics do not limit illustrative texts to the same genre or even the same medium. Rimmon uses both a play and a movie to illuminate certain aspects of James's tale. She considers the "succession of deaths, following each other in such rapid and convenient fashion," and concludes that it "does not even pretend to be more than the equivalent of 'exit, pursued by a bear' when a Shakespearean character is no longer needed in a play" (1973: 202-3).<sup>4</sup> Rimmon accuses James of killing off his characters for convenience. She calls upon a trope from the very canonical Shakespeare to qualify James's narrative strategy. As to the genre of the tale, Rimmon classifies "The Figure in the Carpet" as an "enigma-story," following up the assertion with three examples, "Conan Doyle's *The Sign of the Four*, Agatha Christie's *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*, and the recent horror-film *Whoever Slew*

---

<sup>4</sup>Rimmon's footnote, referencing *The Winter's Tale* 3:3:59, explains the scene in question.

*Auntie Roo?*" (1973: 192).<sup>5</sup> Rimmon itemizes those shared aspects of the cited works she sees in James's tale. That one of the "texts" is not printed on bound pages does not preclude its aptness as an illustrator. Rimmon's essay shows how a horror film can be as useful as Shakespeare in clarifying an argument.

Literary works and authors of literary works are not the only texts and producers of texts referred to. Critics also cite more theoretical works and their authors, using names, quotations, paraphrases, and brief encapsulations to illustrate or back their points. In some cases, the authorities are named, but the specific works are not referenced: "History, as Niebuhr says, is meaningful, but the meaning is not yet" (Blackmur 1943: 599); "According to Coleridge, who distinguished between fancy and imagination in trying to formulate the 'truth' of artistic invention, *fancy* was transparent fiction and *imagination* a higher seat of truth" (Parker Tyler 1958: 31); "What Vereker intends by his 'organ of life' image is perhaps the equivalent of what Robert Frost means by 'felt thought' and Coleridge by 'truth carried alive into the heart'" (Ann Gossman 1962: 21); "The most important of these general ideas, incorporated into the title of my paper happens to come from Blake. 'As a man is, so he sees', says Blake" (Krook 1988: 31).

Tyler, Gossman, and Krook expect their readers to locate the historical positions of their authorities, and by extension, to accept a kind of supra-historical

---

<sup>5</sup>*Who Slew Auntie Roo?* (American International Pictures and Helmdale Film Corporation, 1971; Curtis Harrington, director) is also known as *The Gingerbread House* and *Whoever Slew Auntie Roo?*, as Rimmon calls it.

validity to their truths. Blackmur, on the other hand, refers readers to a contemporary authority, Niebuhr, whose name alone suffices in invoking a socio-political position -- at the time of Blackmur's writing. Fifty years later, the name alone would probably not be familiar to the same proportion of readers; it is of a period. The critical practice of using names to evoke entire theories, however, is perennial. Critics nearer our own time similarly assume their contemporaries will recognize and draw conclusions from mere names.

The process of rereading, theorized from positions as diverse as those of Roland Barthes, Northrop Frye, Paul Ricoeur, Michael Riffaterre, Wolfgang Iser, Paul de Man or J. Hillis Miller, should play a prominent role in the interpretation of narratives since it allows access to the discursive and presentational level of a story, almost entirely concealed during first reading. (Marcel Cornis-Pope 1990: 250)

Cornis-Pope, elsewhere in his critical text, does provide some referencing for Barthes and Iser. But the overall assumption is that the names listed have meaning to his readers, that they can construct approaches to texts from the names alone.

In the case of authors, as shown previously, the name of a work or a character could serve in a critical text without referencing. Critics allude to authorities by using terms coined by the authorities. In some cases, the terms have ingrained themselves into the language, and quotation marks are not necessary. Kanzer, addressing in *American Imago* a readership that expects psychoanalytic terminology, can talk of "the negative oedipus complex" (1960: 345) without explaining the

construct, without referencing its origin, without even mentioning Freud.<sup>6</sup> Because "Freud" is understood. For Kanzer's readership, quotation marks would take away from the construct's legitimacy, and any explanatory or reference note would be redundant and, probably, insulting.

Critics also use terms coined by others *with* quotation marks. Leo B. Levy, who tends to present his opinions in the first person singular, uses the "implicating 'we'" to assert that "The Figure in the Carpet" is "a sort of parable of what *we now* know as the 'intentional fallacy'" (1962: 459; my emphasis). Levy does not mention Wimsatt and Beardsley's (1946) text. He and his readers, "we," "know" the meaning of the phrase, and know it "now" whereas in 1896, James himself would not. Levy's subtext is that the critical construct of the intentional fallacy must be valid because James, without the convenience of a label, has written his "sort of parable" half a century earlier. As Levy uses it, the critical construct labelled "intentional fallacy" achieves a certain validity, as well, by being abstracted from its origins: it is above history.

Gossman provides her readers with Coleridge's name as the authority necessary to substantiate the import of his words, "truth carried alive into the heart" (1962: 21). These words are presumably less well known than "willing suspension

---

<sup>6</sup>Full referencing for the phrase, with German titles and dates, would be unwieldy. James Strachey sets Freud's "first published use" of "Oedipus complex" in 1910 (1957: 171). According to Samuel A. Guttman's *Concordance* (1984), the earliest date for "negative Oedipus complex" is 1925; the same theoretical construct, expressed as "inverted Oedipus complex," appears in 1914.



of disbelief," a phrase Iser uses in his German text, in English, within quotation marks, but without Coleridge's name (1976: 19). In English, within an English text, the assumption of reader familiarity is less glaring: "This detachment is remarkable, in that normally the reader of fiction accepts the lines laid down for him by the narrator in the course of his 'willing suspension of disbelief'" (1978: 8). In Iser's text, the words of Coleridge have transcended their origin as one historical authority's verbalization of the act of reading. The words have their own status as an accepted part of literary diction.<sup>7</sup> The quotation marks serve several purposes. They hold the phrase together as the unit of thought it is. They suggest, as well, that this group of words has *a meaning beyond* the semantic one implied by the mere linguistic elements that compose the phrase. The quotation marks also suggest a self-consciousness on Iser's part in abstracting the intellectual construct from its original text in order to mould it to his argument, as when he repeats the phrase:

The "willing suspension of disbelief" will then apply, not to the narrative framework set up by the author, but to those ideas that had hitherto oriented the reader himself. (1978: 8; in German, 1976: 17)

Coleridge's intellectual property, if one dare call it "intellectual property," is not acknowledged. In a way, it is like Aspirin losing its initial capital and its Bayer.

---

<sup>7</sup>Is it stating the obvious to inform one's readers that Coleridge's "willing suspension of disbelief" is from chapter 14 of *Biographia Literaria* (1817)? It would be interesting to track the international travels of Coleridge's phrase. Aside from Iser's use of it, in English, within his German text (1976: 19), Italo Calvino refers to it, with Coleridge's name, also in English, within his Italian text, in the published version of a 1978 address on levels of reality in literature (1980: 313).

Certainly theorists coin terms to accommodate the intellectual constructs they develop. When critics find the constructs useful, they perforce use the terms. I have shown examples where terms and phrases appear to be *received jargon*: Kanzer's use of Freud's "Oedipus complex," Levy's of Wimsatt and Beardsley's "intentional fallacy," Iser's of Coleridge's "willing suspension of disbelief." The sample of criticism also indicates that critics credit new and little-known terms and usages, giving explanations as they incorporate the concepts into their analyses. Kent Bales, in his 1986 reader-response approach, completes his explanation of a reading process by calling on "'genre-alyzing,' to borrow Paul Hernadi's useful coinage"<sup>8</sup> (Bales 1986: 185).

The *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* states a particular position concerning borrowed terms in a section called "Plagiarism." It is clearly suggested that, when borrowing a specific term, a "student" should include the author's name and a page number in parentheses:

The author's name refers the reader to the full description of the work in the works-cited list at the end of the paper, and the parenthetical documentation identifies the location of the borrowed material in the work. (1995: § 1.7)

The identity of the writer, in this recommendation, appears to be a consideration. It may be understood in the MLA's addressing specifically students that students have not yet developed the knowledge base or expertise to determine the status of a term. Therefore, students must attribute. The practice, as evidenced in sample criticisms

---

<sup>8</sup>Bales refers to Paul Hernadi (1972), but supplies no page number.

here, is not always followed by scholars. At a certain point in the history of a neologism, it becomes jargon. The question we might consider is, when or how does a coined term or usage become jargon?

Critics credit others for the terms and ideas they use according to a number of factors. I will first illustrate differences in crediting, and then address some of the factors involved by comparing Rimmon's "ambiguity" to J. Hillis Miller's "unreadability." Both critics define their terms and contrast them to other constructs. Rimmon spends an entire chapter reviewing theories of textual ambiguity and plurisignificance in order to establish the boundaries for her own definition ("Ambiguity: The Formative Principle," 1977: 3-26). When she discusses "The Figure in the Carpet" in a later chapter, her readers have a clear account of her terminology. Miller establishes what he means by "'unreadability'" over a few pages of his article (1980: 111-113). The difference in attention to defining terms is obviously one of available space: a book has more pages than an article in a journal; definitions are therefore abbreviated in journal articles. Miller, however, not only reduces examples of contrasting terms and ideas, he also limits his illustrations of them and his crediting of them. Following a brief encapsulation of Umberto Eco's distinction between an "open" work and an ambiguous work, Rimmon brings Barthes into her discussion:

While an 'open work' or, in Barthes's words, a work characterized by 'infinite plurality' (1970, pp. 11-12) lacks (or deliberately eschews) centers of orientation, an ambiguous work possesses marked centers

which polarize the data and create mutually exclusive systems.

(Rimmon 1977: 13)

The pages in *S/Z* Rimmon refers to are those where Barthes explains his notion of "scriptible," or "readerly" (*S/Z* [English] 1974: 4).<sup>9</sup> J. Hillis Miller also contrasts his construct of "'unreadability'" to similar ideas. After distinguishing it from ambiguity, he states:

---

<sup>9</sup>Eco himself has noted the similarity between his notion of "open work" and Barthes's ideas on plurisignificance years before *S/Z* was published. The following passage verbalizes the nucleus of Eco's thinking:

A work of art, therefore, is a complete and *closed* form in its uniqueness as a balanced organic whole, while at the same time constituting an *open* product on account of its susceptibility to countless different interpretations which do not impinge on its unadulterable specificity. (1989: 4)

To the very passage I cite above, Eco tags a note to the earlier, French translation: "L'attention à cette forme générale de l' "ouverture" apparaît clairement dans la méthodologie critique de Roland Barthes" (1965: 38, n. 2). A quotation from Barthes's "Avant-propos" to *Sur Racine* (1963) follows. Barthes explains how Racine's texts remain open (his term is "disponibilité") to all kinds of critical practices, and how readers themselves effect multiplicity of meaning (see Barthes 1963: 11; in Eco 1965: 38). The addition of Barthes to Eco's argument illustrates and concretizes the theory expressed. Eco adds the note to the second edition of *Opera Aperta*, expanding it to include an *op. cit.* reference to Luigi Pareyson (1967: 26). In Pareyson, Eco tacitly acknowledges a source; in Barthes, an independently developing analogue to his own thinking. The English translations, following an earlier version of Eco's text, include neither reference (1979: 49 and 65, n. 1; 1989: 4 and 251, n. 1).

"Unreadability," on the other hand, is something intrinsic to the words of a work, an effect of the rhetoric or of the play of figure, concept, and narrative in the work, an effect the words of the work impose on the reader, not a result of "reader response." Moreover, instead of rich plurisignificance, the notion of "unreadability" names the presence in a text of two or more incompatible or contradictory meanings which imply one another or are intertwined with one another. (1980: 113)

In discussing ambiguity, Miller mentions both Rimmon (1977) and Empson (no bibliographic reference). But for the passage quoted, he supplies no names to represent theoretical discussions of "'reader response,'" "plurisignificance," or "'unreadability.'" Similarly, elsewhere in his article, Miller uses "logocentric," in quotation marks, but without Jacques Derrida's name (Miller 1980: 114). As to his primary theoretical concern, "unreadability" itself, he explains: "There is nothing new about the experience of the working of language in literature to which the name 'unreadability' is sometimes today given" (1980: 113). In this discourse, with the passive verb-phrase "is sometimes today given," Miller clearly attributes the origin of the word "'unreadability'" to others. The only illustrative documentation he supplies is the assertion that "the great writers themselves through all the centuries of our tradition have tended to know this experience" (1980: 113). Despite a change in language and morphology, the construct of "unreadability," semantically opposed to "readability," appears to be in contrast to both Barthes's "lisible" and his "scriptible," distinguishing it from both. It is evident that Rimmon credits and Miller does not. More than space is responsible for this difference in referencing.

A note in Rimmon's book states that it is based on the doctoral dissertation she submitted to the University of London in 1974 (1977: xii). Miller, in contrast, writes in 1980 as a Professor at Yale. Students, in their dissertations, are expected to review pertinent literature. They reference quite extensively, two main reasons being to avoid the accusation of plagiarism and to make use of established authorities as backing for ideas. Miller can use theoretical concepts and terms and expect the words themselves to serve as "references" to their origins. At a certain point in the "history" of individual words, only dictionaries and specialized glossaries need mention who coined a term when and in what context. For example, M. H. Abrams, by the fourth edition of *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (1981), addresses Derrida's "logocentrism" and Miller's involvement with deconstruction in the entry on "Deconstruction."<sup>10</sup> As to more general credits, they can appear only years later. The *OED Additions Series* has an entry on "logocentrism" attributing the term to Derrida (v. 2, 1993). Miller, in 1980, does not name Derrida because the term itself serves to "reference" Derrida, just as "Coverdale-like," in Sweeney's essay, serves to "reference" Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance*. Miller is himself an "authority." He does not require the weight of another's name to bolster the credibility of his argument. His quotation marks around "reader response," "unreadability," and

---

<sup>10</sup>The third edition of Abrams's *Glossary* (1971) has no reference to Derrida or logocentrism. Derrida was not yet translated and, presumably, not sufficiently mainstream. Ideas can only insinuate themselves into thinking when they are accessible. Marc Angenot's *Glossaire* (1972) is contemporary to the third edition of Abrams, but being French, it includes Derrida's logocentrism.

"logocentric" may serve not only to mark an understood specialized meaning for the terms, but also to convey the terms' external origins.

But Miller does not use quotation marks consistently around his main term, "unreadability." When he first uses "'unreadable,'" Miller follows the usual practice of introducing new terms within quotation marks: "This subversion [of the claims of literal reference of any realistic narrative] makes all realistic narrative 'unreadable,' undecidable, irreducible to any single unequivocal interpretation" (1980: 111). Miller subsequently uses the term another dozen times, maintaining quotation marks for half, with no apparent pattern: "The notion of unreadability"; "the notion of 'unreadability'" (112; 113). This marks Miller's ambivalence around presenting "unreadability" as a neologism or as received jargon. These factors suggest Miller has another agenda -- that of making the term general.

Grant Webster, in his *Republic of Letters* (1979), cites a 1966 article by Miller about papers presented at the most recent Yale Symposium.

The most recent ideological trend in American criticism is the attempt to see literature in terms of theories of various continental philosophers, linguists, and anthropologists. J. Hillis Miller announces as early as 1966 that, at least among advanced critics at Yale, "part of the impetus for the next advances in literary study will come from one form or another of European criticism. Assimilating the best recent continental criticism, American scholars may come to develop new forms of criticism growing out of American culture as well as out of the encounter with European thought." (1979: 8; citing Miller 1966: 557)

Webster uses Miller's statement about "the impetus for the next advances in literary study" as a temporal marker within his chronology of the advent of European ideas into American critical thought.<sup>11</sup> Miller's 1980 treatment of James's "The Figure in the Carpet" is a product of that "impetus." Miller is an American scholar; James is an icon of American literary culture; Barthes and Derrida, for example, are authorities of European critical thought. The key word in the quoted passage, however, is "assimilating." Once "the best recent continental criticism" becomes assimilated, the theoretical terms become received jargon. Beyond their coming into jargon, the terms and concepts they signify, when abstracted from their European origins, become Americanized and, in a way, more acceptable. Other American critics, following those Webster calls the "advanced critics at Yale," can use the same terms as if they were home-grown.

Certainly within the sample, critics who quote from Miller (1980), and who quote Miller's use of "'logocentric'" or "'unreadability,'" neither mention nor allude to the origins of the terms. "J. Hillis Miller contends," says Williams, "that the paradox of 'unreadability' or 'undecidability' underlies the rhythms of 'The Figure in the Carpet'" (Williams 1984: 110). Williams here recalls Miller's "'unreadable,' undecidable" from a passage I have previously cited (Miller 1980: 111). But Williams, in a way, is misquoting Miller because he does not reproduce Miller's quotation marks around "unreadable." The effect is to imply that Miller sets

---

<sup>11</sup>Sosnoski quotes Webster quoting Miller to illustrate "a widely held view of literary studies as a profession" (1994: 37)



"unreadable" and "undecidable" on equal ground. Halter follows a direct quotation from Miller's article with further explanations. "According to this theory," says Halter, referring back to Miller's verbalization, "a text becomes 'unreadable' when . . . " (1984: 25). Halter also recalls Miller's use of "'logocentric'":

Again, these images are contradictory insofar as they contain the paradox of something that is absent and yet present, hidden and yet apparent everywhere, a figure all there on the surface and yet concealed as the string on which the pearls are strung. Placing such attempts at defining the essence of a fictional work into the larger context of Western metaphysics, J. Hillis Miller sees them as a typical manifestation of "logocentrism." (1984: 27)

The paradox of simultaneous absence and presence echoes Derrida theoretically and Miller specifically (see Miller 1980: 114-7). But it is only after he uses the word "'logocentrism,'" set off in quotation marks, that Halter quotes directly from Miller. Miller's singular use of "'logocentric'" (1980: 114) is within quotation marks. Halter, as Williams does for "'unreadable,'" sets "'logocentrism'" within a single set of quotation marks and thereby erases Miller's subtle external reference. The words must, in fact, shed their quotation marks to attain the status of received jargon. In a way, though, Halter's and Williams's erasure of Miller's quotation marks within their citations serves to extend Miller's jargonizing of the terms. They quote Miller using these words as if they were simply part of the diction. Jargon requires no attribution.

Cornis-Pope, discusses "The Figure in the Carpet" ten years after Miller does. Twenty-three years after *De la grammatologie*, Cornis-Pope uses "logocentric" without quotation marks or italics.

While James's stand on the question of figural hermeneutics remained somewhat contradictory (like his surrogate author, Vereker, James seemed to waver between a logocentric desire "to name it, phrase it, formulate it" ["The Figure in the Carpet" 289], and a tactics of elision and withholding), it still managed to create a fruitful tension inside the hermeneutic plot between two conflicting modes of critical writing. (1990: 252; the page number for "Figure" refers to *Stories* 1944)

Miller, in 1980, uses "'logocentric'" when it is only in a specialized glossary.

Cornis-Pope, in 1990, uses the term when it is about to appear in a general dictionary. Unlike Miller, Cornis-Pope applies and names the theory of logocentrism without the self-consciousness implied by quotation marks. Jargon requires no quotation marks. This appearance constitutes a sign that "logocentrism" has, by 1990, joined the ranks of "Oedipus complex."

Miller's use of critical terms within quotation marks but without referencing falls into the normal scope of critical practice. For his intended readership, the terms themselves incorporate referencing to their originators. The purpose of the quotation marks, however, remains ambiguous precisely because Miller does not reference. He could be indicating that he is quoting another, or he could be implying neologisms and underscoring the words' meaning beyond that apparent from their morphology, particularly at a time when the terms are not in any dictionary. Miller himself suggests such a use for quotation marks in his response to Rimmon-Kenan's reply to his 1980 article.<sup>12</sup> He concludes his introductory paragraph by explaining, "I was

---

<sup>12</sup>I discuss the critical debate below.

attempting to 'express' the 'experience' (both words must be put in suspension) of the failure of an attempt at mastery" (Miller 1980/81: 189). If Miller intends a rhetorical "suspension," he here suggests that readers not presuppose any meaning for the terms as he will reveal what they signify in his text. As such, in his earlier article about "The Figure in the Carpet," "logocentric" and "unreadability" may be "in suspension" to enable his own understanding of the terms to emerge. Whatever Miller's intention behind his quotation marks, the punctuation serves as a subtle indicator that the terms are not completely absorbed into jargon. And his use of the terms, with full explanations, serves both to popularize and authorize them.

The texts critics use most commonly to authorize their arguments are theoretical and interpretive rather than fictional, as critics call on literary theorists and on critics discussing the same work or other works, by the same author or by a different author. Miller, an "authority" himself, uses Tolstoi's name where it can help him. He speaks of "what Tolstoj, in a splendid phrase, called 'the labyrinth of linkages,'" and notes where he found the phrase -- "Cited by Erlich [1969: 241]" -- and the context within which Tolstoi used it:

Tolstoj was attacking critics who attempted to reduce *Anna Karenina* to a brief formula. Critics rather, he said, should inquire into "the laws governing the labyrinth of linkages (*labirint sceplenij*) which is literary art." (Miller 1980: 107)

In this case, Miller is borrowing a formulation about textuality that expresses his own feelings about it.<sup>13</sup> He explains Tolstoi's original use, which better enables his own

---

<sup>13</sup>Rimmon uses the same phrase from the same source (1977: 51).

readers to transfer the meaning, in parallel, to his discussion. As in the case of Pontalis, who must explain Thomas's "The Followers" to his readership, Miller provides the information required by readers to understand the nature of his argument. As well, Tolstoi's name authorizes the concept expressed in the phrase, and thereby validates Miller's application.

The notion of using another's arguments to "authorize" one's own is recognized, and decried, by Bales (1986). Bales discusses Iser's use of arguments by Pontalis: "Most bizarre, however, is Iser's citation of Pontalis as an authority, as though the existence of another opinion roughly similar to his own establishes Iser's case" (1986: 181). The practice of citing previous critics, though, serves both to contextualize arguments and to credit previous scholars who have verbalized the ideas. But Iser's use of Pontalis, as read by Bales, is not unique: sometimes local phrasing also suggests authorizing.

Critics, when discussing a text, also bring in what previous critics have said about the same text, either to agree with them, to challenge them, or simply as a review of the literature. Levy completely agrees with Quentin Anderson: "The necessary clue to the meaning of 'The Figure in the Carpet' is given by Quentin Anderson in *The American Henry James*" (Levy 1962: 459, referring to Anderson [1957]). Edward Rechia's language is less emphatic but still in agreement: "His death may be, as Mark Kanzer suggests, a symbolic punishment" (Rechia 1973: 363; referring to Kanzer 1960: 344).

Disagreement with the work of previous critics can be local or general, part of the main text or parenthetical. It can also be the *raison d'être* of the paper itself. I have previously mentioned that Williams (1984) and Weber (1986) both concern themselves specifically with Iser's reading (1976) of James's tale. G. A. Finch (1968) considers James's tale specifically in response to what Krishna Baldev Vaid says about it in his book (1964). Zgorzelski incorporates the nature of what he is responding to in his title, "The Quest for the Indecipherable: Todorov's Non-Existent Mystery of 'The Figure in the Carpet'" (1984).

A more formal debate appears in the Winter 1980/81 *Poetics Today* 2:1b. That journal's Spring 1980 issue is the one that includes Miller's essay, "The Figure in the Carpet." In that essay (1980: 112), Miller briefly considers Rimmon's views as she expresses them in her book on James (1977). The journal permitted Rimmon-Kenan to respond to Miller, and Miller in turn to reply to Rimmon-Kenan's response. The two comments appear under the general rubric "Controversy." Rimmon-Kenan (1980/81) contextualizes her own response in terms of theory:

because what is at stake are not merely differences (and similarities) between two readings of James's "The Figure in the Carpet," nor solely a distinction between "ambiguity" and "unreadability" but a confrontation between a structuralist (or structuralist-affiliated) and a deconstructive (or post-structuralist) approach. (Rimmon-Kenan 1980/81: 185)

Miller, in responding to Rimmon-Kenan, adds to her distinctions between their approaches "the difference in 'tone' and 'style' of critical discourse" (1980/81: 189).

The two comments do not address James's tale, but they do articulate quite clearly the differences between the critical approaches of their respective "schools."

Disagreement with other critics, however, is more generally found in local arguments, like the one in Miller's original text that precipitated the "controversy."

Vaid discusses the readers in James's tale. He introduces his argument with an excerpt from Matthiessen's assertions about the readers, establishing how he disagrees with his predecessor's interpretation, "F. O. Matthiessen makes this mistake" (Vaid 1964: 84).<sup>14</sup> Weber takes on Iser's *The Act of Reading* in general, and Iser's analysis of "The Figure in the Carpet" in particular. One finds in Weber's paper passages that articulate his disagreements with Iser: "In Iser's version, the critic receives a decisive 'rebuff' at the hands of Vereker. . . . And yet a quite different reading of that scene is not merely possible; it virtually imposes itself" (Weber 1986: 207; referring to Iser [1978]). Disagreement with another critic may be parenthetical to the main argument, and the differences expressed in a note, as does Williams: "Ann Grossman [sic]," he begins, "offers a very different account of this conceptual approach. . ." (Williams 1984: 121, n. 15; referring to Gossman [1962]).

Some critics review the literature to establish the critical approach or approaches within which or against which they set their own. Gossman chooses one proponent of each viewpoint to serve as its representative.

The assumption that both the story and James's prefaces are seriously to be studied for illumination is the orthodox view (cf. Leon Edel, *The*

---

<sup>14</sup>Referring to Matthiessen (n.d. [1944a]).

*Prefaces of Henry James*, Paris, 1931, especially pp. 109-112). The alternative is to assume as Perry Westbrook has recently done ("The Supersubtle Fry," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, VIII, 1953, pp. 137-140) that there is no figure in the carpet. (Gossman 1962: 20)

Edel and Westbrook are from differing critical camps. Gossman refers to the critics to establish the extant boundaries of the critical dialogue against which she can profile her own argument: the secret itself is not important, "its impact on the characters" is (20). Halter provides his readers with a catalogue of all those who have addressed "plurisignificance" in James's tale (1984: 25). His list, in a footnote (25, n. 2), includes Miller (1980), Iser (1978), Pontalis (1968), Rimmon (1977), and Todorov (1973). Halter's analysis, which relies on Lacan for theory, addresses the arguments put forth by most of the critics he names. He does not agree with them all. For example, he introduces his own interpretation of Corvick's death with a reference to Pontalis's interpretation: "One need not go as far as J.-B. Pontalis. . ." (Halter 1984: 36).

Critics also express tacit agreement with their predecessors by borrowing their arguments. They recognize when their own interpretations closely resemble those of others. Some critics credit their sources, and take pains to address similarities and differences. Williams considers certain images from James's tale, images Rimmon has also discussed (Williams 1984: 11). He tags to his argument a brief note acknowledging the similarities: "Rimmon makes an allied point, but in a notably different context, in *The Concept of Ambiguity*, pp. 112-13" (Williams 1984: 121, n. 12; referring to Rimmon [1977]). Weber indicates the origin in the *Aeneid* (I.578) of

"*Vera incessu patuit dea!*" and analyses its meaning within the context of Gwendolen's use of the Latin phrase. He ends the explanation with an acknowledgment, "On this point I am indebted to Peter Lock's highly suggestive, but unpublished, paper, '*The Figure in the Carpet: The Text as Riddle and Force*'" (1986: 213, n. 9).<sup>15</sup> The practice of acknowledging sources for ideas can go beyond the bibliographic referencing of direct quotations.

As I have said, Rimmon's book, *The Concept of Ambiguity* (1977), is based on her doctoral dissertation (xii). Because she produced it as a student, ideas and terms are very carefully credited. In her chapter on "The Figure in the Carpet," Rimmon uses the term "gap," as in the section headers, "The Permanent Central Gap," and "The Mutually Exclusive Systems of Gap-Filling Clues" (1977: 95, 101). Rimmon explains the construct, "gap," within the theoretical first section of her book. She builds her argument with full references to those whose ideas she has borrowed and adapted, and it is apparent that "gap" is part of the jargon of structuralism and narratology. For example, she uses the phrase "gap-filling clues" (51) and notes how she has adapted the term from "Perry and Sternberg 1968" (Rimmon 1977: 240 n. 14). Another note, concerning Barthes's interpretation of blank pages in Robbe-Grillet's *Le Voyeur*, reveals that the French term for a "gap" in the narrative is "trou" (Rimmon 1977: 240 n. 13; referring to Barthes 1964: 64). Rimmon uses a very

---

<sup>15</sup>Lock's paper was published in 1981. Therefore, Weber wrote his paper considerably earlier than 1986.



different credit, however, in an example of James's singular use of the term:<sup>16</sup> "In his 1914 essay entitled 'The New Novel,'" writes Rimmon, "Henry James praises Conrad's achievement in *Chance*" (1977: 45). She then cites a paragraph from James's essay that features the term "gap" used in a way similar to that of her contemporary structural theorists. Her in-text reference (to the full one in the bibliography) indicates "Shapira, ed., 1968, p. 381." Rimmon's readers know when James originally wrote the quoted material, about what, and they know which book Rimmon used to find this material. But Rimmon does not end her referencing here. A superscript note number refers readers to that chapter's endnotes where a further credit is given:

I am grateful to Professor F. J. Kermode for having pointed out this passage to me as well as for his stimulating ideas on the subject of hermeneutic gaps, presented to his postgraduate seminar at University College in 1971-72. (Rimmon 1977: 239, n. 10)

Rimmon's acknowledgment of indebtedness to Kermode and the absence of the term in Franklin, as noted earlier, suggest the word is rare in James's critical work. The

---

<sup>16</sup>I say "singular use of the term" for the following reasons. The quotation is from Shapira's edition of James's criticism (1968 [1963]). Shapira's limited index lists mostly proper names. *Gap*'s absence from the index is therefore inconclusive. There is also no entry for *gap* in Franklin's (1966) *Index* to the Prefaces. In as much as *gap* was not a recognized technical term in 1966, Franklin's *not* having included it suggests James himself used it rarely, if at all, in the Prefaces. Nor is *gap* ubiquitous in today's literary glossaries: it is not in Cuddon (3rd ed. 1991) or Abrams (6th ed. 1993), but Hawthorn (2nd ed. 1994) includes the term.

question of Rimmon's acknowledgment of indebtedness to Kermode leads to another consideration in the referencing of sources, though. When is it necessary, or at least polite, to acknowledge the source of ideas?

The *MLA Handbook* indicates that writers should give "appropriate acknowledgment when . . . presenting another's line of thinking" (1995: § 1.7). The question critics must therefore ask is, how close to another's line of thinking must one's argument be for credit to be required? I wish to consider the following case. Blackmur's analysis of "The Figure in the Carpet" includes an "extract" from Alexis de Tocqueville's "classic work on The Republic of The United States of America" (1943: 600).

There is a little chapter in the first book of the second part called "The Trade of Literature" from which I extract the following passage.

"Democracy not only infuses a taste for letters among the trading classes, but introduces a trading spirit into literature. . . . Among democratic nations, a writer may flatter himself that he will obtain at a cheap rate a meager reputation and a large fortune. For this purpose he need not be admired, it is enough to be liked. . . . In democratic periods the public frequently treat authors as kings do their courtiers; they enrich and they despise them. . . . Democratic literature is always infested by a tribe of writers who look upon letters as a mere trade; and for some few great authors who adorn it, you may reckon thousands of idea-mongers." (Blackmur 1943: 600, quoting Tocqueville; no reference provided beyond that in his text)

The ellipses in the cited passage are Blackmur's, not Tocqueville's; they replace sections Blackmur omits which contrast European experience to the American way.

(Tocqueville 1856: 2: 63). Blackmur introduces the passage by stating that "it was not going to be, he [de Tocqueville] foresaw long before Henry James began writing novels, a model republic of letters" (1943: 600). For Blackmur, Tocqueville's "description" is clearly an analogue to the situation "in the fiction which we are about to engage. De Tocqueville only reminds us of what James knew well" (600-1). I quote Blackmur's abstraction from Tocqueville in full to show how long it is, and to show the position of the ellipses because, twenty-five years later, van Cromphout cites the identical passage from Tocqueville in his own analysis of "The Figure in the Carpet" (1968: 139). Van Cromphout uses an early French reprint of the 1835 text (Tocqueville 1864, 3: 99-100), and places ellipses precisely where Blackmur does. His argument for using the extract is similar to Blackmur's, though the phrasing is not identical: "As early as the eighteen-thirties Tocqueville drew attention to the negative effect of this trading spirit upon writers and their work" (van Cromphout 1968: 139). Both Blackmur and van Cromphout discuss the role of the artist in society and James's tale within that context. Should van Cromphout not credit Blackmur for the idea of using this particular passage from Tocqueville?

It is possible but not probable that van Cromphout's use of Tocqueville is independent of Blackmur's, but it seems inconceivable for van Cromphout to not know Blackmur's essay. He certainly knows of Blackmur as he uses the latter's edition of James's Prefaces (van Cromphout 1968: 133). Blackmur's essay on "The Figure in the Carpet" is one of the most frequently cited essays in the sample. At the time of van Cromphout's writing, it can be found in three books. The original is in

an issue of the *Kenyon Review* devoted to James scholarship. Dupee anthologizes it in *The Question of Henry James* (1945), as does J. W. Aldridge in his textbook of critical approaches to literature, *Critiques and Essays on Modern Fiction 1920-51* (1952). It is not unusual for scholars to review the literature prior to writing their own essays. I can only assume that van Cromphout was familiar with Blackmur's article. Perhaps van Cromphout believed his argument differed from Blackmur's. If such is the case, however, van Cromphout could have included a note explaining this difference, a note similar to Williams's about Rimmon.

Van Cromphout's use of Tocqueville is not the only instance in the sample where the critic does not mention a predecessor's highly pertinent argument. Salmon discusses the ambiguity of "The Figure in the Carpet." She makes the point that Gwendolen Erme "illuminates the shadowy narrator" (796). Salmon recalls

the narrator's description of her air of intense anticipation during Corvick's absence: "with her white face and her fixed eyes [she was] the very type of the lean ladies one had met in the temples of chance" (p. 250). That the narrator pictures himself, towards the end of the tale, as a gambler who has lost all, relates him to the early Gwendolen. (1980: 797; her interpolation; page number refers to the New York Edition)

Salmon tags an endnote to the quotation from James where she identifies "the early Gwendolen": "The reference to Gwendolen Harleth in George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* is unmistakable. As the earlier Gwendolen changes, so does the latter" (1980: 803, n. 16). Not only is the information in this note parenthetical to Salmon's overall argument, it is also the sole subject of a paper by Lainoff (1962).

Salmon's discussion has nothing to do with Eliot or *Daniel Deronda*. The only other mention of George Eliot in Salmon's paper is in the title of her source for James's "famous statement about the role of the reader" (1980: 800), a statement that happens to be from James's "The Novels of George Eliot" (in James 1908: 18). Salmon's aside about James's "unmistakable" reference to Gwendolen Harleth is asserted but undocumented. Lainoff, as I have just stated, makes it the main point of his paper. He goes to the trouble of citing descriptive passages to illustrate the parallels in characterization of "The Two Gwendolens" (1962: 24). The passage he cites from "The Figure in the Carpet" includes the sentence quoted by Salmon. There is no reason to assume Salmon did not notice the resemblance independently. Her statement, however, would still require backing: some tangible examples from the texts to support the claim of an allusion.

However independently one comes to conclusions about texts, and however original one's verbalizations of these conclusions, if another critic has said the same thing, one's own iteration adds nothing new to scholarship on the subject. Salmon's use of George Eliot, though, differs significantly from van Cromphout's use of Tocqueville in that hers is part of an aside, his of a main argument. It is therefore less urgent for Salmon to find and cite previous critical analogues. As well, Lainoff's paper is a note and has not got the wide exposure of Blackmur's essay. Salmon could only know of it by trying to find whether a connection between the two Gwendolens has previously been established. But such a search is not warranted by the tangential nature of Salmon's comment -- although it would have provided her with an

alternative to citing textual evidence to support her claim. She could refer parenthetically to Lainoff in her note on Gwendolen Harleth: "See Seymour Lainoff's 'James and Eliot: The Two Gwendolens.'" I add, similarly, that Zgorzelski argues about the gambling imagery as a function of the narrator (1984: 173). Where his assertion intersects that of Salmon, Zgorzelski's bibliographic reference note might continue with: "For the relation between the gambling imagery and the narrator, see Salmon (1980: 797)." Zgorzelski need not refer to Lainoff because unlike Salmon's, his argument has nothing to do with Eliot's Gwendolen.

What I am suggesting, in this discussion, is not the equivalent of a critical variorum in note form. Rather, I am suggesting that when one's argument strongly resembles one already extant in the literature, noting the fact avoids certain problems. As I have shown, some critics, particularly in the later period when many ideas have already been expressed, do exactly that. Any reader familiar with the earlier work will recognize the idea. Not seeing it acknowledged leads to a reader's wondering whether the non-citing critic is attempting to pass off another's idea as her or his own -- or whether the non-citing critic has simply failed to do the necessary scholarly research to uncover critical analogues. The idea may well be as original to the second critic as to the first, but when the idea is not new to scholarship, critics can buttress both case and credibility by acknowledging those who were there first.

Scholars who plan a critical discussion can easily forget where they came across a particular argument. The group credit is a popular solution in the "Acknowledgments" section of books. Anderson's expressed debts are more

personal: "Among those especially concerned with Henry James and for whose generosity and discernment about James I have particular reason to be grateful are," and he names them (Anderson 1957: viii). Daniel J. Schneider, in contrast, focuses on the writings of those who preceded him: "My indebtedness to some of the great pioneering critics of James's work and to the students of James's life is profound" (Schneider 1978: vii). Both Anderson and Schneider name names, Anderson conceding, "One cannot hope to list them all" (vii). In the case of a shorter paper, however, group crediting cannot replace identifying the specific source of a local argument. And unfortunately, no scholar's memory is sufficiently digitized for photographic recall. How then can critics credit and contextualize their intertexts, in fiction as well as in scholarship, when they no longer remember the bibliographic details?

Sometimes a critic is not completely sure of the name, or recalls the name but not the work. Pontalis appears to have suffered such blackouts: "C'est Gide, je crois, qui soulignait un jour"; "Jorge Luis Borges a noté quelque part" (1958: 1681; 1688). The works of major authors and authorities have frequently been scanned to enable the production of concordances. Critics determined to reference can use these alphabetic indexes to find missing information. Krook transfers a phrase from Blake to the situation of the reader: "'As a man is, so he sees', says Blake, which (you will see in a moment) modulates into the Jamesian variant, 'As a man is, so he *reads*'" (1988: 301). Blake's phrase, removed from its source, carries only its abstract meaning as Krook transposes it to her argument. She uses Blake's name and the

phrase to authorize her approach to the James's text. Yet the full, concrete force of Blake's view of visual perception as idiocentric, evident from the letter in which he uses the phrase, is unavailable to Krook's readers because she neither provides Blake's context, nor does she reference it -- as she does the four other works from which she quotes.<sup>17</sup> As I have previously shown, not referencing the exact source of certain literary quotations is well within the scope of usual critical practice. Had Krook wanted to reference it at the time of writing, though, it is also possible the source was elusive. Yet David Erdman's *Concordance to Blake's works*, published in 1967 and available to me in 1996, was also available to Krook in 1988. Or was it?

Not all libraries carry all books, and reference books rarely travel between institutions for inter-library loans. Krook's paper is signed at Tel Aviv University. Their library catalogue (online) indicates that Erdman's *A Concordance to the Writings of William Blake* (1967) is not in their collection.<sup>18</sup> In 1988 (or 1986 when Krook's paper was first written), the kind of information retrieval accessible to today's scholars was not as fully in place. Krook could not in 1988 easily ask someone in another city to look up needed information, a procedure which has benefitted me several times in the course of researching this thesis. Beyond searchable data bases on CD-ROM, and searchable texts and bibliographies on the

---

<sup>17</sup>The letter, to Dr. Trusler (23 August, 1799) is reproduced in Geoffrey Keynes's edition of Blake's works (1966: 793-4).

<sup>18</sup>Telnet <tauvax.tau.ac.il> (February 26, 1996). Of course, this does not preclude its having been there in 1986 or 1988 and subsequently lost. Library catalogues, however, often continue to list misplaced books, noting their absence.



World Wide Web, the virtual expansion of the hallways of academe, through scholarly discussion groups on the Internet, permits today's critics to ask hundreds of colleagues for help in tracking down an elusive source. And the answer, complete with full bibliographic referencing, often comes back within a matter of days if not hours. The value of this resource cannot yet be estimated, but for those who write scholarly articles and want to reference as fully as possible, access to necessary information has been immeasurably extended.

I have examined the presence and role in critical papers of texts by writers other than the target author. I will now turn to the critical essays themselves as reproducible texts.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE REPRODUCTION OF CRITICAL TEXTS

The sample of criticism includes nine texts that have appeared in more than one type of publication.<sup>1</sup> For example, Beach's approach to "The Figure in the Carpet," a chapter in his book *The Method of Henry James* (1918), becomes one of twenty-six essays in F. W. Dupee's anthology, *The Question of Henry James* (1945). The critical texts of Matthiessen (1944a), Lainoff (1961), and Sollers (1966) are all first published as articles in scholarly journals. Matthiessen's essay in *Partisan Review* becomes the introduction to his edition of James's fiction, *Stories of Writers and Artists* (1944b); Tompkins reproduces Lainoff's article from *Boston University Studies in English* in her anthology, *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Turn of the Screw" and Other Tales* (1970); and Sollers includes his essay from *Tel Quel* in his book, *Logiques* (1968). When a text moves to a new venue, various aspects of

---

<sup>1</sup>Excluding pure translations, these are: Beach (1918; 1945); Blackmur (1943; 1947; 1952); Matthiessen (1944a; 1944b); Lynd (1948; 1952); Tyler (1958; 1964); Pontalis (1958; 1965); Lainoff (1961; 1970); Sollers (1966; 1968); and Todorov (1969; 1971; 1973). I add that beyond Todorov (1973), two other texts are published versions of oral presentations, that is Szegedy-Maszák (1984) and Krook (1988).

contextual deixis are altered. In this chapter I will examine how the publishing context affects a critical essay.

Gillian Brown and George Yule, in their chapter on "The role of context in interpretation," italicize the major concerns of contextual deixis:

Some of the most obvious linguistic elements which require contextual information for their interpretation are the deictic forms such as *here*, *now*, *I*, *you*, *this* and *that*. In order to interpret these elements in a piece of discourse, it is necessary to know (at least) who the speaker and hearer are, and the time and place of the production of the discourse. (1983: 27)

The critic, "I," writing for a particular readership, "you," with expected publication in a particular kind of book in a particular country, "here," can expect the "here" to change with the "now," and the referents of "this" and "that," explicitly or implicitly, to change with the "here" and "now."

Some aspects of the "here" and "now" are subtle, intangible, notably in terms of the cultural and intellectual climate within which the text is produced. The criticisms of Pontalis (1958) and Matthiessen (1944a) can serve to illustrate some of these effects. There is no English version of Pontalis's essay on James, though he was a critic of sufficient stature in France to have published a collection of his essays, *Après Freud* (1965), which includes his paper on James. Another indicator of regard for Pontalis is that a second publisher brought the book out again, in 1968, and a German translation, *Nach Freud*, appeared that same year. Book publication is one kind of indicator; the identity of an editor is another. By examining Pontalis's

original essay on James as it appears in *Les Temps Modernes*, one discovers that the general editor of the first publication to accept this piece was Jean-Paul Sartre. A similar kind of cultural contextualizing occurs with Matthiessen's article. The five critics who cite Matthiessen refer to his introduction in *Stories of Writers and Artists* (1944). Matthiessen himself is a "name" critic known for his work in American literature. Yet a preface by "Matthiessen" to works by James differs subtly from an article by Matthiessen in *Partisan Review* (1944). The table of contents indicates the issue also includes articles by writers such as Paul Valéry, William Carlos Williams, Karl Shapiro, Robert Penn Warren, George Orwell, and Edmund Wilson. These names help to characterize the intellectual climate within which Matthiessen's text was produced and disseminated. In *Partisan Review*, the text is localized in time; in *Stories of Writers and Artists* it is above time.<sup>2</sup>

Dupee's anthology, *The Question of Henry James* (1945), includes a paper by Beach. That essay, "The Figure in the Carpet," is the central, pivotal chapter in Beach's *The Method of Henry James* (1918). Beach's book is divided into "Part One: The Method," and "Part Two: Towards a Method." Each of these parts is further subdivided into numbered chapters. The essay "The Figure in the Carpet" is positioned between parts "One" and "Two," belonging to neither and structurally linking them. Because all of what precedes the essay in Beach's book is absent in the Dupee anthology, although the words of the text remain unaltered (the "apparatus" is

---

<sup>2</sup>I note in passing that the situation is ironically compounded by the 1944 publication date's having been omitted from the book.

changed, as I will discuss below), readers cannot infer the same "meaning" in certain situations. Consider this excerpt:

Naturally, a book devoted to the inward life of a group of people would be nothing without its "*idea*." But the strict limitation of the action to the consciousness of these people would transform idea into "*picture*." The succession of incidents in an ordinary story would in such a narrative be represented by the process of "*revelation*" of the picture. *Suspense* would have reference not to what might happen but to the subjective reverberation of what happens. In a record of inward life it is obvious how important must be the choice and maintenance of *point of view*. (Beach 1918: 155]; in Dupee 1945: 100; my italics)

I have added emphasis to certain words, some of which Beach has already placed between quotation marks. Had I continued the quotation, I would also have emphasized "dialogue," "'drama,'" "'eliminations,'" "'neutral tone,'" "romantic," and "ethical." Readers of the Dupee anthology can construct their own meanings for these terms. Readers of Beach's original, though, recognize echoes of the titles of chapters in "Part One": "I. Idea," "II. Picture," "III. Revelation," and so on. The section from which I quote serves as a recapitulation of Beach's earlier reconstruction of James's "method." In Beach's 1918 book, the section called "The Figure in the Carpet" is a constituent element of a textual structure, and the terms in the quoted section have referents. In Dupee's 1945 anthology, the terms appear more abstract because the text has been "abstracted" from its context.

When critical essays are reproduced, the resulting changes are sometimes subtle, such as those I have just discussed. The texts of criticisms can also undergo

substantive changes when moved to a new venue. Sometimes critics adapt their texts to a new readership. Titles can be changed, references added, updated, modified, or even omitted. McGarr shows how textual changes can impact on the perceived meaning of literary works in an analysis of Pound's *Cantos*. In his statement of purpose, he explains:

I want to explore *how* meanings operate at the work's most primary material levels. In carrying out this particular exercise, we shall trace an exemplary textual scene where the material forms and events of writing and printing call attention to the parts they play in the signifying system of the work. (McGann 1991: 130)

I will illustrate how parallel "material forms and events of writing and printing" impact on some of the "signifying system[s]" of critical works through the essays of Beach (1918) and, more extensively, Todorov (1969).

Anyone reading Beach's essay in Dupee's anthology would infer that Beach "assumes" far more givens than he actually does, or that scholars writing in 1918 did not reference sources. Readers might also assume that Beach is using the 1896 text. Dupee expresses "Grateful acknowledgment" to publishers "for permission to use the quotations from the works of Henry James which appear within the articles in this collection" (1945: xix). For "The Figure in the Carpet," the reference is to *Embarrassments*. R. P. Blackmur's *The Art of the Novel* is mentioned in the context of Blackmur's introductory essay, not James's Prefaces. Dupee does not refer in any way to the Prefaces in his acknowledgment. Although the years of publication of all critical texts about James are provided, Dupee does not give any year of publication

for any text by James. A reader would have to "know" *Embarrassments* as an 1896 text. It happens, though, that throughout his book, Beach quotes from the Scribner's New York Edition. Therefore in the case of "The Figure in the Carpet," he uses the revised text of 1909 and not one of the earlier ones. Dupee's acknowledging a slightly different text is less problematic for a reader, though, than the fact that he reproduces none of Beach's eleven footnotes. And Dupee is more likely to be responsible for their omission than Beach. The anthology consists of twenty-five texts originally published between 1880 and 1944. In all of these, only a handful of notes are apparent: two content notes original to the critics; two editor's explanatory notes; a fifth, not signed "ed.," likely added for the anthology. There are no reference notes. Although Dupee states in his "Acknowledgment" that, "in a few cases, the authors have made minor alterations in their texts" (1945: xvii), the absence of notes is pervasive enough to be an editorial decision. Further support for this conclusion comes from Beach's second edition (1954) which maintains the original footnotes.<sup>3</sup> And the footnotes, through which Beach identifies the texts from which he quotes, help readers locate the supportive illustrations for Beach's arguments in James's works.

Beach begins quoting from "The Figure in the Carpet" in the second paragraph of his essay, identifying the tale in his own text: "Most fascinating of all these tales

---

<sup>3</sup>In the 1954 edition of his 1918 book Beach adds an introduction in which he reviews the critical literature. He does not revise his original "pioneer work in the field" (vii), but comments on it through endnotes, referring the reader to them with alphabetic footnotes below the original numeric ones.

. . . is 'The Figure in the Carpet' " (1918: 145; in Dupee 1945: 92; my ellipses).

Beach sprinkles quotations from James's tales and Prefaces throughout his chapter.

Through footnotes, he identifies the works from which he quotes, and the volume and page numbers in the New York Edition where the quoted words are found. Readers know how Beach is constructing his arguments with illustrations, analogies, and contrasts, because the reference notes tell them. But in Dupee, all these quotations in Beach's paper appear without local reference to any specific texts. Although it is possible to recover the sources with some research, the information is not immediately at hand, which renders Beach's arguments less accessible.

The referencing in the four versions of Todorov's essay also changes from text to text. As I will show, some of the changes involve simple updating, some involve adapting information to a readership in another language. Some changes, however, alter the text to conform in style and purpose to the circumstances of its new publishing context. Todorov's critical text has four titles according to its venue. As "Les Nouvelles de Henry James," it serves as a preface in *Nouvelles: Maud-Evelyn; La mort du lion* (1969).<sup>4</sup> When Todorov's essays are collected in *Poétique de la prose* (1971), the piece is renamed "Le secret du récit." "Le secret du récit" then serves as the source for both English versions of the text. "The Structural Analysis of Literature: the Tales of Henry James" appears in *Structuralism: an Introduction* (1973, David Robey, ed.). And in Richard Howard's translation, *The Poetics of*

---

<sup>4</sup>The book is a bilingual edition, its English title being *Tales: Maud-Evelyn; The Death of the Lion*.



*Prose* (1977), the essay becomes "The Secret of Narrative." To ease my readers' recognition of which version of Todorov's text I mean, in the following discussion I will refer to the essays as "Les Nouvelles," "Le secret," "The Secret," and "Structural Analysis," and to the books where they appear as *Nouvelles* (1969), *Poétique* (1971), *Structuralism* (1973), and *Poetics* (1977).<sup>5</sup>

*Nouvelles* (1969) contains a bibliography whose main purpose is to provide a French readership with a list of available translations of James's tales into French, and of critical papers about James written in French.<sup>6</sup> When Todorov mentions and quotes from works by James in his introductory essay, he refers to this bibliography. Todorov identifies the tales by their French title, giving the original publication date in parentheses -- e.g. "*L'Image dans le tapis* (1896)" (*Nouvelles* 1969: 10). When the tale is in a collection, Todorov names its listing in the bibliography -- e.g. "*Les Amis des amis* (1896; traduit dans *L'Image dans le tapis*)" (27). Todorov quotes from these translations throughout his text, but provides no page numbers.

When "Nouvelles" (1969) becomes "Le secret du récit" (1971), the references of the type exemplified remain unchanged. But some references, as Todorov explains in his "Note d'introduction," have been updated (*Poétique* 1971: 7). This updating

---

<sup>5</sup>In abbreviating the title of *Poétique de la prose* (1971) to *Poétique*, I must distinguish it from Todorov's earlier "Poétique" which appears in *Qu'est ce que le structuralisme? Ouvrage collectif* (1968), and from that same text's later publication as a separate volume, *Poétique* (1973).

<sup>6</sup>The bibliography does not identify any of James's translators. Some critical references in English are also provided.

results from changes in the contemporary availability of the James texts in French. Not all tales mentioned in *Nouvelles* (1969) are listed in the bibliography, and their referencing indicates their status as translations into French at the time Todorov is writing. For example, he refers to "*The Birthplace* (1903)" by its original English title, adding "non traduit" (*Nouvelles* 1969: 37). The identification remains the same in *Poétique* (1971: 179). Todorov also indicates that in 1969 there are plans to translate some tales, such as "*The Jolly Corner* (1908; à paraître dans cette collection)" (*Nouvelles* 1969: 25). Two years later, French versions having been published, Todorov's identification changes accordingly. The reference to *The Jolly Corner* becomes "*le Coin plaisant* (1908; traduit dans *Histoires de fantômes*)" (*Poétique* 1971: 167).

Where the deictic "now" changes, so does the "here." In 1969, Todorov can reference the tales in *Nouvelles* by context -- e.g. "*Maud-Evelyn* (1900; traduit ici)" (*Nouvelles* 28). In 1971, the original text's "ici" is not *Poétique de la prose*, and the reference becomes "*Maud-Evelyn* (1900; traduit dans *Nouvelles*)" (*Poétique* 170). The inclusion of "traduit" in all these references not only maintains consistency in the style of referencing established in 1969, it also maintains a certain importance accorded to availability in French. Although the original bibliography in *Nouvelles* (1969) is not reproduced in *Poétique* (1971), the in-text references are sufficiently detailed that French readers can go to a *librairie* or a *bibliothèque* and request the book by title alone. When the addressees are Anglophone readers, however, different

criteria are responsible for the manner of documentation, and other changes in the text suggest a recasting of the essay's purpose.

Readers of Howard's translation, "The Secret of Narrative" (in *Poetics* 1977), see the works of James discussed with English titles beside their original publication dates. As in its French source text, "Le secret du récit" (in *Poétique* 1971), there is no bibliography. These subtle changes in referencing reflect a change in purpose for Todorov's criticism. In its primary form, the identity of French-language tales and their location is an important component of "Nouvelles" (1969) because Todorov's aim is to introduce a French readership to James's tales. When the essay is collected in *Poétique de la prose* (1971), it serves as a witness to Todorov's manner of analysis as it manifested itself in 1969. The essays in *Poétique de la prose* appear in chronological order. Aside from giving readers Todorov's approach to the various topics, the collection of essays has acquired the purpose of providing insight on Todorov himself. A general readership for Henry James's tales, the audience of *Nouvelles* (1969), is an historic aspect. The English translation is simply one further remove from the original purpose.

The most telling example of the change of purpose is reflected in the (non)identification of that original venue. The opening section of Todorov's criticism states that he intends to use the tales in the book as a means of dispelling misunderstandings about James:

Les deux nouvelles qui suivent suffisent, à elles seules, à dissiper le malentendu. Plutôt que de les "défendre" j'essaierai de les situer à

l'intérieure de l'univers jamesien, tel qu'il se définit dans ses nouvelles.  
(*Nouvelles* 1969: 10)

"Les deux nouvelles qui suivent" are, of course, "Maud-Evelyn" and "La Mort du lion," a fact that must be footnoted in "Le secret du récit" (*Poétique* 1971: 152). In Howard's translation, however, it disappears altogether from Todorov's text: "A consideration of two tales will suffice to dissipate this misunderstanding" (Todorov, *Poetics* 1977: 144). The text no longer suggests that the tales "follow," and no footnote informs readers about the identity of the "two tales." Readers of the English text can only assume, wrongly, that the first of these two tales is "The Figure in the Carpet (1896)," immediately named in the next paragraph. As mentions of other tales accumulate in the essay, the introductory statement will be long forgotten, its original "meaning" being no longer important.

Howard's translation follows the original French text(s) in another respect as well: he maintains the absence of page numbers from the references of quoted material. For the many quotations in *Poétique de la prose* whose source language is English, Howard would have had to look up the originals in order to render them correctly in an English text. Providing the page numbers would have been incidental to this research. As it is, for the essay in question, all page number references were readily available when Howard was working on his translation because another English version of Todorov's text already existed, in Robey's *Structuralism* (1973). Although I have chosen to discuss the English versions of "Le secret du récit" out of chronological order, the earlier translation, unlike Howard's, is fully referenced.

According to Robey, "Structural Analysis" (1973) is "a somewhat abridged version of the study 'Le Secret du récit' in *Poétique de la prose*, pp. 151-85 (Ed.)" (*Structuralism* 1973: 102, n. 2). Aside from stylistic differences resulting from different translators,<sup>7</sup> a text-to-text comparison reveals that only a few paragraphs of the copy-text have been omitted from the 1973 version, while the opening section has been replaced.<sup>8</sup> For purposes of my discussion, only the change in the opening paragraphs and the style of referencing will be addressed.

That form of argument is a major component of the 1973 version of Todorov's text is carried through to bibliographic referencing. There are two significant changes in the extent of information given. Firstly, the 1973 version, unlike the other three, provides sources and page numbers for all quoted material. With respect to James's tales, Todorov refers to Edel's 1962-1964 edition of *The Complete Tales of Henry James*. The second difference is that, beyond the conventional requirements of literary criticism, for every tale Todorov mentions, even when it is not quoted from, volume and page numbers are specified. It is tempting to suppose that the context of structuralism itself is responsible for the increase in bibliographic referencing, because of how it contributes to revealing the thought processes of the literary critic.

---

<sup>7</sup>There is no credit for the translation in *Structuralism*.

<sup>8</sup>The opening paragraphs corresponding to section "I" are replaced (*Nouvelles* 1969: 9-10; *Poétique* 1971: 151-2; *Poetics* 1977: 143-4; vs *Structuralism* 1973: 73). And the example from "The Tone of Time" (1900) in section "V" is omitted (*Nouvelles* 30-1; *Poétique* 172-3; *Poetics* 164-5; vs *Structuralism* 90).

However, the theoretical construct of structuralism is present in all versions of Todorov's text, though different indicators would alert contemporary readers to this information. When Todorov's essays are collected in *Poétique de la prose* (1971), he has already published *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des Formalistes russes* (1965), and "Poétique" in *Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? Ouvrage collectif* (1968). Todorov is known as a structuralist, and one can therefore suggest the anticipated readership of "Le secret du récit" (1971) to be one interested in his views as a structuralist.

The two translated versions of Todorov's text have a similar, but English-speaking readership -- one British and one American. They differ from each other, though, in the context of their (re)production. "The Structural Analysis of Literature: the Tales of Henry James" appears in *Structuralism: an Introduction* (1973). The book, edited by David Robey, contains "the written versions of the 1972 Wolfson College Lectures on the subject of Structuralism" (Robey n.p.). Where the 1973 version is explicitly structuralist, the 1977 text is implicitly so. "The Secret of Narrative" in *The Poetics of Prose* (1977) is Richard Howard's English translation of the 1971 version. The book is introduced by Jonathan Culler, whose foreword establishes the connection.<sup>9</sup> Speaking of structuralist critics in France and of "the poetics which emerges from their work," Culler calls *The Poetics of Prose* "an important example" (1977: 8). Readers of both the French and English versions of

---

<sup>9</sup>There is further intertwining. In his own *Structuralist Poetics*, Culler indicates that "fragments of chapter 1 first appeared in *Structuralism: An Introduction*, ed. David Robey (Oxford University Press, 1973)" (Culler 1975: xiii).

Todorov's collection of essays, and of the Wolfson lecture series, are thus anticipating critical discourse from the point of view of a structuralist. They constitute more specialized audiences than the readers of *Nouvelles* (1969). One might expect the sophistication of referencing to match. As I have shown, though, except for the Wolfson version, this is not the case. I hypothesize that purpose changes with publication venue, and these aspects play the deciding role.

The style and extent of referencing in the 1969, 1971, and 1977 versions of Todorov's text reflect a shift from "James in French" to "How Todorov Analyzes." The fourth version of the text, in Robey's *Structuralism* (1973), represents the discipline "literature" in a collection of scholarly essays concerning structuralism in various fields. These include linguistics, social anthropology, semiotics, philosophy, and mathematics. The purpose of the text thus shifts to illustrating structuralism in literature, although Todorov and James remain author and subject/object. Where the referencing in the other three versions is casual, in this "Structural Analysis" version it is very detailed, and I suggest that the referencing changes in this case according to the scholarly company in the rest of the book. Full references contribute to a scholarly appearance.

Whatever the rationale for the detailing of references, it can affect how readers grasp the importance of quoted material. How the writer constructs the reader becomes a factor in how much is assumed to be known. Howard's translation, following "Le secret du récit" in the casualness of its references, must surmount certain obstacles in reader recognition. I use the following example from "Le secret

du récit" (1971) to illustrate. Todorov makes the following statement concerning characterization: "Il existe, grossièrement, deux manières de caractériser un personnage" (*Poétique* 1971: 159). He illustrates the two styles of characterization with quotations from two works he identifies, simply, as *Notre-Dame de Paris* and *Madame Bovary* respectively. Todorov explains the difference between the two approaches as that between telling and showing. Further down, on the same page, Todorov states that "James reste pendant assez longtemps dans le sillage de Flaubert." The link to *Madame Bovary* need never be made explicit. It is assumed that French readers of either James or Todorov will have no difficulty identifying French canonical texts or their authors. The same cannot be said for English-speaking readers. Because "Structuralism in Literature" is fully referenced, the in-text quotations are attributed to "Victor Hugo" and "Flaubert" respectively. Howard, in translating these same passages,<sup>10</sup> must obtain reader recognition in a different way. In "The Secret of Narrative," the passage is from "*The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*" (*Poetics* 1978: 151). One minor indicator that *Hunchback* likely has a higher recognition factor among English-speaking readers is in *Benét's Reader's Encyclopedia*: the entry on Hugo lists the work only by that name; there is a separate entry for *Hunchback of Notre-Dame, The*; and there is no entry for *Notre-Dame de Paris*.

---

<sup>10</sup>The translators of the passages in "Structuralism" (1973) are acknowledged in endnotes. One must assume that Howard himself translated the passages for "The Secret of Narrative" (1978).



I have previously shown how the Howard translation erases the original context in terms of the two tales it introduces. Such an erasure is less surprising in that it follows the 1973 version in *Structuralism*, which removes the residual reference to *Maud-Evelyn* and *The Death of the Lion* altogether. In "Structural Analysis," Todorov replaces the original introductory section concerning James with a brief explanation of structuralism in literature. The original version, as translated by Howard, includes statements such as:

The tales play a special role; they stand as so many theoretical studies in which James poses the great esthetic problems of his work, and in which he solves them. Hence they constitute a privileged route which I have chosen for my journey into the author's complex and fascinating universe. (*Poetics* 1977: 143)

Readers of the earlier translation are set up by very different considerations. These first sentences are representative:

*Essays on the subject of Structuralism and literature have without doubt appeared in far greater quantity than those pieces of actual structural analysis that have been produced. . . . It has thus almost been forgotten that there exist means of making structural analysis known other than by meditating upon its (im)-possibility: by practicing it. I have chosen this means in preference, taking as my material the tales of Henry James, and, for a theoretical discussion of the subject, I take the liberty of referring the reader to other texts which have appeared in the last few years. (Structuralism 1973: 73)*

The new introductory material is set apart from the body of the critical text *per se* by its italics. Two notes tagged to the section respectively refer readers to various

theoretical works on structuralism and to the second version of Todorov's text in *Poétique de la prose* (1971). For much the same critical text, Todorov presents two very different statements of purpose. Readers of both, however, embark on English-language critical texts translated from the same French original, Todorov's actual analysis beginning with, "Dans la célèbre nouvelle *l'Image dans le tapis* (1896) James raconte qu'un jeune critique, venant d'écrire un article . . ." (*Poétique* 1971: 152).

The introductory section constitutes an element of what discourse analysts would call the criticism's "staging." P. Clements explains "staging" as "a dimension of prose structure which identifies the relative prominence given to various segments of prose discourse" (1975: 323).<sup>11</sup> The staging effected by the introductory comments in "The Structural Analysis of Literature" gives prominence to the critical approach and directs readers of the 1973 text to the form of Todorov's argument. The staging effected by the opening section in the other three versions gives prominence to the works of James and directs readers of the 1977 text, for example, to the contents and conclusions of Todorov's argument. For literary critics within the sample who refer to Todorov, however, the staging has little effect on how his text is actually perceived and used. I present the following discussion with a certain caveat: it is impractical to analyze the effects of Todorov's staging from evidence in criticisms outside the sample because there is no citation index for literature; an

---

<sup>11</sup>Brown and Yule document Joseph E. Grimes's introduction of the "staging" "metaphor" (Grimes 1975: 323), and explain how Clements has "widened" the application (Brown and Yule 1983: 134).

analysis of how critics within the sample use Todorov is limited by their small number.

Where the notion of "structuralism" is not overt in the title of the text or the title of the book, Todorov's name is sufficient to associate his text with a structuralist approach, and this is implicit in the critical essays of those who refer to *Poétique* (1971) and *Poetics* (1977). Rimmon states in a footnote:

Several members of the *Tel Quel* group have discussed "The Figure in the Carpet," but their main interest was the significance of the non-disclosure of the secret, not the techniques used to evade revelation. See Tzvetan Todorov, "Le secret du récit" in *Poétique de la prose* (Paris: Seuil, 1971). . . . (1973: 192-3 n. 36)

Rimmon alludes to Todorov's structuralism by mentioning his association with the *Tel Quel* group,<sup>12</sup> but what she brings to her own readers' attention is the focus of his argument, not its form. She uses the same version of Todorov in 1977, again noting his emphasis on the content of James's story rather than the techniques (1977: 111). Rimmon is familiar with the theoretical origin of Todorov's text, and focuses on its content. She argues that "Todorov rightly says," authorizing an argument with which she, a "structuralist" herself, agrees.

Williams (1984), referring to *Poetics* (1977), compares the content of Todorov's argument to that of Iser (1978). Initially favourable, Williams balances that appraisal with the observation that "the acuteness of such perceptions tends

---

<sup>12</sup>For a brief overview of the *Tel Quel* group's poetics, see Culler's "'Beyond Structuralism': Tel Quel," in his *Structuralist Poetics* (1975: 241-54).

equally to produce a highly schematic rigidity." "Todorov's technique," says Williams, "suggests the same order of misconception as Iser detects in the fictional narrator." Williams's last sentence on Todorov concludes that the critic "has set about extracting a ready-made code of meaning, which is unequivocally to explain the range and intricacy of James's imaginative endeavour in the tales" (Williams 1984: 110). The phrases "schematic rigidity" and "ready-made code" are aspects of technique, with "schematic" and "code" suggesting structure. Williams's diction implies he sets Todorov's text within a structuralist framework.

Miller (1980), Halter (1984), and Zgorzelski (1984) refer to Todorov's text as per Robey's *Structuralism* (1973). The bibliographic reference suffices to alert their readers to Todorov's structuralist approach. Within their essays, however, the critics focus primarily on content. Miller, in a special forum on narratology, calls readers' attention to "valuable discussions of James's story." His list includes Rimmon (1973 and 1977) and Todorov (1973), of whom he states: "Todorov's formulation is close to my own." After quoting the formulation with which he agrees, "James's tales are based on the quest for an absolute and absent cause. . . ," Miller provides his contrasting view: "I differ from Todorov in arguing that James allows also for the possibility that the 'cause' may be not only absent but non-existent, a phantom projection" (Miller 1980: 112). Miller uses Todorov's interpretation of James as a template against which to compare and contrast his own views. Because Todorov's discussion is "valuable," so is Miller's. Halter, in a forum on narratology as well, backs his claim about the importance of "plurisignificance" in "contemporary

criticism" with a reference to the 1973 text (Halter 1984: 25). Halter also cites Todorov's interpretation of James's work, as stated in the 1973 text, in order to back his own Lacanian interpretation (36-7). Only Zgorzelski explicitly states Todorov's purpose as staged in "The Structural Analysis of Literature" (1973). As Zgorzelski explains in his own introduction:

In his essay on the tales by Henry James, Tzvetan Todorov strove simultaneously to illustrate the precepts of structuralism and to offer critical readings of particular texts. Todorov's success in achieving both proposed aims might be perhaps more extensively questioned in another study, but in this short essay we would like to concentrate on one of his interpretations only: on the observations concerning Henry James's story *The Figure in the Carpet*. (1984: 171)

Therefore, the absence of overt mentions of structuralism in *Poétique* (1971) and in *Poetics* (1977) does not prevent professional readers from knowing the role of structuralism in Todorov's essay on James. Nor does the overt context of structuralism for the 1973 version preclude the essay's being read in terms of its content as well: the "notion" of James is not excluded from the new introduction; and Todorov does not explicitly call attention to the structuring of his arguments as they occur within the text.

A final comment on the versions of Todorov's essay involves the final sentence, one that resonates differently in the very first venue. Somehow, in *Poétique* (1971), in *Structuralism* (1973), and in *Poetics* (1977), where Todorov's text is followed by other essays, the words sound like an exhortation, their tone rhetorical. In the first version, the essay ends with:

Il faut donc, cette "lecture de James" une fois terminée, commencer à lire James, se lancer dans une quête du sens de son oeuvre, tout en sachant que ce sens n'est rien d'autre que la quête elle-même.

(*Nouvelles* 1969: 43)

Readers of *Poétique* and *Poetics*, after this conclusion, go on to another essay by Todorov on James. Readers of *Structuralism* are met with John Mepham on "The Structuralist Sciences and Philosophy." Only readers of the original preface to *Nouvelles: Maud-Evelyn; La Mort du Lion* can read the words as an invitation, and actually turn the page to works by James himself.

Critical texts, like primary texts, can have more than one incarnation. As for primary texts, a move to a new location is not always without effect. There may be no changes in the actual words, but the intellectual climate within which a text was originally produced, and that of the venue where it is reproduced are not always the same. If a text is originally part of another, words inside the abstracted text can lose their referents. There can be changes in bibliographic references: to remove them altogether, to update them, or to accommodate a different audience. Readers should probably keep in mind that when a critical text moves to a new publication context, it will differ, possibly in some significant way, from the original. Particularly when translations and abstractions from within another work are concerned, readers of critical texts should be aware of possible variations, and how these might affect their perceptions of the critical essay itself.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

Critics, in their meta-literary essays, refer to many different texts using various degrees of detail in their bibliographic referencing. I have examined these intertexts in critical discourse primarily in terms of how they are identified and the role they play within the critics' arguments. The types of texts critics call upon in their scholarly essays are as varied as texts themselves. Those by the target author hold a privileged position, but one also finds many allusions and references to texts by others. Texts in the sample of criticism specifically address Henry James's tale, "The Figure in the Carpet." They may or may not be representative of criticism in general, but based on my analysis, I posit certain hypotheses concerning critics and their intertexts, and caveats for those who read and write critical essays.

When critics use texts by the target author, they use available books and rarely concern themselves with possible variants. In the case of texts by Henry James, the author's own revisions constitute sufficient reason to be concerned. However, some variants are due to publishers' errors, and critics considering the work of any author might take heed and be wary of the integrity of the text they use for research. The target text itself is frequently "illuminated" by excerpts from other texts the author has written. As these other texts become published, and available, they show up in

critical discourse, and this presence is independent of critical approach. These other texts are not always identified, and the excerpts are not always contextualized within the critics' essays. I have shown how such contextualization can serve to support the critics' use of these excerpts, and I suggest that if the original context does not contribute to the critics' arguments, they should perhaps seek support in another text. I have also noted that critics expect their readers to be familiar with certain facts about the texts they mention, and this givenness can account for the absence of references in some cases.

Works by other authors serve as templates in the critics' discourse, familiar texts against which critics invite their readers to compare and contrast the target text in terms of characterization, narrative technique, plot, or other aspects of textuality the critics believe target text and intertext have in common. These intertexts need not be of the same genre as the target text, nor need they be familiar to the target author. What is important is that the critics and their readers share familiarity with the texts invoked for this purpose. These texts are identified to varying degrees, and again the notion of givenness plays a role in the extent of bibliographic referencing and contextualizing. When critics do not expect their readers to be familiar with the intertext they call upon, they explain it and rationalize its presence.

Works by other authors are not the only ones mentioned or alluded to in critical discourse. In particular, works about literature, both theoretical and practical, play a role in critics' analyses. Allusions to theory tend to verbalize what the critics see in the target text, and to authorize their arguments. Givenness plays a role, too,



in the extent of referencing. Names can be "dropped," phrases and theoretical constructs used without credit. The purpose of crediting can be to acknowledge intellectual property, but it can also serve to authorize when the phrase or construct is less well-known, and its originator has an "identity." Another aspect of non-attribution, though, is the degree to which the theoretical phrase has become jargon.

Critics also draw on their predecessors' essays as intertexts. In this capacity, previous criticisms establish the extant boundaries of concern about the target text and enable critics to place their own arguments within the tradition. When critics agree with a previous local argument, they call on it for support and/or authorization. They also use it as a point of departure, either to disagree with it outright and present their own case, or to push further the argument another presented in seminal form. When critics are aware of similarities between their arguments and those of earlier colleagues, they inform readers of the similarities, sometimes better to express their own argument. Sometimes, however, very similar arguments published previously remain unacknowledged. The drawbacks of not crediting are the perception of borrowing without noting indebtedness, or of not having done a proper search of the literature. Many tools exist in order to locate missing or forgotten references, in particular electronic data bases and the global scholarly village of the Internet.

Nowadays, when a text is seen as a "tissue of quotations," "none of them original," the presence of so many intertexts spelled out in critical essays is not surprising. Critics themselves merely act out in their own texts current beliefs about the nature of textuality. But, as I have shown, the practice has been present in

critical essays throughout the twentieth century. Each of the temporal extremes in the sample analyzed, Beach in 1918 and Cornis-Pope in 1990, brings his own catalogue of names to his criticism. The names are metonymies for the texts authored by those names and synecdoches for the aspects of textuality considered important to the critic's local argument. But the intertexts, the degree of their referencing, and their uses also serve as indicators of contemporary cultural contexts, and of contemporary critical concerns. Time has elapsed; the names have changed; the concerns have shifted away from other authors and their themes towards various theorists about texts and reading, and to the intersection of text and reader. The practice of naming names and calling on texts, though, remains the same.

Critics, in their conclusions, frequently allude and refer to the target text, other texts by the target author, or to other critics. In many cases, however, the presence of these intertexts is unwarranted. The borrowed words may relate to the argument semantically, but often they relate *only* semantically. Westbrook (1953) concludes by reflecting on his own analysis: "This interpretation need not be rejected because it goes counter to much of what James seems to say" (1953: 140). He follows with comments about the tale's Preface and ends with a quotation from the Preface that appears to address his concern about his own paper: "As James says, 'The reader is left on the evidence to conclude'" (Westbrook 1953: 140). That this phrase can be found in James's writings is fortuitous, but it merely decorates Westbrook's argument. Sollers uses parallel constructions to drive home his point: "L'image dans le tapis, la bête dans le jungle; la bête dans le tapis, l'image dans le

jungle -- ou encore: la mort dans le monde, le sens dans le texte; le sens dans le monde, la mort dans le texte" (1966: 92). Sollers combines two rhetorical dispositions. Richard Lanham defines isocolon as "a repetition of phrases of equal length and usually corresponding structure" (1968: 119). Sollers combines this with chiasmus for an elegant conclusion. Boland uses simple allusion, playing a verbal game with one of the tale's metaphors: "But if the author himself has found the ultimate thread, he will allow for an infinite number of combinations in which his beads can be strung" (1977: 429). Krook brings in a phrase from another tale. She recalls, from *The Golden Bowl*, what Maggie Verver says to her husband: "'Find out... Find out for yourself'" (Krook 1988: 315). A character of James's, in an extraneous context, happens to say something Krook can apply to her argument:

These simple words (which might have been an epigraph for this paper) articulate the deepest theme or 'intention' of James's story: that neither the Reader *in* Henry James nor the Reader *of* Henry James will ever be 'told', he will always have to 'find out, find out' for himself. (Krook 1988: 315)

The construct "James" links the phrase from one text to another, and there is an appearance of relationship.

These decorative forms of "argument" are mostly gratuitous, but in the spirit of collegiality, I borrow it in my own final words. Critics use intertexts to buttress their attempts "to name it, phrase it, formulate it."<sup>1</sup> Intertextuality, as a figure in the critical carpet, is always there -- it is just that it continuously changes colours.

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Figure in the Carpet" (*Embarrassments* 1896: 19).

## ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography includes only books, articles, and data bases quoted or referred to in the text. It is partially annotated: where relevant to my arguments, I supply additional information for some items. It is divided into three sections: works by Henry James, critical texts addressing "The Figure in the Carpet," and other references.

### *WORKS BY HENRY JAMES (1843-1916):*

---. 1882. *The Portrait of a Lady*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

---. 1896a. "The Figure in the Carpet." *Cosmopolis* (Jan.-Feb.). This first published version of the tale was serialized in the trilingual literary journal's first two issues.

---. 1896b. *Embarrassments*. London: William Heinemann; London and New York: Macmillan and Co. Includes the first "book" publication of "The Figure in the Carpet," a revision of the tale as it appears in *Cosmopolis* (1896).

---. 1907-09. *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*. New York Edition. 24 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Macmillan, 1907-09. Vol. XV, *The Lesson of the Master, The Death of the Lion, The Next Time, and Other tales* (1909), includes the final revised version of "The Figure in the Carpet."

- . 1908. *Views and Reviews*. Ed. Le Roy Phillips. Boston: The Ball Publishing Company.
- . 1916a. *Glasses*. 1896. Rev. ed. Uniform Edition of the Tales. London: Martin Secker.
- . 1916b. *The Figure in the Carpet*. Uniform Edition of the Tales. London: Martin Secker. Reproduces the text from the New York Edition (1909).
- . 1920. *The Letters of Henry James*. Ed. Percy Lubbock. 2 vols. New York, C. Scribner's Sons; London: Macmillan.
- . 1921-23. *Novels and Stories of Henry James*. Ed. Percy Lubbock. 35 vols. London: Macmillan. Vol. 20, *The Lesson of the Master, The Death of the Lion, The Next Time and Other Tales* (1922), includes "The Figure in the Carpet."
- . 1934. *The Art of the Novel*. With introduction by Richard P. Blackmur. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- . 1944. *Stories of Writers and Artists*. Ed. with introduction by F. O. Matthiessen. New York: New Directions. Rpt. 1956. Includes "The Figure in the Carpet." The 1944 date of publication is not printed on many copies of that book.
- . 1947. *The Notebooks of Henry James*. Eds. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 1948. *The Lesson of the Master and Other Stories*. Ed. Michael Swan. London: John Lehmann. Includes "The Figure in the Carpet."
- . 1957. *The Scenic Art*. Ed. Allan Wade. New York: Hill and Wang.
- . 1958. *Eight Tales from the Major Phase*. Ed. Morton Zabel. New York: Norton. Includes "The Figure and the Carpet."
- . 1960. "The Figure in the Carpet." *Stories from Six Authors*. Eds. Buckler, William and Arnold B. Sklare. New York: McGraw-Hill. 275-312.
- . 1962-64. *The Complete Tales of Henry James*. Ed. Leon Edel. 12 vols. Philadelphia: Lippincott. Volume IX: 1892-1898 (1964), reproduces "The Figure in the Carpet" as it appears in *Embarrassments* (1896).
- . 1963. *Henry James: Selected Literary Criticism*. Ed. Morris Shapira. London: Heinemann. Rpt. 1968 Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- . 1972. *Theory of Fiction: Henry James*. Ed. James E. Miller, Jr. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1973- . *The Tales of Henry James*. Ed. Maqbool Aziz. 3 vols. to date. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**CRITICAL TEXTS ADDRESSING "THE FIGURE IN THE CARPET":**

These items constitute the references for the texts analysed in this thesis. For two thirds of the entries, I am indebted to Kristin Pruitt McColgan (1979), Dorothy McInnis Scura (1979), and John Budd (1983), whose bibliographies together cover the

periods from 1917 to 1981. I have supplemented their extensive work with the *MLA International Bibliography* on CD-ROM for appropriate texts published after 1981. My list, however, does not include every item identified by my sources. I have excluded theses, dissertations, and their abstracts, and a few works in Japanese and Portuguese. Neither is my list restricted to items identified by these outside bibliographers. I have added several items because two or more of the critics otherwise included refer to them: Cixous, Iser, Matthiessen, Pontalis, Sollers, and Vaid. As well, the version of Todorov in Robey (1973) is item 1972 B102 in Scura (1979), but no other version of this same text is identified. I have added the three other versions of this text to my list.

ANDERSON, QUENTIN. 1957. *The American Henry James*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. In particular, 148-9.

BALES, KENT. 1986. "Intention and Readers' Responses." *Neohelicon* 13.1: 177-94.

BEACH, JOSEPH WARREN. 1918. *The Method of Henry James*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford Oxford University Press. In particular, "The Figure in the Carpet." 145-61.

---. 1945. "The Figure in the Carpet." *The Question of Henry James: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. F. W. Dupee. London: Allen Wingate; New York: Henry Holt and Co. 92-104. Rpt. from *The Method of Henry James* (1918).

---. 1954. *The Method of Henry James* (1918). Enlarged ed. with corrections: Philadelphia: Albert Saifer. In particular, "The Figure in the Carpet." 145-61.

BLACKMUR, R[ICHARD] P. 1943. "In the Country of the Blue." *Kenyon Review* 5 (Autumn): 595-617.

---. 1945. "In the Country of the Blue." *The Question of Henry James: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. F. W. Dupee. London: Allen Wingate; New York: Henry Holt and Co. 191-211. Rpt. from *Kenyon Review* (1943).

---. 1952. "In the Country of the Blue." *Critiques and Essays on Modern Fiction, 1920-51*. Ed. J. W. Aldridge. New York: Ronald Press. 303-18. Rpt. from *Kenyon Review* (1943).

BLANCHE, JACQUES-ÉMILE. 1923. *Mes Modèles*. Paris: Stock. In particular, "Henry James." 143-83.

BOLAND, DOROTHY M. 1977. "Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet': A Fabric of the East." *Papers on Language and Literature* 13: 424-29.

BUCKLER, WILLIAM and SKLARE, ARNOLD B. 1960. Introduction. *Stories from Six Authors*. Eds. William Buckler and Arnold B. Sklare. New York: McGraw-Hill. ix-xvi.

CIXOUS, HÉLÈNE. 1970. "Henry James: L'écriture comme placement ou De l'ambiguïté de l'intérêt." *Poétique* 1: 35-50.



CORNIS-POPE, MARCEL. 1990. "Poststructuralist Narratology and Critical Writing: A *Figure in the Carpet* Textshop." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 20.2 (Spring): 245-65.

EDGAR, PELHAM. 1964. *Henry James: Man and Author*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. In particular, "The Figure in the Carpet (1896)." 166-68. This book was first published in 1927.

FEIDELSON, CHARLES JR. 1970. "Art as Problem in 'The Figure in the Carpet' and 'The Madonna of the Future.'" *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Turn of the Screw" and Other Tales*. Ed. Jane P. Tompkins. 47-55.

FINCH, G. A. 1968. "A Retreading of James' Carpet." *Twentieth Century Literature* 14 (July): 98-101.

GOSSMAN, ANN. 1962. "Operative Irony in 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *Descant* 6 (Spring): 20-25.

HALTER, PETER. 1984. "Is Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet' Unreadable?" *Contemporary Approaches to Narrative*. Ed. Anthony Mortimer. Tübingen: Narr. 25-37.

ISER, WOLFGANG. 1976. *Der Akt des Lesens: Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. München: W. Fink. In particular, "Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet*; Statt einer Einleitung." 12-23.

- . 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Trans. from the German (1976). Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press. In particular, "Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet*, in Place of an Introduction." 3-10.
- JOHNSON, WARREN. 1988. "Parable, Secrecy, and the Form of Fiction: the Example of 'The Figure in the Carpet' and *The Portrait of a Lady*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 87 (April): 230-50.
- KANZER, MARK. 1960. "The Figure in the Carpet." *American Imago* 17 (Winter): 339-48.
- KROOK, DOROTHEA. 1988. "'As a man is, so he sees': The Reader in Henry James." *Neophilologus* 72.2 (April): 300-15. Slightly revised version of a paper delivered at the conference of the International Association of University Professors of English held at York in September 1986.
- LABRIE, ERNEST ROSS. 1969. "Sirens of Life and Art in Henry James." *Lakehead University Review* (Port Arthur, Ontario) 2: 150-69.
- LAINOFF, SEYMOUR. 1961. "Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet': What Is Critical Responsiveness?" *Boston University Studies in English* 5 (Summer): 122-28.
- . 1962. "James and Eliot: The Two Gwendolens." *Victorian Newsletter* 21 (Spring): 23-24.

---. 1970. "Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet': What Is Critical Responsiveness?" *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Turn of the Screw" and Other Tales*. Ed. Jane P. Tompkins. 40-46. Rpt. from *Boston University Studies in English* (1961).

LEVY, LEO B. 1962. "A Reading of 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *American Literature* 33 (January): 457-65.

LOCK, PETER W. 1981. "'The Figure in the Carpet': The Text as Riddle and Force." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 36: 157-75.

LYND, ROBERT. 1952. *Books and Writers*. New York: The Macmillan Co. In particular, "The Literary Life" (1948). 113-17. The book does not identify the 1948 publication data for the article.

MATTHIESSEN, F. O. 1944a. "Henry James's Portrait of the Artist." *Partisan Review* 11.1 (Winter): 71-87.

---. 1944b. Introduction. *Stories of Writers and Artists*. By Henry James. Ed. F. O. Matthiessen. New York: New Directions. 1-17. Rpt. of "Henry James's Portrait of the Artist" from *Partisan Review* (1944a). The date of publication is not printed on many copies of this book.

MILLER, J. HILLIS. 1980. "The Figure in the Carpet." *Poetics Today* 1.3: 107-18. The article was conceived as part of Miller's book in progress, *Ariadne's Thread*. The project proved too large for one volume, and the essay is not included in the book, published in 1992.

---. 1980/81. "A Guest in the House; Reply to Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan's Reply." *Poetics Today* 2.1b: 189-91.

PONTALIS, JEAN-BATISTE. 1958. "Le lecteur et son auteur." *Les Temps Modernes* 13.145 (March): 1678-90.

---. 1968. *Après Freud*. Paris: Gallimard. Rp.. "Le lecteur et son auteur" from *Les Temps Modernes* (1958), retitled "Le lecteur et son auteur: A propos de deux récits de Henry James." 336-55. The book was first published in 1965 by Les Temps Modernes, Julliard (Paris). Iser refers to the German trans. of the book: *Nach Freud*; Trans. Peter Assion et al.; Frankfurt: [n.p.], 1968.

POWERS, LYALL H. 1961. "A Reperusal of James's 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *American Literature* 33 (May): 224-28.

RECCHIA, EDWARD. 1973. "James's 'The Figure in the Carpet': The Quality of Fictional Experience." *Studies in Short Fiction* 10 (Fall): 357-65.

RIMMON, SHLOMITH. 1973. "Barthes' 'Hermeneutic Code' and Henry James's Literary Detective: Plot--Composition in 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *Hebrew University Studies in Literature* 1: 183-207.

---. 1977. *The Concept of Ambiguity--The Example of James*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. In particular, "The Figure in the Carpet." 95-115.

RIMMON-KENAN, SHLOMITH. 1980/81. "Deconstructive Reflections on Deconstruction: In Reply to Hillis Miller." *Poetics Today* 2.1b: 185-88.

SALMON, RACHEL. 1980. A Marriage of Opposites: Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet' and the Problem of Ambiguity," *ELH* 47: 788-803.

SCHNEIDER, DANIEL J. 1978. *The Crystal Cage: Adventures of the Imagination in the Fiction of Henry James*. Lawrence, Kansas: Regents Press of Kansas. In particular, pp 4-5.

SOLLERS, PHILIPPE. 1966. "Le Secret." *Tel Quel* 27: 90-2.

---. 1968. *Logiques*. Paris: Éditions de seuil. Rpt. "Le Secret" from *Tel Quel* (1966). 118-23.

SWEENEY, GERALD M. 1983. "The Deadly Figure in James's Carpet." *Modern Language Studies* 13.4 (Fall): 79-85.

SZEGEDY-MASZÁK, MIHÁLY. 1984. "Henry James: European or American?" *The Origins and Originality of American Culture*. Papers Presented at the International Conference in American Studies, Budapest, 9-11 April 1980. Ed. Tibor Frank. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 233-45.

TODOROV, TZVETAN. 1969. "Les nouvelles de Henry James." Introduction. *Nouvelles: Maud-Evelyn; La Mort du Lion*. By Henry James. Ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Trans. Louise Servicen. Paris: Aubier-Flammarion. 9-43.

---. 1971. *Poétique de la Prose*. Paris: Editions du Seuil. Rpt. "Les nouvelles de Henry James" from *Nouvelles: Maud-Evelyn; La Mort du Lion* (1969), retitled "Le Secret du Récit." 151-85.

---. 1973. "The Structural Analysis of Literature: The Tales of Henry James."

*Structuralism: An Introduction*. Wolfson College Lectures, 1972. Ed. David Robey. Oxford: Clarendon. 73-103. Adapted trans. of "Le secret du récit" from *Poétique de la prose* (1971).

---. 1977. *The Poetics of Prose*. Trans. from the French by Richard Howard.

Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. Trans. of *Poétique de la prose*. Includes "Le Secret du Récit" (1971), trans. as "The Secret of Narrative." 143-78.

TOMPKINS, JANE P. 1970. Introduction. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Turn of the Screw" and Other Tales*. Ed. Jane P. Tompkins. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall. 1-10.

TYLER, PARKER. 1958. "The Child as 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *Chicago Review* 11 (Winter): 31-42.

---. 1964. "The Figure in the Carpet." *Every Artist His Own Scandal: A Study of Real and Fictive Heroes*. New York: Horizon Press. Rpt. "The Child as 'The Figure in the Carpet'" from *Chicago Review* (1958), retitled "The Figure in the Carpet." 223-37.

VAID, KRISHNA BALDEV. 1964. *Technique in the Tales of Henry James*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. In particular, "The Figure in the Carpet." 79-89.

VAN CROMPHOUT, G[USTAAF]. 1968. "Artist and Society in Henry James." *English Studies* 49 (April): 132-40.

- WEBER, SAMUEL. 1986. "Caught in the Act of Reading." *Demarcating the Disciplines: Philosophy, Literature, Art*. Ed. Samuel Weber. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 181-214.
- WESTBROOK, PERRY D. 1953. "The Supersubtle Fry." *Nineteenth Century Fiction* 8 (September): 134-40.
- WILLIAMS, M[ERLE] A. 1984. "Reading 'The Figure in the Carpet': Henry James and Wolfgang Iser." *English Studies in Africa* 27.2: 107-21.
- ZGORZELSKI, ANDRZEJ. 1984. "The Quest for the Indecipherable: Todorov's Non-Existent Mystery of 'The Figure in the Carpet.'" *Litterae et Lingua in Honorem Premislavi Mroczkowski*. Prace Komisji Historycznoliterackiej 44. Gen. ed. Jan Nowakowski. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich. 171-77.

#### OTHER REFERENCES:

- ABRAMS, M. H. 1971. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- . 1981. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- . c. 1993. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch.
- ANGENOT, MARC. 1972. *Glossaire de la critique contemporaine*. Montréal: Hurtubise/HMH.

AZIZ, MAQBOOL. 1968. "'Four Meetings': A Caveat for James Critics." *Essays in Criticism* 18.3 (July): 258-74).

---. 1973. Introduction to *The Tales of Henry James* by Henry James. Ed. Maqbool Aziz. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press. xvii-l. 3 volumes to date.

BARTHES, ROLAND. 1963. *Sur Racine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

---. 1964. *Essais Critiques*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

---. 1970. *S/Z*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

---. 1974. *S/Z* (English). Trans. Richard Miller. Pref. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.

---. 1977. "The Death of the Author." *Image - Music - Text*. Essays select. and trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang. 142-8. Rpt. 1988 in *Modern Criticism and Theory*, ed. David Lodge. London and New York: Longman. 167-72. Translation of "La mort de l'auteur." *Mantéia* 5 (1968).

*BENÉT'S READER'S ENCYCLOPEDIA*. 3rd. ed. 1987. New York: Harper & Row.

BLACKMUR, R[ICHARD] P. 1934a. "The Critical Prefaces." *Hound & Horn* 7 (Apr-May): 444-77.

---. 1934b. Introduction to *The Art of the Novel; Critical Prefaces* by Henry James. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. vii-xxxix. Rpt. of "The Critical Prefaces" from *Hound & Horne* (1934).



- . 1935. *The Double Agent; Essays in Craft and Elucidation*. New York: Arrow Editions. Rpt. "The Critical Prefaces" from *Hound & Horn* (1934a), retitled as "The Critical Prefaces of Henry James." 234-68.
- BLAKE, WILLIAM (1757-1827). 1966. *The Complete Writings of William Blake; with Variant Readings*. New ed. Ed. Geoffrey Keynes. London and Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- BOOTH, WAYNE C. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press; Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.
- BROWN, GILLIAN and YULE, GEORGE. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- BUDD, JOHN. 1983. *Henry James: A Bibliography of Criticism, 1975-1981*. Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press.
- CALVINO, ITALO. 1980. "I livelli della realtà in letteratura" (1978). *Una pietra sopra Discorsi di letteratura e società*. Torino: Giulio Einaudi. 310-23. First delivered as a lecture at the Convegno internazionale *Livelli della realtà* in Firenze, 9-13 September 1978.
- CLAYTON, JAY and ROTHSTEIN, ERIC. 1991. "The Figure in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality." *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Eds. Clayton and Rothstein. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press. 3-36.

- CLEMENTS, P. 1979. "The Effects of Staging on Recall from Prose." *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Ed. Roy O. Freedle. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 287-350.
- COLERIDGE, SAMUEL TAYLOR (1772-1834). 1907. *Biographia Literaria* (1817). Ed. with his aesthetical essays by J. Shawcross. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press.
- CUDDON, J. A. 1991. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 3rd ed. Oxford; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Reference.
- CULLER, JONATHAN. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1977. Foreword to *The Poetics of Prose* by Tzvetan Todorov. New York: Cornell University Press. 7-13.
- DERRIDA, JACQUES. 1967a. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- . 1967b. *L'écriture et la différence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, Collection "Tel Quel," 1967.
- DUPEE, F. W. Ed. 1945. *The Question of Henry James*. London: Allen Wingate; New York: Henry Holt and Company. Rpt. 1947 London: Allen Wingate.
- EAGLETON, TERRY. 1983. *Literary Theory; An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

ECO, UMBERTO. 1962. *Opera Aperta*. Milano: Bompiani.

---. 1965. *L'Oeuvre Ouverte*. Trans. Chantal Roux de Bézieux with the collaboration of André Boucourechliev. Paris: Éditions du Seuil. Trans. of *Opera Aperta* (1962).

---. 1967. *Opera Aperta*. 2nd. ed., rev. Milano: Bompiani.

---. 1979. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Rpt. Midland Book Edition, 1984. Includes "The Poetics of the Open Work," a revision of a trans. by Bruce Merry of "L'opera in movimento e la coscienza dell'epoca" (*Incontri Musicale* 3 [1959]) first published in *Twentieth Century Studies* (December 1974). The essay appears in all versions and translations of *Opera Aperta*.

---. 1989. *The Open Work*. Trans. Anna Cancogni. Intr. David Robey. London: Hutchinson Radius; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Trans. of various eds. of *Opera Aperta* (1962-71).

EDEL, LEON. 1931. *The Prefaces of Henry James*. Paris: Jouve.

---. (Ed.). 1964. *The Complete Tales of Henry James: Volume IX: 1892-1898* by Henry James. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

EDEL, LEON and LAURENCE, DAN H. 1982. *A Bibliography of Henry James*. 3rd ed. rev. with the assistance of James Rambeau. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

"EDITORS' NOTE." 1983. *Modern Language Studies* 13.4 (Fall): 3-4.

ERDMAN, DAVID V. (Ed.). 1967. *A Concordance to the Writings of William Blake*. 2 vols. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

ERLICH, VICTOR. 1969. *Russian Formalism: History -- Doctrine*. 3rd ed. Hague, Paris: Mouton. 1st ed. 1955.

FOUCAULT, MICHEL. 1979. "What Is an Author?" Trans. Josué V. Harari. *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. Ed. Josué V. Harari. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 141-60. The first version of this essay was as a lecture delivered before the Société Française de Philosophie at the Collège de France in February, 1969. Harari's text is a translation of the version published the same year in *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie* 63.3: 73-104. Another translation, by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, appears in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (1977), by Michel Foucault. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 113-38.

FRANKLIN, ROSEMARY F. 1966. *An Index to Henry James's Prefaces to the New York Edition*. Charlottesville, Va: Bibliographic Society of the University of Virginia.

FRIEDMAN, SUSAN STANFORD. 1991. "Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author." *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Eds. Clayton and Rothstein. 146-80.

GALE, ROBERT L. 1972. *Plots and Characters in the Fiction of Henry James*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Previously published in 1965.

GRIMES, JOSEPH E. 1975. *The Thread of Discourse*. Hague and Paris: Mouton.

GUTTMAN, SAMUEL A. (Ed.). 1984. *The Concordance to the Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. 2nd ed. 6 vols. New York: International Universities Press.

HAWTHORN, JEREMY. 1994. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. London and New York: E. Arnold.

"HENRY JAMES REPRINTS." 1949. *Times Literary Supplement* (February 5): 96. Aziz attributes this article to Simon Nowell-Smith (1973: xviii n. 5).

HERNADI, PAUL. 1972. *Beyond Genre: New Directions in Literary Classifications*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

HORNE, PHILIP. 1990. *Henry James and Revision: The New York Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

JAUSS, HANS ROBERT. 1974. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." Trans. Elizabeth Benzinger. *New Directions in Literary History*. Ed. Ralph Cohen. 11-41. Trans. of chapters V - XII of *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*, Konstanz, 1967; also in a later collection of essays, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation*, Frankfurt, 1970.

KRISTEVA, JULIA. 1969. *Sémiotike: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

LANHAM, RICHARD A. 1968. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

MAO, LUMING. 1993. "An Analysis of a Rhetorical We." *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Mid-American Linguistics Conference*. (Spring): [n.p.]

MCCOLGAN, KRISTIN PRUITT. 1979. *Henry James 1917-1959: A Reference Guide*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

McGANN, JEROME. 1991. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

MILLER, J. HILLIS. 1966. "The Antitheses of Criticism: Reflections on the Yale Colloquium." *MLN* 81: 557-71.

---. 1992. *Ariadne's Thread: Story Lines*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

*MLA HANDBOOK FOR WRITERS OF RESEARCH PAPERS*. 4th ed. 1995. Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

*MLA INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY*. 1987- . [CD-ROM]. New York: H. W. Wilson. Corresponds to the printed bibliography with title *MLA International Bibliography of Books and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literatures*. New York: the Association, 1925- . Backfile of 1963-80 issued 1996? by SilverPlatter. CD-ROMs for 1981/94- published by SilverPlatter.

*OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY ADDITIONS SERIES*. 1993- . Eds. John [A.] Simpson and Edmund [S. C.] Weiner. 2 vols. to date. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- PERRY, MENAKHEM, and STERNBERG, MEIR. 1968. "The King Through Ironical Eyes; The Narrator's Devices in the Biblical Story of David and Bathsheba and Two Excursions on the Theory of Narrative Text." *Ha-Sifrut* 1: 263-92.
- ROBEY, DAVID. (Ed.). 1973. *Structuralism: An Introduction*. The Wolfson College Lectures, 1972. Oxford: clarendon Press.
- SCURA, DOROTHY MCINNIS. 1979. *Henry James 1960-1974: A Reference Guide*. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- SOSNOSKI, JAMES J. 1994. *Token Professionals and Master Critics; A Critique of Orthodoxy in Literary Studies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- STRACHEY, JAMES. (Ed.). 1953. *Five Lectures on Psycho-Analysis, Leonardo da Vinci and Other Works*. By Sigmund Freud. 1910. Trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey. In collaboration with Anna Freud. Assist. Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis. Vol. 11 of *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. 24 vols. Rpt. 1957.
- TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CATALOGUE. Online. ALEPH (Automated Library Expandable Program -- Hebrew University). Telnet <tauvax.tau.ac.il>. Username ALEPH. No password required. Feb. 1996.
- TOCQUEVILLE, COUNT ALEXIS DE (1805-1859). 1856. *The Republic of the United States of America, and Its Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined*. Two vols. in one. Trans. Henry Reeves. New York: A. S. Barnes.

---. 1864. *De la démocratie en Amérique* (1835). Vol. 3. Paris: [n.p.].

TODOROV, TZVETAN. (Trans.). 1965. *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des formalistes russes*. Comp., pres., and ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

---. 1968. "Poétique." *Qu'est ce que le structuralisme? Ouvrage collectif*. By Oswald Ducrot, Tzvetan Todorov, Dan Sperber, Moustafa Safouan, and François Wahl. Paris: Éditions du Seuil. 97-166.

---. 1973. *Poétique*. Vol. 2 of *Qu'est ce que le structuralisme?* Paris: Éditions du Seuil. Rpt. "Poétique" (1968).

WEBSTER, GRANT. 1979. *The Republic of Letters: A History of Postwar American Literary Opinion*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

WHARTON, EDITH. 1920. "Henry James in his Letters." *Quarterly Review* 234 (July): 188-202.

---. 1963. "The Man of Letters." *Henry James, A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Leon Edel. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1963. 31-6. Rpt. pp 194-202 of "Henry James in his Letters" from *Quarterly Review* (1920).

WIMSATT, W. K. and BEARDSLEY, MONROE C. 1946. "The Intentional Fallacy." *Sewanee Review* 54 (Summer): 468-88.

ZADWORNA, DANUTA. 1983. "'The Dragon' -- A Story about Time." *Studies on Fantastic Literature* (Gdańsk) 3: 7-18.