

Educating Miles: Thinking the Evil in *The Turn of the Screw*

Hazel Hutchison

He called it a “potboiler” and “an excursion into chaos,” but Henry James knew what he was doing when he wrote *The Turn of the Screw* (*Letters* IV: 86, *TS* 132).¹ A cunning blend of sensationalism and social realism, of gothic romance and psychological thriller, this story of a young brother and sister, their Governess, and the lingering presence of two dead servants who may, or may not, haunt the great house at Bly, was carefully crafted to court the popular market (Anesko 143). It was not always the case, but in this instance, James judged public taste astutely, and over the years, this slim, perplexing novella has established itself as his best-read novel. Regularly reprinted since it first appeared in 1898, translated into many world languages, and adapted for stage, film, television and opera, *The Turn of the Screw* continues to tease and frustrate. The tale was written for serialization in the American magazine *Collier's Weekly*, which circulated to over 250,000 readers. It was published in five parts over twelve installments, with black and white illustrations by Eric Pape and John La Farge, which were printed in halftone—a new and expensive technique in the 1890s. Despite his reputation for complex and lofty literature, James responded capably to the requirements of this mass-market format, building the tale around moments of heightened suspense, which were designed to fall at the end of each section, and providing the most melodramatic of endings (Beidler xviii). Despite its popularity, however, the tale remains something of an enigma. Since it first appeared, critics have been attempting to work out just what is going on under the surface of this lurid and yet subtle text.

The bulk of this debate has focused on the Governess, never named, and little more than a girl herself, who finds herself responsible for the moral fates of her two young charges, Miles and Flora, in circumstances for which she is poorly prepared. The prime

reason that the Governess draws so much attention is because of the way in which she narrates her own tale. Apart from the introductory prologue, which creates a framing narrative that both validates and undermines the story that follows, the text encloses the reader in the mind of the Governess—or more accurately in a later version of her mind, as she tells this story from a point in the future, looking back with the insight and maturity that she so evidently lacks as events unfold. Like many of James's other texts then, this tale is not just about what happens (and exactly what does happen at Bly is never clear), but also about the consciousness of the observer, about the developing awareness of the relationships, secrets and special knowledge that always form the real subjects of James's fiction. And, of course, the Governess may not be as much in control of her text as she likes to believe. Ever since Edmund Wilson's essay "The Ambiguity of Henry James" appeared in 1934, arguing that the whole scenario is a hysterical invention by the Governess, readers have disputed whether there are any ghosts at Bly at all. The Governess's account of events may be merely the outpouring of her own sexual frustration and transferred desire for the mysterious Uncle in London. The terrifying ghosts may be nothing more than the projections of her own possessive and ultimately destructive imagination. Certainly, the narrative has plenty of holes in it, silences and contradictions that open it up to a wealth of different readings and interpretations. Precisely what did the man-servant Peter Quint and the previous governess Miss Jessel do with Miles and Flora that was just so terrible? Who is the mysterious Uncle in London, and why is he so intent on keeping away from Bly? Was Quint's death really accidental, or did Miss Jessel exact her revenge on him for corrupting her? Was she pregnant with Quint's child? Did she die in childbirth? And, perhaps, most perplexingly, what was it that ten-year-old Miles said at school to get himself expelled? We are never told, and yet—like the Governess—the reader comes to have a kind of a knowledge of these things as the story unfolds and as elements of the tale piece themselves together in the mind. As James himself noted in the preface, written some ten years later, there was no virtue in setting out "weak specifications" as he wrote. The horror of the

tale would be much more intense if the reader could supply it from his own imagination: “Make him think the evil, make him think it for himself” (James, *TS* 136).

The Turn of the Screw, therefore, is not just a book about what one knows, but also about how one knows it. It is a book about what it is useful to know, and which kinds of knowledge might do more harm than good. It explores how the enquiring mind might take sensations and perceptions—even apparently supernatural ones—and convert these into concepts, facts, and moral judgements. It also makes some core assumptions about the nature of learning, and these in turn show James’s affinities and those of his generation with romantic educational theories reaching back to those of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, especially as voiced in his classic text *Emile: or On Education* (1762). *The Turn of the Screw* may have been successfully marketed as a ghost story, but it is at heart a novel of education—which should come as no surprise, given that it is designed around the relationship between pupil and teacher. However, with his characteristically dark sense of invention at work, James offers a troubled view of that relationship. The Governess is not much of a help to her charges and has a great deal to learn herself.

The Right Throbs and the Wrong

The young middle-class Governess was a familiar figure in Victorian fiction, perhaps most vividly in the form of Jane Eyre from Charlotte Brontë’s novel, and there are reasons for believing that James may have had *Jane Eyre* in mind as he wrote (Petry 61–2). The prologue tells us that the action of the story is set at least fifty years before Douglas read it to his friends by the fireside one winter’s night—and this timescale sets these events firmly back in the late romantic era, probably sometime in the 1830s or 40s, very much in the period of the action of Brontë’s novel, published in 1847 and set over the previous twenty years. Like Jane, James’s Governess stands between the reader and the action of the story and has the power to shape our perceptions about herself and the other figures in the tale. Although the factual information we receive about the Governess is scant, we see her personality and its flaws unfolding as the story develops. We

also begin to get a sense of how the events of the narrative shape this “young, untried, nervous” girl into the “most charming person... awfully clever and nice” whom Douglas met ten years later (James, *TS* 4, 8). This nervous young girl also matures into the articulate and confident narrator whom the reader encounters through her text. Thus, one of the many overlooked narratives implicit within this text is the subsequent effect of the Governess’s experiences at Bly on her character during the time that has elapsed between the action and its narration. This difference between the older and younger self is repeatedly evident in the fabric of the text, creating a kind of double narration in which both voices are constantly in play. The Governess’s speaking persona sometimes validates her earlier actions: “I confess I rather applaud myself as I look back,” she writes of her determination to see the thing through (39). At other points, she recognizes the serious lapses in her judgement: “I was infatuated—I was blind with victory” (119). In the ongoing debate about her reliability, it is one of the more convincing points in favor of the sanity of the Governess, that, looking back to her youthful errors, she is able to express her own doubts and weaknesses in this way. Truly non-reliable narrators (such as those of Edgar Allan Poe or H. P. Lovecraft, for example) are much more convinced of their own infallibility. Seeing the Governess as a character in the process of development allows the reader to view her with more empathy. It does not entirely excuse her many flaws and errors, but it does suggest that she has a more layered and mobile personality than some critical readings of the text suggest. *The Turn of the Screw*, therefore, can very usefully be read as a *Bildungsroman*, a novel of education, of formation, or as Shaffner prefers to call it, a “novel of apprenticeship” (6–15). Of course, every first-person narrative is a *Bildungsroman* to some extent, in that it presents the history of the events that have formed the speaking voice of the text. This text, moreover, is also self-consciously concerned with the ways in which character is formed and maturity attained.

The Governess not only stands between reader and action. She also stands between the different social ranks represented in the text—the upstairs and downstairs worlds of masters and

servants. Nineteenth-century British governesses were required to be young women of “good breeding,” so that they should pass on good standards and manners to children. However, governesses were working women at a time when people of “good breeding” were expected to look down upon working women, thus leaving governess in a kind of social limbo—not quite good enough to associate with her employers, but too refined to mix with the servants (Hughes 85–98). Of course, attitudes to women’s work had shifted quite dramatically between the 1830s the 1890s. Shortly after writing *The Turn of the Screw*, James replaced his male typist with a female secretary, Mary Weld, a smart, well-trained young woman from an upper-class family who later made a fashionable marriage (Hutchison, “An Embroidered Veil” 150–2). Female telegraph workers, novelists, and journalists also appear increasingly in James’s fiction throughout the 1890s and 1900s, usually as sympathetic, admirable figures, occasionally as comic ones. So, this revisiting of an earlier age, in which female work was stigmatized, was probably attended for James and his initial audience with a sense of irony, perhaps of remoteness. This would certainly be the case for James’s American readers in *Collier’s*, who would, on the whole, see nothing strange about a young unmarried woman earning her own living and very likely did themselves.

However, even as the reader is invited to side with the Governess and accept her as a young woman of good sense and moral judgement, there is evidence of her fallibility. Her own account begins: “I remember the whole beginning as a succession of flights and drops, a little see-saw of the right throbs and the wrong” (James, *TS* 11). From this opening line, we discover that the Governess’s sensations, her “flights and drops,” will quickly be converted into judgements and values, into the “right” and the “wrong.” What she sees and feels will determine what she thinks, and will be the mechanism by which these experiences will change and mature her. The Governess also appears to have a remarkable eye for detail, and—like all first-person narrators—a suspiciously accurate memory. At times, her perceptions are apparently corroborated by external factors. Most vivid is the moment when she describes the man she has

seen at the window, and her description is recognized by Mrs. Grose as a plausible description of the dead Peter Quint (34). At other moments, however, such as when the Governess describes her first vision of Miss Jessel at the lake, it seems that her imagination has got the better of her—perhaps fuelled by all that “last century fiction” she has been reading late at night (55). Poor Mrs. Grose, the house-keeper, is regularly left with the task of bringing the Governess back down to earth, asking how on earth she can prove what she suspects (42–3).

The reader would also like such questions answered definitively, but it never quite happens. As Douglas says in the prologue: “The story won’t tell...not in any vulgar literal way” (James, *TS* 5). It is an interesting line. Why should it be “vulgar” to explain things clearly? If the Governess is learning so much, why must the reader be left to fill in so many gaps? And why should the Governess be so reticent about asking the children direct questions or giving them plain advice? She has no such scruples in talking to Mrs. Grose. The answer clearly has something to do with the nature of her relationship with Miles and Flora, and in the context of nineteenth-century models of childhood, the answer is an obvious one: it is because she is their teacher.

Negative Education

As a child, Henry James experienced more educational methods than most. His father, Henry James, Sr., a distinguished writer and philosopher in his own right, was fond of travel, of intellectual speculation, and of educational experiments on his offspring. The five James children, four brothers and a sister, were repeatedly shuttled between Europe and America and received a schooling best described as varied. In the periods during which they lived in New York and Newport, they attended day schools—though rarely the same one for two academic sessions in a row. In Europe, there was a mix of academies, institutes, tutors, and governesses, including the young Harry’s favorite, Mlle Augustine Danse, who suddenly left the family after a year in scandalous and, to the children, mysterious circumstances.

However, this scandal, as James would later admit, “never obscured our impression of her genius and her charm.” If he was supposed to draw a moral lesson from the incident, he garnered one that was of his own making: “It was exciting, it was really valuable, to have to that extent rubbed shoulders with an ‘adventuress’; it showed one that for the adventuress there might on occasion be much to be said” (James, *Autobiography* 173–4). Much of *A Small Boy and Others* (1913), the first volume of James’s autobiography, is devoted to cataloguing this succession of learning environments, in which the young James clearly failed to pick up much technical or scientific knowledge, but quickly developed as a shrewd, self-motivated student of human nature. To give Henry Senior his due, this seemed to be what he wanted most for his children. As James wrote in later life, his father’s desire was that the children should continually “Convert, convert, convert...every contact, every impression and every experience we should know, were to form our soluble stuff” (James, *Autobiography* 123). Later, during a year at Harvard Law School, James would again draw a distinction between what he was supposedly being taught in the classroom and what he was really learning through experiment and conversation, especially in his formative contact with the literary scholar Francis J. Child, a progressive educationalist who would later help to promote the tutorial method of teaching through dialogue at Harvard University (Hutchison, “Just Literary” 42–45).

Thus James’s own education, perhaps inadvertently, followed a growing trend in American culture of the mid-nineteenth century in favor of learning by experience rather than precept. The romantic principle that the child, naturally innocent and curious, should develop untrammelled by educational dogma, but free to inquire and explore, was a key element in the transcendentalist movement of the 1840s and 50s. The educational reformer Bronson Alcott (father of the novelist Louisa May Alcott) devoted most of his career to largely unsuccessful efforts to promote more permissive, inclusive and inquiry-based methods of schooling across New England. However, Alcott’s ideas, inspired by the progressive Swiss educationalist Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, who was himself heavily influenced

by Rousseau, did have a deep impact on Ralph Waldo Emerson, whose essays and lectures, such as “Nature,” “Experience,” and “Self-Reliance,” would so profoundly shape American cultural attitudes in the mid-century. At the heart of this approach to learning was Rousseau’s maxim, set out in Book II of *Emile*, that “the first movements of nature are always right. There is no original perversity in the human heart” (Rousseau 92). Striking at a central tenet of Puritanism—that humanity is inherently flawed and in need of salvation through faith—this romantic view of childhood as a state of innocence and intuitive connection with the natural world offers a more optimistic view of the individual’s basic make-up, but also presents growing up as a darker process of moral compromise in response to an imperfect society. Naturally good but adaptable, the child becomes an inevitable target for the forces of adult corruption.

In Rousseau’s system of education, the answer to this problem is the technique of “negative” education. The best early training of children consists, he argues, “not at all in teaching virtue or truth but in securing the heart from vice and the mind from error” (Rousseau 93). Children should be protected from knowledge, especially the kind of information and suggestion they might encounter in books, until it is of use to them. Their apprehension should be slowed down rather than accelerated. Instead they should be patiently taught to observe the flora and fauna of the countryside, and to deduce for themselves the laws that govern nature and the logic which dictates that self-respect and consideration for others will ultimately give them the most satisfying lives and the best place in society. Essential to Rousseau’s method for the education of his fictional pupil Emile is the long-term involvement of some dedicated family friend, a “governor” to guide the child through the emotional pitfalls of youth. But any absence of continuity in this process, the chopping and changing of teachers, will undermine the benefits of this slow and careful nurturing: “It is impossible that a child who passes successively through so many different hands ever be well raised,” writes Rousseau. “At every change he makes secret comparisons which always tend to diminish his esteem for those who govern him.” The child begins to see that adults are fallible with the result

that “all the authority of the age is lost, and the education is a failure” (Rousseau 57).

Books are the most dangerous things that the child can be given in early youth. First, they are the instruments of boredom, instilling a contempt for knowledge (Rousseau 116). Later, they become the transmitters of a sexual curiosity that, if triggered too early, and nurtured by irresponsible agents, leads to the loss of innocence:

Your children read. From their reading they get knowledge they would not have if they had not read. If they study, the imagination catches fire and intensifies in the silence of their rooms. If they live in society, they hear odd talk; they see things that strike them. They have been persuaded that they are men; therefore, whatever men do in their presence serves as the occasion for them to investigate how it applies to them. The actions of others must surely serve as models for them when the judgements of others serve as laws for them. The domestics who are made dependent on them, and are consequently interested in pleasing them, pay their court to them at the expense of good morals. Laughing governesses make remarks to them at four which the most brazen women would not dare to make to them at fifteen. Soon the governesses forget what they said, but the children do not forget what they heard. Naughty conversations prepare the way for libertine morals. The rascally lackey debauches the children, and the latter’s secret acts as a guarantee for the former’s. (Rousseau 218)

Here Rousseau sketches out a scenario strangely like the implied corruption and secrecy that is supposed to have enveloped both Miles and Flora during their time under the supervision of Peter Quint and Miss Jessel at Bly. Without moral guidance or the protection of any responsible agent of their own class, the children are allowed access to inappropriate knowledge and experience, and become the targets of the servants’ resentment at their place in society. Like most well-educated people of his generation, James had certainly read his Rousseau; his own autobiography alludes to Rousseau’s *Confessions*, which offers a potential model for James’s own account of his intellectual and artistic formation. However, I think it unlikely that he expected his readers to interpret *The Turn of the Screw* as

a dramatization of Rousseau's educational theories. Indeed, much of the story can be read as evidence of the failure of such theories. Nevertheless, what James probably could take for granted was that his audience would recognize many of the Governess's underlying ideals and assumptions about the nature of childhood and the proper way to acquire knowledge and moral understanding: children learn by observation and example much more than by precept or rote; teaching should be "negative" in that it should slow down the delivery of information and thus cause the child to find things out independently; lack of continuity in education is dangerous because it undermines the child's faith in his or her mentor and thus destabilizes their emerging sense of self; finally, knowledge that the child is given—whether by books or by mischievous adults—before it is of genuine use will do nothing but harm and will stunt his or her ability to make sound judgements.

Emile at Bly

Because of the vividness of the story's supernatural encounters, it is easy to forget that *The Turn of the Screw* is structured around the central dilemma of how to educate Miles—whose name is, of course, the English form of Emile. Most of the dialog in the novel, either between Mrs. Grose and the Governess, or between the Governess and Miles, is about this problem: should the boy attend school or be taught at home? The prologue explains that the Governess is initially hired to care for Flora at Bly and that ten-year-old Miles will only be at home during holidays, as he has been placed at a boarding school since the death of Quint. No sooner, however, has the child arrived home than the Governess receives a letter from the school, forwarded unopened by the Uncle, stating that Miles is not permitted to return after the holidays. What Miles has said or done to warrant his expulsion is not made clear in the letter. Presumably, the headmaster of the school, like the Governess, believes in educating people by letting them draw their own conclusions. One inference is that Miles, like Rousseau's child left to the ways of servants, has heard and seen more than he should from Peter Quint and has passed this inappropriate knowledge on to other boys at

school. He certainly speaks to the Governess in a register that seems unsettling for a child of ten, addressing her as “My dear” and complaining of an “unnatural” system of living that leaves him “always with the same lady,” when he is, as he claims, “a fellow, don’t you see? who’s—well getting on” (James, *TS* 76). The tone of Miles’s speech and his adoption of slang terms and phrases suggest that he may be imitating the speech of someone much older and that he, like Rousseau’s imagined child, believes himself already to be a man. It is perhaps this inappropriately adult tone that has alarmed the school authorities. Miles later admits that he “said things” to other pupils (119), but we don’t know what, or where he learned these. The Governess’s initial desire to vindicate Miles suggests that she views school itself as an unsuitable environment for the child. Even the feckless Uncle in London seems sufficiently familiar with educational norms to realise that the boy is rather too young for formal schooling, and should still be educated away from society, which was the original idea of sending the children to Bly, “the proper place for them being of course the country” as he puts it (7). As the story goes on, however, the Governess becomes more and more convinced of the idea of Miles’s “wickedness,” and of the part played by Quint and Jessel in this corruption (84). The Governess interprets Miles’s repeated requests to go back to school as evidence of this wickedness. He desires new knowledge: “I want to see more life,” he complains. He longs for “a new field,” which the Governess interprets as a need for new friends with whom to share his dark secrets (87).

Of course, Miles’s requests to leave Bly can be glossed differently. As the Governess admits, her own training is scant for the education of a bright boy of the upper classes, and Miles may be unsettled either by her emotional intensity or by troubled memories of the past at Bly. Either way, within Rousseau’s system, Miles’s longing for school and for book learning in preference to the outdoor opportunities and free timetable of Bly, characterised by “music and affection and success and private theatricals” (55), implies an intellectual precociousness which many of James’s readers would recognise as unhealthy and likely to lead to moral confusion. On

the fateful afternoon when the Governess first sees Miss Jessel at the lake, Miles has stayed indoors “to finish a book” (39). When Miss Jessel reappears later in the tale, Miles has once more stayed home supposedly for educational purposes: “Oh, *he’s* with Quint,” declares the Governess. “They’ll be in the schoolroom” (92). The implication here is that the ghost of Quint, the Uncle’s former valet, and presumably no scholar, is teaching Miles—but teaching something that Miles has no business to be learning. Conversely on the day of Miss Jessel’s first appearance, Flora, whose name suggests an empathy with the natural world, is shown playing by the lake with bits of wood, fashioning a boat out of them in the kind of practical, outdoor, imaginative play advocated by Rousseau and those who went on to apply his thinking, such as Pestalozzi, William Godwin and Maria Edgeworth (Richardson, 52-4). For Flora, untainted by school, the natural surroundings of Bly still have something to teach her—although, ironically, in the end, she can only be rescued by being taken away to London.

However, as the novel progresses it becomes clear—even in readings of the text that accept the supernatural presence of the ghosts at Bly—that the Governess is not really capable of applying good educational principles. From the very early stages of the story, she makes some key errors, such as when she confesses to Mrs Grose that she had been “rather carried away in Harley Street” in front of Flora. Along with Mrs Grose’s reply that “you’re not the first—and you won’t be the last,” this provides an example of the kind of carelessly suggestive conversation that Rousseau perceives as being so intriguing and damaging to the child (13). The Governess does attempt to put into practice the principles of restraint that govern the idea of “negative education,” which goes some way to explain her refusal to name the dead servants to the children. Her theory seems to be that if they can bring themselves to verbalise their previous experiences and to utter the names of Jessel and Quint, this will demonstrate that the children have developed their own moral understanding and have asserted their own emotional control over the situation. This would be good educational practice. However, the Governess seriously loses her pedagogical balance—most vividly in

the climactic scene with Flora by the lake, where she herself names Miss Jessel, an action which shows her own failure as a teacher for Flora—whichever reading of the tale you prefer. If the tale is read as a supernatural story, the Governess has denied Flora the chance to name her haunting demon and exorcise it (as Miles does later). Conversely, within a materialist interpretation of the text, she has simply terrified the child, imposed her own fears and fantasies on her imagination, and breached the process of natural, self-directed education to which Flora is drawn. Even more disturbing, however, is the nature of the relationship between the Governess and Miles. Not only does he address her with a slightly flirtatious note, but she also seems to engage in an increasing infatuation with the boy and her repeated desire to “save” him. What is she doing, for example, describing herself and Miles at their final meal together as “some young couple who, on their wedding-journey, at the inn, feel shy in the presence of the waiter,” if not violating his status as a child and hurrying him into the world of adult emotions? (112).

However, in her preoccupation with trying to find out whether or not Miles knows why he has been expelled from school, the Governess is precisely in line with Rousseau’s idea that morality is intrinsically tied to the question of consciousness. Rousseau writes that the child “must respond only to what nature asks of him, and then he will do nothing but good...because the bad action depends on the intention of doing harm, and he will never have this intention. If he had it one single time, all would be lost already; he would be wicked almost beyond recall” (Rousseau, 93). This seems to be the puzzle that the Governess is attempting to solve throughout the tale, whether Miles is an innocent angel whose flouting of conventions and school rules is blithely innocent, or if he is indeed “wicked beyond recall,” cunning, dissembling and sly. Even the name of the house at Bly seems chosen by James to signal this confusion of the “blithe” with the “sly” in Miles’s character. However, the ending of the novel does little to resolve this question. Miles’s death may be the result of a spiritual rejection of Quint’s supernatural control. Or it may be the outcome of the Governess’s misguided and suffocating passion for the boy. The tragedy is that whichever way one reads this

story, the children at Bly have been failed by the adults around them. The Governess, Quint, and Jessel are essentially guilty of the same educational crime. Unable to detach their own emotive needs from the development of the children's minds, they give Miles and Flora unwelcome knowledge, treat them too much like adults, and judge them by inappropriate standards. From the moment that the Uncle passed on his familial responsibility for training the children to other agents, this scenario was unlikely to produce a happy ending.

Finding Out for Yourself

True understanding, argues Rousseau in *Emile*, derives not from being given information, but from discovering the laws and principles of nature for oneself. Education is an empirical process, in which logic and reason must work alongside patience and restraint. The pupil must be left to learn through discovery. Reality must be minutely observed and its lessons absorbed slowly for these to be of value. Knowledge is useful only when one is ready to receive it and can apply it appropriately. Readers of James's work sometimes complain that his fiction is too slow, too indirect, his language too imprecise. Even his brother, the philosopher William James, criticized Henry's apparent incapacity to describe anything "in one sentence as straight and explicit as can be" and accused him instead of "breathing and sighing all round and round it" (Matthiessen 341). William, however, who himself developed a mode of thought which he called "Radical Empiricism," in which no knowledge was usable save what one had ascertained oneself, should have seen better what his brother was up to. Their ideas were not so far apart. Indeed, Henry James's characters are very fond of telling each other to "find out for yourself" (*The Ambassadors* 189; *The Golden Bowl* 203; *The Other House* 86). Isabel Archer, Lambert Strether, Maggie Verver: all of James's most promising pupils must school themselves in the ways of the world without easy answers. Their stories "won't tell" any more than the Governess's tale would, and this is the secret of the power of these texts to engage the reader's imagination. As James wrote in the preface to *The Turn of the Screw*, the reader's experience will be much more powerful if he thinks for himself. And

as James's other prefaces and critical essays show, this negativity of presentation is a central idea in his fictional method. The novelist, like the teacher, operates best by standing back from explanations and maxims. "My values were positively all blanks," wrote James of his construction of the events at Bly (TS 136). Superficially, it might sound like an abdication of creative responsibility. However, reading the story of Miles in the light of the story of Emile allows us to see that such blankness of value on the author's part does not mean that there is no lesson to be learned from *The Turn of the Screw*. Rather, it suggests that any knowledge that this text might give will only be good for us if we are prepared to find it out for ourselves.

Notes

1. In this essay, all book titles within parenthetical citations will be referred to by their initials. For example, "TS" here refers to James' *The Turn of the Screw*.

Works Cited

Anesko, Michael. *Friction with the Market: Henry James and the Profession of Authorship*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

Beidler, Peter. *The Collier's Weekly Edition of The Turn of the Screw*. Seattle: Coffeetown Press, 2010.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. Rpt. ed. London: Penguin, 1996.

Dahlstrand, Frederick C. *Amos Bronson Alcott: An Intellectual Biography*. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1977.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Hughes, Kathryn. *The Victorian Governess*. London: Hambledon & London, 2001.

Hutchison, Hazel. "An Embroidered Veil of Sound: The Word in the Machine in Henry James's *In the Cage*". *Henry James Review* 34.2 (Summer 2013): 147–162.

_____. "Just Literary: Henry James and 'the Law School Experiment.'" *Literary Imagination* 15.1 (2013): 36–47.

James, Henry. *Letters*. Ed. Leon Edel. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1974–1984.

_____. *The Ambassadors*. 1901. Rpt. London: Macmillan, 1909.

_____. *Autobiography*. Ed. Frederick Dupee. London: W. H. Allen, 1956.

_____. *The Other House*. 1896. Rpt. London: Everyman, 1996.

_____. *The Portrait of a Lady*. 1882. Rpt. London: Macmillan, 1907.

_____. *The Turn of the Screw*. 1898. Rpt. ed. London: Everyman, 1993.

James, William. *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1912.

Matthiessen, F. O. *The James Family: Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James Senior, William, Henry and Alice James*. New York: Knopf, 1947.

Petry, Alice Hall. “Jamesian Parody: Jane Eyre and *The Turn of the Screw*.” *Modern Language Studies* 13 (1983): 61–78.

Richardson, Alan. *Literature, Education, and Romanticism: Reading as Social Practice, 1780–1832*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile: or On Education*. 1776. Trans. Alan Bloom. New York: Basic Book, 1978.

Wilson, Edmund. “The Ambiguity of Henry James.” *Hound and Horn* (1934): 385–406.

Copyright of Critical Insights: Henry James is the property of Grey House Publishing Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.