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Introduction

In the MLA’s *Approaches to Teaching Henry James’s Daisy Miller and The Turn of the Screw*, editors Reed and Beidler note that instructors “use a variety of editions” of *Daisy Miller*, and that “those who assign *Daisy Miller* in a survey course use the edition in their textbook” (11). However, as this study will show, choosing an edition of *Daisy Miller (DM)* without researching it can have unintended consequences. There are many factors we must consider when selecting an edition: the novella’s history, the methodologies of editors, the implications of authorial intent, the revisions James made for the New York Edition, and the availability of modern editions. We must consider the history of *DM’s* publication because numerous editions were published during James’s lifetime. The changes between editions range from revisions in punctuation to additions of full paragraphs. Once we understand the text’s history, we need to consider the methodology of editors—this allows us to critically examine editorial choices made by editors of modern editions of *DM*. The issue of authorial intent—whether or not it should affect our reading and/or selection of a text, and if so, to what degree—cannot be ignored. James extensively revised many of his works for the New York Edition (NYE), a multivolume collection comprised of some of his best novels and novellas. He intended for the NYE to be the “definitive” edition of his work, but critics are divided to this day on which edition(s) are the “best” for teaching and scholarship. The goal of this paper is to equip instructors to make that decision for themselves. By considering history, editing practices, authorial intent, the NYE revisions, and the modern editions available to us today, educators will be able to decide which edition (or combination thereof) is best for
their classrooms. On a broader scope, the variant editions of this novella offer us a significant case study regarding the importance of textual editing for scholars. As this paper will show, choosing an edition and finding accurate information on which to base one’s decision can be complicated.

History

At least sixteen unique editions of *DM* were published during James’s lifetime.¹ I define a “unique edition” as a printing that uses different plates from any other edition, since this would allow for revision. *DM* was published in several formats: periodicals (first in individual issues and later in collected volumes), books, illustrated books, and in multivolume collections of James’s work (see Table 1). It was first published in 1878 in the British periodical *The Cornhill Magazine*, Part I in the June issue and Part II in the July issue (Edel and Laurence 39). James originally offered the story to *Lippincott’s Magazine* in Philadelphia, but the editor passed on it without giving a reason. James later appealed to a friend regarding the cause, and was informed that the editor must have been offended by it, deeming it an “outrage on American girlhood” (James, NYE v). He then offered it to the *Cornhill*, whose editor Leslie Stephen was happy to receive it (Horne, *Revision* 228). It went on to become an international success; everyone was talking about the scandalous Daisy Miller (Aziz 509). Due to gaps in international copyright law, *DM*

was pirated by two American periodicals, which James stated was “a sweet tribute I had n’t yet received and was never again to know” (NYE vi).

Table 1
Selected Editions of *Daisy Miller*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>“Daisy Miller: A Study,” <em>The Cornhill Magazine</em>, June and July issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td><em>Collected Novels and Tales</em>, 14 vols., Macmillan (<em>DM</em> in vol. 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a. An asterisk (*) denotes editions used as copy-texts for modern editions.

Four months after *DM* was published in the *Cornhill*, James released an authorized book edition in America as part of *Harper’s Half-Hour Series*. Despite the immense popularity of *DM* (it sold 200,000 copies in its first book incarnation), James did not make very much money from it due to a poor royalty deal: “For Daisy Miller I have rec’d the usual 10% . . . . This has a beggarly sound, but the Harpers sent me the other day a cheque for $200 (James qtd. in Anesko, *Friction* 49). The Harper edition sold for 20 cents in “wrappers” (i.e., paperback) and 35 cents in cloth. This meant that James
earned a mere 2 cents or 3.5 cents per copy. According to the Official Data Foundation, 20 cents in 1878 would amount to $5.11 today, and 35 cents would be worth $8.94. This was a very cheap edition. The $200 James earned would be equivalent to $5,110 today, meaning that royalties would be between $0.51 and $1.02 per copy. James remarked, in a phrase reminiscent of Benjamin Franklin, that “A man’s 1st [sic] successes are those, always, by which he makes the least” (49). James soon made a deal with Macmillan to publish DM along with An International Episode and Four Meetings in book form in England. It was published in February 1879, and did well enough to get a second printing not long after the first (Edel and Laurence 40). This edition contained very few changes from the Cornhill edition. In Aziz’s excellent appendix on “Textual Variants,” he records only sixteen changes between the Cornhill and the Macmillan, while pages and pages of revisions are unique to the NYE (398-433).

There is some controversy about which edition—the Harper or the Macmillan—was the first book form. This is due in part to the differing accounts of their respective publishing dates. Boudreau and Morgan assert that “In late 1878 [DM] was published in the United States by Harper and Brothers and in England by Macmillan, although the publication date is printed as 1879 in both editions” (39). This statement makes it sound as if the two editions were published simultaneously, which is possible, but Edel and Laurence give very specific publishing dates for each edition: “1 November 1878” for the Harper and “15 February 1879” for the Macmillan (39-40). However, Edel and Laurence acknowledge a variant date on the Harper’s copyright page, listing it as “1879 [1878]” (39). The presentation of the two dates matches Le Roy Phillips’ 1906 account of the publication of DM (13). The alternate dates listed in both of these sources suggest that
Boudreau and Morgan may be right about the date being “printed as 1879” in the Harper (39). If the Harper and Macmillan contained matching dates, it could explain how Stephen Fender, editor of *Daisy Miller and Other Tales*, could claim that the Macmillan 1879 is the “first book version of the tale,” despite Edel and Laurence’s claim to the contrary (39).

With multiple, conflicting, accounts of which edition of *DM* came first, it is important for us to determine if the dates suggested by different editors are plausible rather than incorrect. Since these sources provide publication dates that are contrary to one another, how are we to decide which editor is the most reliable? A mistake in the publication date may only be the first of many in an edition. While there are not many differences between the texts of the *Cornhill*, Harper, and Macmillan, we must know the correct publication order if we are to understand James’s revision process for each edition.

Thanks to modern technology and open-access resources, we are able to find scans of historical documents online. The Internet Archive contains a scan of the Harper edition, uploaded by the University of California Libraries, with the date is listed as 1878 on the copyright page. It is unlikely that Boudreau and Morgan would have claimed that the dates in both the Harper and Macmillan editions were 1879 unless they had seen copies of both. Therefore, it is reasonable for us to suspect that there were at least two printings of the Harper—each with different dates. The Internet Archive also contains a copy of the Macmillan from Oxford’s Bodleian Library. This edition was published in two volumes, the first of which contained *DM*. The copyright page lists the date as 1879, which corresponds with all of my sources. Since the date is printed as 1878 in at least
some Harper editions, we can reasonably assume that the Harper came before the Macmillan, making it the first book edition of the tale. This information allows us to track James’s revisions chronologically.

It has been suggested that the Macmillan book edition was of higher quality than the previous Harper edition, which Decker called a “pamphlet” rather than a book (3). Poole confirms this distinction by stating that Harper “brought [DM] out as an independent volume in a cheap format.” The scan of the Harper from the Internet Archive also suggests that it was in a “cheap format,” since the print is large and the margins are small. In fact, Edel and Laurence list the size of the Harper as 4.75 by 3.125 inches (39). The Macmillan, on the other hand, was 7.25 by 5 inches. However, it should be noted that both editions contained advertisements: 15 pages in the Harper and 40 pages in the Macmillan (39). The higher number of ads in the Macmillan lends credibility to the Harper, but the text is easier to read in the Internet Archive scan of the Macmillan. I personally prefer the Macmillan as copy-text because of its readability. A copy-text is the text used as the basis for creating an edition. Adding further support to the Macmillan, Wegelin and Wonham claim that “James was in England at the time and did not supervise [the Harper] edition,” and the changes were likely made by an American editor rather than by James himself (3). However, Kaplan² contradicts this claim: he states that “in the short time which elapsed between magazine publication and the appearance in book form, James was able to correct errors and do some revising and polishing.”

Fred Kaplan is the editor of The Turn of the Screw and Other Short Novels (2007) by Signet Classics, an imprint of Penguin. Although this edition is available in both print and Kindle editions, it does not have any footnotes to provide context or define foreign words. Since DM contains a number of French (and some Italian) words, the lack of footnotes is particularly inhibiting for readers who are not fluent in those languages. Students could look up each word individually, but it would take more time than most students are willing to spend. Therefore, having footnotes and/or a glossary of foreign words is one of my requirements for an excellent edition of DM.
Regardless of whose edits are present in the Harper, “The changes in ‘Daisy Miller’ are slight,” which makes sense, given that it was published so only four months after the *Cornhill* (Kaplan). Decker supports this claim, stating that “The 1879 Harper edition is nearly identical to the *Cornhill* text” (31).

After the Harper and Macmillan editions were released, the *Cornhill* released two book editions, one collecting their January-June monthly issues, and another containing their July-December issues for 1878. Edel and Laurence claim that the first appearance of *DM* was in these volumes: “*Cornhill Magazine*, XXXVII (June)” and “XXXVIII (July)” (324). However, we know from Spencer L. Eddy that the *Cornhill* was first published monthly, then collected into volumes (8). It was possible for authors to revise their work between the first monthly publication and the book edition. Tennyson’s “Tithonus,” for instance, which appeared in the very first issue of the *Cornhill* in 1860, apparently contained an “inferior first line (later revised for volume publication)” (35). We do not know if James followed Tennyson’s lead and revised *DM* for volumes 37 and 38 of the *Cornhill*, but it is certainly possible. Without a copy of the original *Cornhill* issues for comparison, we cannot be sure that there are not differences between the two editions.

The fact that Edel and Laurence cite the book editions of the *Cornhill* in their extensive *Bibliography*, rather than the individual issues, suggests that the original issues may be lost to us today. However, we do have scanned copies of both volumes 37 and 38 through the Internet Archive, uploaded by the University of Toronto.

Publication dates are not the only aspect of *DM* on which editors provide conflicting accounts: even titles can be disputed. The editor of the Dover Thrift edition of *Daisy Miller*, Stanley Appelbaum, claims in his “Bibliographical Note” that his edition is
“An unabridged republication of the work originally published in the Cornhill magazine, 1878,” but it then proceeds to title the two parts of the text “Les Trois Couronnes” (the hotel where Winterbourne first meets Daisy) and “Rome,” rather than “Part I” and “Part II” (as they appear in the Internet Archive scans). Did the original Cornhill contain these alternate titles? Without scanned copies of the June and July issues, we cannot be sure. It is plausible that Appelbaum is correct in his claim, but since no other sources even mention these alternate titles, his claim is weak at best, diminishing the authority of the Dover edition.

The Dover edition also misspells Vevey as “Vevay,” meaning that it could be derived from the Harper edition of DM rather than the Cornhill as Appelbaum asserted. Only the Harper editions of DM contain this spelling error. We cannot know for sure, but it could be that the town of Vevay, Indiana, might have caused the American editors of the Harper editions to assume that the spelling was the same. It is notable that the error is not present in the British Cornhill and Macmillan editions.

In The Dover Anthology of American Literature, the edition used as copy-text is not listed as the Cornhill, but as the 1878 Harper. The misspelling of “Vevay” is once again present, suggesting that both Dover editions use the same copy-text. The footnotes in the Dover Anthology may shed light on the variant section titles: “The first part was titled ‘Les Trois Couronnes’ [The Three Crowns] in the original 1878 Cornhill Magazine publication. . . . The second part was titled ‘Rome’ (Blaisdell n1-2). This assertion implies that changes were made between the first printing of the Cornhill and its volume publications, at least in the section titles. However, it should be noted that the 1892 illustrated Harper edition includes both title variations: “Part I: Les Trois Couronnes,”
and “Part II: Rome.” These can be seen in the Internet Archive scan of the edition, uploaded by the University of California (3, 63). The Dover editions are likely fine for use in the classroom, but they would not be my first choice because of the discrepancies mentioned above and their lack of critical apparatus.

Conversely, even editions with excellent critical apparatuses, such as the Norton Critical Edition of the *Tales of Henry James*, can contain inaccuracies. Wegelin and Wonham, editors of the Norton edition, assert that *DM’s “first appearance in a book was in America in Harper’s Half-Hour Series as volume I of Daisy Miller: A Study/An International Episode/Four Meetings*, published in November 1878” (3). This is the title of the first Macmillan edition from February 1879, but not the Harper edition. Phillips’ *Bibliography* from 1906 confirms that the 1878 Harper was “published as a separate book,” without any additional stories (14). However, Phillips writes that Harper’s *Franklin Square Library* edition, published in 1883, contained “Other Stories” (29). It is possible that Wegelin and Wonham based their claim on a copy of the *Franklin Square Library* edition, mistakenly thinking that it was the first Harper edition. However, it is more likely that the textual note is simply a misprint. If even a prestigious Norton Critical Edition can have faulty historical notes, it follows that instructors should check multiple sources to verify the facts before teaching them.

Besides the quality of editions and their critical apparatus, we should also consider which edition James used for his NYE revision of *DM*. According to Aziz, James used “the text of 1879 [Macmillan]” rather than the Harper for revision (154). However, Phillip Horne, author of *Henry James and Revision*, disagrees: he notes that the NYE changes correspond to “the 1883 in 12 places and the 1879 in 5,” indicating that
James used Macmillan’s 1883 “Collective Edition,” not the 1879 edition, as his “copy-text, but not very decisively” (x). Since James was revising DM thirty years after its initial publication in Cornhill, it makes sense that he would use his latest revised edition, the 1883, as his copy-text. Despite this strong possibility, none of the editors in my sample of seven modern editions of DM use the 1883 Macmillan as copy-text, which may be due to its poor availability. I was able to find scanned copies through the Internet Archive of the Cornhill book edition, the Harper 1878, the Macmillan 1879, the illustrated Harper of 1892, and the NYE of 1909. I scoured the internet for a copy of the 1883, but it was not to be found. Since the 1883 is not used by modern editors (only Horne, whose book was published in 1990) and it is not easily accessible by instructors and students, I will not be addressing it further in this study.

A history of DM would not be complete without mentioning the dramatic adaptation that James published in 1883. It bore the title, Daisy Miller: A Comedy. The play deserves its own study because James made significant changes to the story and characters. For example, he added three new players: Madame de Katkoff, a Russian princess with whom Winterbourne is infatuated; Alice Durant, a friend of Mrs. Costello’s who is initially presented as a love interest for Winterbourne; and Charles Reverdy, a servant who functions as comic relief. James even added a “happy ending,” where Daisy recovers and goes back to America with Winterbourne to be married. Why did James adapt the story for the stage? According to William Stafford, James “had a love affair with drama since his very earliest years, was an avid theatre-goer all his life, [and] a distinguished dramatic critic” (2). It was quite ambitious of James to break into the theatre scene, demonstrating the tenacity he put into his writing projects.
Despite the painstaking work he undertook to adapt *DM* into a play, it was rejected in both New York and London, and “His bitterness over its rejection . . . suggest[s] the possibility that the initial idea for the dramatization may have come from the New York producers themselves” (2). Durham notes that the “clutter of intrigue, the numerous asides and soliloquies, the unnatural happy ending—these were perhaps James’ sops to the lack of subtlety he felt part of the drama” (qtd. in Stafford 122). The ending is indeed “unnatural,” and even Daisy seems a little unsure about her and Winterbourne’s future. In the last lines of the play, Winterbourne, in reply to Reverdy’s announcement that he and Miss Durant will be married in America, says “We shall be married the same day. (To Daisy.) Sha’n’t we, Daisy—in America?” Daisy replies, “Oh, yes; you ought to go home!” (James qtd. in Stafford 100). Winterbourne does not even ask Daisy to marry him properly—it is a response to someone else’s engagement announcement. Daisy says *you* rather than *we* “ought to go home,” and the “yes” is vague: is she simply pleased that he wants to go “home” to America, or is she genuinely accepting his presumptive proposal? In any case, there is a reason the story was immensely popular and the play was not—the novella is considerably better. Most critics would agree with this subjective claim that the tragic ending of the original makes a much stronger impression on the reader than the “unnatural” happy ending. However, the play is still very much worth studying, if only to see how radically James altered the original. He ultimately returned to his original plot when revising for the New York Edition. The play, although unsuccessful commercially, was moderately successful in print, being first published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, then in book form not long after (Edel and Laurence 55).
Nine years after the play was published, in 1892, Harper published an illustrated edition of *Daisy Miller and An International Episode*, with illustrations by Harry McVickar (Phillips 44). Images from this edition are present in two of the modern editions in my sample: the Norton (Levine 343) and the Bedford (Decker 8, 14, 21, 27, 29). However, neither of these editions uses the text of the illustrated edition as copy-text. The 1892 edition was reissued without *An International Episode* in 1901, using the same plates as the first edition (Phillips 13). This edition must have been successful, since it was still in print five years later, as evidenced by a 1906 copy in the Eastern Washington University Library (“Catalog Entry”).

Fifteen years after the first illustrated edition was published, James released the first volume of the *The Novels and Tales of Henry James: The New York Edition* in 1907 (Edel and Laurence 137). Horne notes that “Like many other authors toward the end of their lives, James embarked on a project of self-reordering, self-recollection, and self-representation, extending his artistic control . . . [over] his whole oeuvre” (“Work” 66-67). The set consisted of twenty-six volumes; two of which were published posthumously (Edel and Laurence 138). *DM* was published in volume 18, along with several other stories, in 1909. The NYE was also published in England by Macmillan starting in 1908, using the “sheets of the ordinary issue of the American edition”; it was titled the “Edition de Luxe.” It did not sell well in England, resulting in extra pages sitting in the publisher’s office. Shockingly, these pages were later “used as package wrapping during the Second World War” (138).

There was one more edition of *DM* released during James’s lifetime—a 1915 volume containing the tale by itself as part of Martin Secker’s fourteen-volume *Uniform
Tales of Henry James. This edition follows the text “of the New York Edition”; therefore, it has no revisions (Edel and Laurence 154). In fact, James only approved the publication of the Uniform edition “on [Secker’s] distinct understanding, please, that he conform literatim and punctuatim to [the NYE] text. It is vital that he adhere to that authentic punctuation—to the last comma or rather, more essentially, no-comma” (James qtd. in Edel and Laurence 155). This statement shows that James cared very much about detail, and that the alterations he made to the punctuation in the NYE—along with other changes—should not be ignored.

James’s extensive revisions in the NYE were met with considerable resistance from the public. In “Revision as a ‘Living Affair’ in Henry James’s New York Edition,” J. Stephen Murphy provides insight into why James undertook the revisions in the first place. He asserts that are two approaches to reprinting classic literature: a “preservationist approach,” which views the past as sacred; and a “revisionist one,” which contends that “works of art remain vital within a culture by undergoing change rather than petrifaction” (163). Murphy notes that “Perhaps no more ironic sign of the failure of James’s revisionism exists than that the Library of America edition of James’s complete works prints the earlier, unrevised editions of his books” (164). Before the NYE was released, Scribner thought that they “would boost sales by advertising the revisions [but] they dropped the reference to the revisions the following year,” indicating that the revisions were not well-received (165). It was normal for authors to revise their works before the publication of a multivolume edition, but James took his revision further than some people were comfortable with, resulting in a “largely negative reaction to the edition” (165).
Strong reactions to revision of so-called “classic” works are not limited to the past. For example, many fans have expressed outrage at George Lucas’s changes to the original *Star Wars* trilogy. Twenty years after the first film, he revised each film significantly, only to continue making alterations with every subsequent re-release. Some changes were positive, such as “remixed audio [and] crisp visuals. . . . [But] a notable amount of CGI was added to the films, [and] there were entirely new scenes added while others [were] significantly altered.” These edits “created a rift between fans and creator,” which has only been strengthened over the years by Lucas’s unwillingness to release a remastered “unaltered version” of the original films (Moran). The reason why many fans care so deeply about having the films edited is because they grew up with *Star Wars*: it is part of their history. Changing it is akin to rewriting their past. James’s readers might have felt the same way—they would have remembered *DM* when it first came out and the thrill of discussing it with their friends. It was a cultural phenomenon. To take a story with such power and to change it after it was more or less established for thirty years must have upset James’s devotees. He saw the novella as “his” to alter as he wished, but he did not consider how the “preservationist” mindset of his day (and, to some extent, ours) would impact the NYE’s reception.

Like the “revised” editions *Star Wars*, not all of the changes in the NYE were bad: there are many places where simple phrases like “he said” or “she replied” become much more descriptive in the NYE. Poole provides this example: “‘Winterbourne rejoined’ is transformed into ‘the young man permitted himself to growl’” in the NYE. The increased use of figurative language throughout the NYE creates much more vivid imagery for the reader, thus enhancing engagement. However, James also replaced some
strong phrases with weaker ones in revision. For example, he changed a description of Daisy’s face from “singularly honest and fresh” to “decently limpid as the cleanest water” (*Cornhill* 682, NYE 11). Sometimes James’s NYE revisions overcomplicate a phrase and diminish its value. There are so many differences between the two editions that one would have to compare the changes line by line to determine which edition is stronger overall. I suggest instead to assign an earlier edition of the text (such as the *Cornhill*) to students first, then have students search the NYE for a few examples of passages that they believe are improved through revision. This exercise would inform students of the differences between editions and provoke discussion about what makes “good” writing.

Regardless of the edition one prefers, there is an inherent issue that comes with having multiple editions: a decrease in authority. Murphy notes that in James’s time, “Improvements in printing and the growth of the market for novels allowed writers greater opportunity to revise, thus increasing their authority over their work, but this opportunity could also diminish the authority of a text” because of the increase in multiple authoritative editions with substantive changes (165). Although advances in “printing allowed texts to be truer to an author’s intentions,” this practice did not remove “the intended variant,” or the author’s deliberate changes between editions. Books go through many hands—the author, editors, and printers—causing scholars to question which variants are “intended” by the author, which are “textual errors,” and which are the result of editors and printers (165). It is difficult to be sure—even impossible in some cases. For example, we are not sure why Vevey spelled “Vevay” in the 1878 and 1892 Harper editions of *DM*, but not in the *Cornhill*, Macmillan, or Scribner’s editions.
Some authors tried to reign in these multiple editions of their work by creating “collected editions” which “allowed authors to indicate which version of their texts were truest to their intentions or, if none were satisfactory, to produce another version of a given text” (Murphy 165). We know that James did the latter—at least when it came to revising his earlier works for the NYE. If they were already “perfect” in his eyes, he would not have altered some of them so significantly. In the case of DM, it had been thirty years since it was first published, and James’s writing sensibilities must have changed during that time—how could they not? However, we must not put too much weight on James’s intentions. If we allow the intentional fallacy—assuming that the author’s interpretation is the only correct one—to dictate our interpretations of DM, we unnecessarily limit ourselves. Authors do not always know what they “mean,” and even if they do, readers constitute half of the interpretive equation. A reader’s view can be just as valid as the author’s if it is supported by textual evidence, and the author’s view may be invalidated if the work does not clearly communicate his or her intention to readers.

James revised his works throughout his life, not just for the NYE. For “some serialized works, . . . he would send off different revised proofs to the American and the English periodicals,” mostly altering accidentals but sometimes editing substantives too (Murphy 168). Every new edition was “an opportunity for revision” for James—just like it was for George Lucas (168). The reason James’s alterations did not seem to upset anyone before the NYE is likely because the changes were minor up till that point. Lucas, on the other hand, made obvious (and sometimes annoying) changes to each new version of his films. Murphy explains that the NYE “comes off for many readers, not as James’s final word, but as further evidence, even damning evidence, that there is no such thing as
a final word” (169). Even though James intended the NYE of his works to be definitive, it was not, and cannot be for everyone. Editors and readers alike will always have different opinions about which edition is the most compelling, because it is almost entirely subjective. We can apply different theories and lenses and rationales to determine the “best” version of DM, but we will never be able to set that determination in stone. The purpose of this study is not to determine which edition of DM is “better” than the others, but to inform educators and scholars of the editions they have to choose from—and to provide context for their decisions. Murphy observes that “books are published in particular places and times, but the nature of texts allows them to become part of another place and time. . . . [T]hey are never limited to a point in history” (169). We will be studying the different editions of DM for years to come.

Murphy correctly states that “For James a novel or a tale is most complete when it compels revision, is most alive when a reader is reimagining it” (171). Revising his works was a way of keeping them relevant and “alive.” In James’s mind, if a work did not “compel” reworking, it was not worth his time. The fact that he revised DM so many times and even reworked it into a play in 1883 suggests that the novella had a special place in his heart. Murphy asserts that, for James, “Revision was not correction but merely attentive rereading that found what was always already there in the text, waiting to be discovered. Revision was discovery, not creation” (174). With every work he revised, he was paying tribute to it, honoring it. He had not “simply reread [the texts]; he changed characters, speech, action, and plot” (174). Murphy notes that when we look at one of James’s revised works, we may ask the question “Is it early or late James?” to which Murphy answers, “It is both” (176). This means that the NYE edition of DM is a
hybrid—we should consider both the young James and the more-experienced James when reading the NYE. James called the revision of the NYE “a living affair,” believing that revising his work helped keep it alive in the minds and hearts of readers (James qtd. in Murphy 177). He denied the preservationist attitude that art is fixed in time and should never be changed.

**Editing Practices**

In his 1950 article “The Rationale of Copy-Text,” scholar W. W. Greg developed a framework for choosing copy-texts that we still use today. He challenged the idea that the oldest version of a text is the most authoritative, stating that “authority is never absolute, but only relative” (19). He writes that “the modern editorial practice [is] to choose whatever extant text may be supposed to represent most nearly what the author wrote and to follow it with the least possible alteration” (21). It is important to note here that Greg does not emphasize authorial intent but instead historical accuracy when he focuses on “what the author wrote.” However, in the case of *DM*, his rationale is not specific enough—what James “wrote” depends on the point in time from which we choose an edition. In the case of multiple competing editions, Greg wrote,

we need to draw a distinction between the significant, or as I shall call them ‘substantive’, readings of the text, those namely that affect the author’s meaning or the essence of his expression, and others, such in general as spelling, punctuation, word-division, and the like, affecting mainly its formal presentation, which may be regarded as the accidents, or as I shall call them ‘accidentals’, of the text. (21)
For DM, there are no substantive changes between the original 1878 *Cornhill*, the 1878 Harper, and the 1879 Macmillan which are used as copy-texts for modern editions. However, the 1909 NYE is considerably different when compared side by side with any of these editions. Therefore, the “two” editions with substantive differences are the *Cornhill* (and the Harper and the Macmillan) and the NYE. These two texts also contain many differences in punctuation and word choice, meaning that the differences between accidentals and substantives are both significant. Greg argues that “it is only in the matter of accidentals that we are bound (within reason) to follow [the copy-text], and in respect of substantive readings we have exactly the same liberty (and obligation) of choice as has a classical editor, or as we should have were it a modernized text that we were preparing” (21). In other words, editors of all works should follow the accidentals of their copy-text, no matter what. However, editors are free to choose whichever edition they prefer, based on its substantive changes. For DM, this means that editors have the freedom to choose an earlier edition, such as the *Cornhill*, or the NYE; they are not restricted in their choice.

Twenty-five years after Greg posited his rationale, G. Thomas Tanselle published “Greg’s Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature” in 1975. He noted that Greg’s framework “would seem to apply to all situations. But it is important to raise the question of its universality, for Greg’s primary interest, after all, was in the printed drama of the English Renaissance” (180-81). Tanselle ultimately determined that his rationale does have value outside of that period: “Did he believe that his rationale was more widely applicable? . . . Greg’s own answer to these questions, I think it can be plainly inferred from his essay, would be Yes” (181). Regardless of Greg’s intention, we can apply his rationale to other genres of texts. Greg’s framework is useful outside of its
original context because all texts have substantives and accidentals. It is up to the editor to decide the number and type of accidentals that constitute a substantive change in the text. This common grammar joke illustrates just how important punctuation, the most prevalent type of accidental, can be: “Let’s eat, Grandma” is far different from “Let’s eat Grandma.” Context is key in determining misprints versus intentional changes between editions.

Tanselle later expanded on his analysis of Greg in the 1994 article “Editing without a Copy-Text.” He defines a copy-text as “a basic text into which alterations (or ‘emendations’) can be incorporated,” which he calls an “inherently restrictive concept” (2). Tanselle asserts that “living with [Greg’s] ideas for a considerable period has enabled us to see more clearly their essential direction and has put us in a position to understand how, paradoxically, a reduction of emphasis on ‘copy-text’ actually builds on and completes his argument” (3). Greg advocated for “editorial freedom,” but Tanselle argues that his adherence to the idea of a copy-text limited that freedom (8). Greg could not see a way around the necessity of the copy-text because “it was the function of [it], in his view, to provide the accidentals” (8). Allowing editors to discriminate between accidentals in various editions would eliminate the need for a copy-text, changing the purpose Greg’s rationale (9). Instead of using it to choose a copy-text, Tanselle suggests that we focus on creating a new text using Greg’s principle of substantives and accidentals.

The idea of “copy-text” becomes more obscure when one is dealing with “radiating texts,” or editions of a text that were released concurrently (and based on a single manuscript), such as the “syndicated newspaper pieces” of Stephen Crane (14). I would argue that the idea of “radiating texts” could be expanded to include pieces that
originated with a single manuscript, but were not released at the same time. This is the case with *DM*: its *Cornhill*, Harper, and Macmillan appearances were all released within months of each other, containing very minimal changes. Harper and Macmillan each re-released *DM* in 1883 with editions that varied from their predecessors, but not by much. The Harper Illustrated edition of 1892 followed the same pattern. Only the 1909 NYE contained changes of any weight, and yet it still originated with an earlier edition of the text. Would it not be fair to consider all of these to be radiating texts? Each edition was based on an earlier version of the text, all the way down to the *Cornhill* being based on the original manuscript. In this sense, all of the editions stemmed from the one manuscript, radiating outward through time, changing slightly with each printing. Therefore, I would consider “radiating texts” to be any editions of a text that were released during the author’s lifetime (or right after his or her death, as in the case of Emily Dickinson). Editions released after James’s death are unlikely to contain any of his revisions (only those of editors and printers), so they are irrelevant in our examination of James’s revisions of *DM*.

Tanselle claims that “Every choice made among variants in radiating texts is an active critical choice,” and that removing the copy-text allows editors the freedom to make those choices (19). This approach does not only apply to editors who are working with radiating texts, but also to editors of all texts:

If this idea—that critical editing is constructive rather than emendatory—were also applied to texts in linear genealogies, the role of judgment might more clearly be seen as dominant, and any practical guideline (such as Greg’s rationale) might be better recognized as an aid to judgment, not a brake on it. (19)
Working intentionally without a copy-text does not mean that we must throw out Greg’s ideas altogether; we must apply them in a different way. Distinguishing between substantives and accidentals is still useful for modern editors because it helps us focus on what matters most: substantives. We can devote the majority of our time to these substantives and less to surface-level features. However, I do not mean to dismiss the value of such features; enough small changes can amount to a substantive change.

We did not know it at the time, but Tanselle’s “no copy-text” idea was exactly what Paul Lindholdt and I adopted in our 2017 book chapter, “The World Sings Hallelujah”: an analysis of the origins of and meanings behind Leonard Cohen’s famous song. Since both of us came from literary backgrounds, we sought to better understand the lyrics of Cohen’s work, but soon realized that choosing a copy-text would be difficult: Cohen recorded six different versions of “Hallelujah” during his lifetime, each of them unique. We ultimately constructed a more accurate version of the lyrics by collating “nine [disparate] sources: six recordings of ‘Hallelujah,’ two sheet music versions, and the lyrics from [Cohen’s book] Stranger Music” (Peterson and Lindholdt 109). We did not dismiss Greg’s ideas completely, however. We intentionally included all seven verses Cohen wrote in our version, even though he never actually used all of them in the same performance (111). We took the verses to be substantives, then chose accidentals to follow depending on “which variation of each line was sung/printed the most . . . [and] if there was no majority for a line, we went word-by-word . . . . For verse order, we followed a similar process of majority” (109-110). Tanselle was right when he said that his theory was the fulfillment of Greg’s: a combined approach of looking for
substantives and accidentals across multiple editions of the text, rather than a single copy-
text, worked quite well for us.

**Authorial Intent**

Scholars have been divided on the value of authorial intent in criticism for years. In 1946, Wimsatt and Beardsley published their famous article, “The Intentional Fallacy,” in which they analyze the literary critic’s tendency to misinterpret a text by focusing too much on the author, rather than the work itself. They assert that “the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art” (468). This view is commonly held by the New Critics, who wished to get away from the authority of the author, believing it to be an inhibiting influence on criticism. Wimsatt and Beardsley make this excellent point: “How [are we] to find out what the poet tried to do? If the poet succeeded in doing it, then the poem itself shows what he [or she] was trying to do” (469, my emphasis). From this perspective, it does not matter what the author’s intention was; what matters is what the text communicates to readers. This concept does not only apply to poetry, but to all artistic endeavors.

Wimsatt and Beardsley explain that a poem does not belong to the critic or the author: “it is detached from the author at birth and goes about the world beyond his [or her] power to intend about it or control it. . . . The poem belongs to the public” (470). The authors do not wish to dismiss the value of “literary biography,” which they call “a legitimate and attractive study in itself,” but want to caution us against the “danger of confusing personal and poetic studies” (477). Looking for meaning in a text by examining an author’s life is not fruitless; it can yield very interesting discoveries.
However, it cannot substitute for poetic studies: analyses of the text itself. We need to ask ourselves, “Would this interpretation based on the author’s life still hold true if we knew nothing about the author? Would it still be plausible, based on textual evidence?” If not, we may be falling for the intentional fallacy. One way to avoid this mistake is to distinguish between types of “evidence for the meaning of a poem” (477). Wimsatt and Beardsley name three types: internal (what is on the page), external (what is not on the page, such as biography and history), and intermediate, (the bridge between them).

Intermediate evidence includes “the character of the author,” “his [or her] use of a word,” and “the associations which a word ha[s] for [the author]” (478). With all three types of evidence at our disposal, we can check our findings across each of them for more accurate interpretations of literature.

For example, the question of Daisy’s innocence caused a stir among readers in James’s time (as it still does for us today). In 1879, William Dean Howells noted in a letter that

James waked up all the women with his Daisy Miller, the intention of which they misconceived, and there has been a vast discussion in which nobody felt very deeply, and everybody talked very loudly. The thing went so far that society almost divided itself into Daisy Millerites and anti-Daisy Millerites. (qtd. in Boudreau and Morgan 130-31).

The internal evidence for Daisy’s innocence is not conclusive, because we only see Daisy through the eyes of other characters. Since the narrator never enters her mind, we are not sure what Daisy’s intentions are with Winterbourne and Giovanelli. This confusion is understandable—even Winterbourne is surprised at the end of the novella when
Giovanelli calls Daisy “the most innocent” (*Cornhill* 67). The external evidence is very clear, since James, in a letter to a friend, stated that “Poor little Daisy Miller was, as I understand her, above all things innocent” (qtd. in Boudreau and Morgan 103). For intermediate evidence, we learn that *innocent* had two meanings in James’s time: being “blameless” and/or lacking in “sexual experience,” suggesting that Daisy was probably unaware of her emotional impact on Winterbourne (103n1). When all three types of evidence are compared with one another, it appears that Daisy was indeed innocent. However, we should not dismiss the opinions of the “anti-Daisy Millerites.” One benefit of ruling out authorial intent is that we are free to find additional meanings that fit the text, regardless of what the author has said about the work. Interpretations of readers and critics can be just as valid as the author’s if they are supported by evidence. If one’s reading is supported by all three types of evidence, it strengthens his or her claim. The intentional fallacy occurs when we dismiss the value of internal evidence (the text) in favor of external or intermediate. We need not choose only one type of evidence, or favor one kind over the others. It is up to each critic to decide which types of evidence seem more persuasive in a given situation.

In 1967, more than twenty years after Wimsatt and Beardsley’s famous article was published, the debate about the importance of authorial intent was still in full swing. E. D. Hirsch published *Validity in Interpretation*, containing five chapters of his theories for analyzing literature. One of these chapters was “In Defense of the Author,” in which he argues against the “largely victorious assault on the sensible belief that a text means what its author meant” (1). A reverence for the author was replaced with a “theory of semantic autonomy,” or the notion that anyone can derive meaning from a work, not just
the author (2). For many scholars, “the theory . . . was entirely beneficial to literary criticism and scholarship because it shifted the focus of discussion from the author to his work” (2). Although Hirsch contends that “the immediate effect of banishing the author was wholly beneficial,” he explains that the theory of semantic autonomy is “responsible for that uneasiness which persists in the academies” when trying to pin down a definitive meaning of a text (3). The author’s interpretation was replaced with the “critic’s ‘reading’ of a text” because “the text had to represent somebody’s meaning—if not the author’s, then the critic’s” (3). Today, we have many different “readings” of DM to choose from—so many, in fact, that I do not think it is possible to read all of them. The novella has been the subject of critical debate for more than 100 years (1878-present). When we read interpretations of DM, it becomes clear that “interpreters can and do disagree,” and these disagreements “cannot be resolved” (4). For example, there will always be legitimate, conflicting opinions on whether or not Daisy was “innocent,” and on which version of the text is James’s strongest work (the Cornhill, Harper, Macmillan, or NYE). This is part of what makes literary studies so special—ambiguities allow for diversity of interpretation. Our conversations about DM will never really be finished because there will always be new critics with new takes on the novella.

Hirsch enhanced literary studies by encouraging us to make a distinction between meaning and significance: “Meaning is that which is represented by a text” while “Significance, on the other hand, names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a conception, or a situation, or indeed anything imaginable” (8). When an author makes substantive changes to a work, as James did with the NYE of DM, we can be tempted to think that the meaning of the text changed. However, according to Hirsch,
“the author’s revaluation of his text’s significance does not change its meaning” (10). In James’s case, when he made his NYE revisions, it had been thirty years since he had first published *DM*. He was a more experienced writer, so naturally he would have seen elements of the text he wanted to change. The meaning of *DM* remained the same, but its significance to him had changed, resulting in radical revision.

Hirsch states that “the primary object of criticism . . . is significance,” which means that we should focus on the various relationships between the text and its contexts (9). This method contradicts the New Critics, who deliberately ignore those relationships so that they can focus on the text itself. Hirsch argues that in order to critique the text, we must consider outside contexts. He claims that it is a permissible task to attempt to discover what [the author] meant. Such a task has a determinate object and therefore could be accomplished correctly or incorrectly. However, the task of finding out what a text says has no determinate object, since the text can say different things to different readers. One reading is as valid or invalid as another. (11)

Hirsch believes that we can find out what an author “meant” because it is a “task [that] has a determinable object.” I agree that there can be a right or a wrong answer to the question, “What did the author intend?” I do not think we can know unless the author has told us, and only then if 1) the author knows his or her intention; and 2) the author is willing to tell us. Even if the author does comment on the meaning of his or her work, comments are not always literal: they can be cryptic or sarcastic. We cannot read the author’s mind. Thankfully, we do not need to know an author’s intention to find meaning in a text. I concur that a “text can say different things to different readers”—we are all
individuals with our own set of experiences and tastes—but I do not believe that “One reading is as valid or invalid as another.” Some interpretations do have more validity than others because of the amount and type of evidence supporting those interpretations. If we remember Wimsatt and Beardsley’s three types of evidence (e.g., internal, external, and intermediate), an interpretation that is supported by all three is more valid than an assertion that is based on only one. The question of Daisy’s innocence is still up for debate because the internal evidence of the text is inconclusive. The external evidence that James claimed Daisy was “above all things innocent” in a letter only carries weight for critics who value authorial intent (qtd. in Layard 233). The intermediate evidence, which in this case is that the word “innocent” includes the connotation of being a virgin, does not change anything.

We cannot dismiss the idea that Daisy was manipulative simply because James said that she was not. The fact that he had to say it at all suggests that the text of the novella does not say this clearly. However, there were “Daisy Millerites”—those who agreed with James about Daisy’s innocence, even though he did not make a public statement about it until years later. Hirsch notes that “Most authors believe in the accessibility of their verbal meaning, for otherwise most of them would not write. . . . It is far more likely that an author and an interpreter can entertain identical meanings than that they cannot” (18). Even though we cannot get inside James’s head, not all of his

---

3 Circa 1880, Eliza Lynn Linton, a friend of James, wrote and asked him about Daisy’s innocence after “a very warm dispute about [his] intention in Daisy Miller” (qtd. in Layard 232). He replied, “Poor little Daisy Miller was, as I understand her, above all things innocent” (qtd. in 233). His response, buried in a series of correspondences between Linton and others, was published in 1901 by Layard, twenty-three years after the initial publication of the story in 1878. This exchange indicates that James did not want to influence readers’ interpretations of the novella—if he had, he would have published a similar response, publicly, right after the novella was published. Another of his friends, author William Dean Howells, wrote an essay defending Daisy’s innocence and published it in the Atlantic in February 1879 (Aziz 509-10).
meanings are shrouded in ambiguity. I think most of us could agree that Daisy Miller is a tragedy—her death is preventable because she could have taken some of Eugenio’s pills before going out, and yet it is inevitable. She could not distinguish between superficial and sensible rules; in her quest to defy social conventions, she eventually broke the wrong kind of rule. James eloquently summarizes the inevitability of Daisy’s fate through the words of Giovanelli at the grave: “She did what she liked” (NYE 92). Daisy was a free spirit—there was no stopping her.

Hirsch concludes his chapter, “In Defense of the Author,” by stating that “no textual meaning can transcend the meaning possibilities and the control of the language in which it is expressed” (23). In other words, there are a limited number of interpretations for a given word or phrase based on context. However, Hirsch rejects the notion that “linguistic signs can somehow speak their own meaning—a mystical idea that has never been persuasively defended.” Signs need interpreters, and “meaning is an affair of consciousness and not of physical signs or things” (23). This is his defense of the author: language must be interpreted by people to have meaning, and the author has just as much right to interpret his or her work as the reader or the critic.

One year after Hirsch argued for the author’s place in literary criticism, Roland Barthes published a counterargument in the form of his 1968 essay “The Death of the Author.” In it, he claims that “writing is the destruction of every voice, every origin,” which makes all texts author-less (49). Barthes states that “once a fact is recounted . . . this gap appears, the voice loses its origin, the author enters into his [or her] own death, [and] writing begins” (49). The act of writing itself causes the author to be irrelevant because readers can interpret the text themselves. To make an analogy, once food is
served, the cook is no longer needed. Barthes makes the excellent point that “in ethnographic societies, narrative is never assumed by a person but by a . . . reciter, whose ‘performance’ (i.e., his mastery of the narrative code) can be admired, but never his ‘genius.’ The author is a modern character, no doubt produced by our society. . . . (49).

Barthes explains that in the oral tradition, the “author” of a story does not matter—it belongs to a culture, rather than an individual. It is a collectivist view of literature, whereas our construction of the “author” is an individualist one. Barthes calls the author a “character,” which is an apt description because we created the discourse—the way of interpreting the world—that honors authors above readers. Ironically, we the readers are the ones who maintain this discourse that places the author on a pedestal. Why do we do this? Our reverence for the author likely stems from our appreciation of his or her unique talents. We know that not all authors meet the same standard—there is a reason why, in American literature, we elevate “classic” writers like Henry James, Emily Dickinson, Walt Whitman, Ernest Hemingway, and many others. Should we not honor their talents? We should, but not so much that it takes over all of our criticism. Barthes writes that criticism “is tyrannically centered on the author,” and that the “explanation of the work is still sought in the person of its producer” (50). The inherent problem with interpreting a work through the author’s life is that the work may not have anything to do with it. Not all works are autobiographical. In the case of DM, James was inspired to write it by a story he heard from a friend (James, NYE v). While this is interesting, do we really need to know it to understand the text? I think not.

Barthes is trying to get us to break away from an over-reliance on the author’s “person,” “history,” “tastes,” and “passions” when interpreting literary works because “it
is language which speaks, not the author” (50). He explains that the author “has the same relation of antecedence with his work that a father sustains with his child,” or perhaps the analogy of a mother and child would be more appropriate, since the author “gives birth” to a literary work after much labor (52). Regardless, the author becomes the past, while the text becomes the present. Barthes wants us to avoid the “Author-God” approach and focus on the author’s creation instead (53). To cement this idea, he states that “the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture” which writers “can only imitate.” There is nothing “original” in the works of great authors, since they draw from “a ready-made lexicon, whose words can be explained only through other words, and this ad infinitum” (53). Barthes’s description of the author is quite bleak: he or she is an imitator, not a trailblazer. There is some truth to this point of view, in that creating a wholly “original” work is impossible—we are all influenced by the people and things around us, and this bleeds into and usually inspires our writing. We are limited by vocabulary as well, except in the case of creating nonce words (as Shakespeare did). However, the way that we combine words and ideas is unique. For example, James uses techniques in DM that have been used by others (e.g., contrasting multiple dialects), but the way he uses them is masterful. Every choice serves the story he created. It does not matter that James did not invent the novella form, or that he was not the first to develop a strong female lead character—what matters is that he took these ideas and reworked them into something new. Barthes states that the author’s “sole power is to mingle writings,” but this does not negate the “power” of the author; it simply provides a more specific description of what an author does. To “mingle writings” is to contribute to the conversation—the body of work—on a topic.
Barthes might not hold the author in high esteem, but he does value the reader. He states that each reader is “inscribed . . . [with] all the citations out of which a writing is made,” that is, the culture from which the piece of writing is formed (54). Unlike the author, the reader could be anyone, and thus is “without history, without biography, without psychology” (54). We all have different backgrounds, leading to different interpretations of a work. Barthes encourages us to focus on the interpretations of the reader, not the author, because “the unity of a text is not in its origin but in its destination” (54). His final claim is that “in order to restore writing to its future, we must reverse the myth: the birth of the reader must be requited by the death of the Author” (55). The “myth” to which he is referring is the idea that the author is the lens through which we should read texts. When we “assign an Author to a text,” we effectively “impose a brake on it,” which is exactly what Barthes wants us to avoid (53). While I agree that limiting our critical analyses of literature to the “author-lens” closes us off from other valid (and interesting) interpretations, I do not think that we need to “kill” the author to “liberate” the reader. Could we not simply analyze the text through one critical lens at a time, ignoring the existence of the author (or the reader) if we so choose? These lenses need not be oppositional: sometimes the author and the reader agree on an interpretation. When they do not, we can analyze both perspectives and decide for ourselves which we prefer. The author and the reader can coexist.

Revisions in the NYE

Hershel Parker, one of the most vocal critics of the NYE, had this to say about the revisions: “[James] felt no compunction about touching up Daisy Miller . . . . As he revised, he defaced the tale” (40). Parker insinuates that James should have felt a
“compunction” about the revisions, and that by revising so dramatically, he “defaced” the tale, abusing his authorial powers. Parked does not stop there—he asserts that James “vulgarized the simple charm of the original” and “violated the story, from first to last” (41). Is that possible? Here are what the facts say: James added over 2,000 words to DM when he created the NYE. There are numerous instances of substantive changes.

Consider the following passage from the *Cornhill* and its revised counterpart in the NYE:

He was ceasing to be embarrassed, for he had begun to perceive that she was not in the least embarrassed herself. *(Cornhill 682)*

The NYE passage gives us much more insight into how Winterbourne sees Daisy. The first passage shows a confident, carefree Daisy who was “not in the least embarrassed herself” about conversing with a stranger. In the second, we see Winterbourne hypothesize that she might be “cold,” “austere,” “prim,” and “unapproachable,” but Daisy is none of those things, as we later discover. That Winterbourne would jump to those negative conclusions about “American girls” from the start shows how intimidated he is by her. These distancing labels he gives her are a way of making himself feel better about not being in control of the situation—if Daisy wanted, she could simply walk away. He is the one making himself vulnerable by approaching her. The NYE passage
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4 Using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software, I converted the texts of the *Cornhill* and the NYE to Word documents. After correcting obvious errors, I used the word-count feature in Word to determine the word-count of each text: the *Cornhill* is approximately 21,365 words long, while the NYE is 2,065 words longer, making for a total 23,430 words in the NYE.
highlights Winterbourne’s feelings of anxiety, while the *Cornhill* passage leaves more of his emotions to the imagination. It emphasizes Daisy’s carefree nature and shows that Winterbourne is starting to feel at ease. The NYE passage shows the opposite: Winterbourne is trying to cope with his anxiety by developing “generalised” observations about Daisy. Despite the reversal, I see both passages as fitting the story: the first one fits Daisy’s character better, but the second shows Winterbourne’s personality more effectively.

Some of the diction choices James made in the NYE are stronger than his original choices, while others are not. In the following passage, we see James describe Daisy in two very different ways:

[S]he gradually gave him more of the benefit of her glance; and then he saw that this glance was perfectly direct and unshrinking. It was not, however, what would have been called an immodest glance, for the young girl’s eyes were singularly honest and fresh. *(Cornhill 682)*

[S]he gradually, none the less, gave him more of the benefit of her attention; and then he saw that act unqualified by the faintest shadow of reserve. It was n’t however what would have been called a “bold” front that she presented, for her expression was as decently limpid as the very cleanest water. *(NYE 11)*

Let us begin by examining James’s diction choices. He exchanges “glance” for “attention,” and while “glance” provides Daisy with an action that the audience can visualize, “attention” is more generic. James at first describes Daisy’s glance as “perfectly direct and unshrinking,” then changes it to an “act unqualified by the faintest shadow of reserve.” The latter is more abstract. The word “unqualified” is usually used in the sense of being unfit, and although James uses it in a different sense here, the connotation of unqualified must be overcome before one can appreciate James’s meaning. Such ambiguity is not an issue in the *Cornhill* passage because “perfect,” “direct,” and “unshrinking” all have generally positive connotations. James’s next change
from “immodest glance” to “a ‘bold’ front” shifts from the softer word “immodest,” which is typically associated with women, to “a ‘bold’ front,” which is gender-neutral. I prefer “immodest glance” because it is active, with Daisy doing a visible action. Putting up “a ‘bold’ front” is passive, and the phrase also suggests that Daisy is hiding something, which has a negative connotation. The last change from her “eyes were singularly honest and fresh” to “her expression was as decently limpid as the very cleanest water,” reduces the power of the original remark in three ways. First, it is much longer than “singularly honest and fresh,” which makes less of an impression on the reader’s mind. Second, the qualifier of “decently” before the rest of the phrase diminishes its importance. According to Dictionary.com, the word limpid means “clear” or “transparent,” with the additional meaning of “being without stress or worry” (“Limpid”). If Daisy’s expression is only “decently limpid,” it really is not clear, but slightly cloudy. We get the sense that Daisy is a little preoccupied. James does not use “clear” to describe the water he is comparing with Daisy’s expression—he calls it the “cleanest water.” Essentially, James is describing Daisy’s look as “decently clear (and unburdened) like clean water.” This analogy makes no sense. If her expression is unclear, why compare it to “clean” water? Third, the word “limpid” is not widely used and carries the connotation of being “limp.” Her eyes being “singularly honest and fresh” is much more direct—and it emphasizes her innocence.

One could examine several passages in the same way as I did above, but now I would like to provide a general overview of the changes in the NYE. Adrian Poole, editor of Oxford World Classics’ Daisy Miller and An International Episode, includes an
appendix with “some examples of the numerous changes between the texts” of the NYE and the Macmillan (which is very similar to the *Cornhill*). He notes the following:

[T]he most prominent feature of the revisions is the heightened attention to the characters’ speech, to qualities of tone, intonation, intention, and implication, and to their effects on the hearer. The act of speaking becomes more dramatic in the sense we are given of both participants, of what passes (or fails to pass) between them.

There are many instances where there are changes to the “characters’ speech.” Poole notes that the expressions “he said” and “she said” are replaced with much more “nuanced and elaborated” ones, such as “emboldened to reply,” “imperturbably laughed,” and “colourlessly remarked.” James relies heavily on adverbs in the NYE. Dialect is also refined: “The Millers no longer say ‘isn’t’ but ‘ain’t’, ‘he doesn’t’ but ‘he don’t’.” Poole explains that these changes in dialect have the effect of “accentuat[ing] cultural differences,” which heightens the contrast between America and Europe, strengthening James’s hold on the international theme.

One of the most prevalent changes throughout the NYE is the punctuation. In 2014, Robin Vella Riehl wrote “James and the ‘No-Comma’: Punctuation and Authority in ‘Daisy Miller’”—an analysis of how James’s additions and removals of punctuation in the NYE alter our interpretation of the text. She notes that 287 commas were removed between the *Cornhill* and the NYE, and that many semicolons were changed to other types of punctuation (68). Riehl asserts that “James’s new punctuation assists in rewriting his characters, helping to make their motives less opaque and their personalities less ambiguous” (69). She provides numerous examples, all of which support her thesis that
“the modified punctuation works to take away agency from the reader of ‘Daisy Miller’ and reassert James’s control over the text” (69). Why did James make these changes? According to Riehl, James was “correcting what he viewed as misreadings of the story,” particularly in the case of Daisy’s innocence (70). She notes that “James consistently uses punctuation—or, more precisely, the omission of punctuation—as a tool to reestablish certain character traits,” making his interpretation of the characters clearer to readers. Riehl does not see these “clarifications” as positive, however; she states that they “work to re-establish James as the sole authority of the text” (72).

Riehl sees an “obvious pattern in James’s revisions: the majority of his changes have the effect of condensing his prose, removing markers that signaled pauses,” such as commas and even periods (73). James no longer encourages readers to interpret his work thoughtfully, but “instead preemptively establish[es] the reader’s response by encoding that discipline directly onto the text” (74). He attempts to allow no room for “error” in reader interpretation, but doing so also has the unhappy consequence of boxing in readers, limiting their imaginations. Riehl concludes her argument as follows:

The 1878 text invited readers to “study” and draw their conclusions, just as the characters observed their surroundings and gleaned information. But like its characters, the readers of the New York Edition’s “Daisy Miller” lose their status as active observers. James’s revised text simply informs a reader who has been relegated to a passive role, stripped of the agency previously granted by the punctuation of “Daisy Miller: A Study.”

With less ambiguity, there is less room for interpretation, which ultimately limits reader agency. While I agree that James’s attempts to control the meaning of the text through
punctuation do limit reader agency, this does not mean that readers are no longer free to form their own interpretations or make their own “pauses” as they read. Take audiobooks for example: I can find at least ten different versions of *DM* online, each with readers interpreting the pauses (or lack thereof) differently. The NYE may attempt to curb misunderstandings of the text, but different interpretations are inevitable. Scholarship itself is based on the principle of multiple, valid opinions coexisting and contributing to an ongoing conversation. Once a text is out in the world, it no longer belongs solely to the author—its meaning is also constructed by the audience. Negative opinions of Daisy, despite their being the opposite of what James intended, are no less valid than positive interpretations of her character. When I first read the novella, I was an “anti-Daisy Millerite,” frustrated by her apparent disregard for Winterbourne’s emotions. However, upon subsequent readings, I began to see what James saw: an “innocent” girl who had no idea that her flirtations could have a negative effect on the men around her. Daisy found solace in the affections of young men because they were the only ones who paid attention to her. Her family’s neglect pushed her towards her deadly mistake.

**Modern Editions**

The internet is flooded with unreliable editions of the classics—*DM* is no exception. Since most classic works are in the public domain, they are fair game for anyone to publish and sell. E-books are particularly easy to self-publish: on Amazon’s *Kindle* store alone there are at least 150 unique editions of *DM*. Of those, 61% do not list

---

5 I conducted a survey using a sample size of 150 *Kindle* editions of *Daisy Miller*: 15 were from established publishers or imprints, 43 were from unreliable publishers, and 92 had no publisher listed. My sample included collections of James’s work and anthologies of American Literature. I excluded editions in languages other than English.
a publisher at all, 29% are from unreliable publishers,⁶ and a mere 10% are from established publishers or imprints.⁷ This means that 90% of the Kindle editions of DM are ill-suited for classroom use.

What happens if students accidentally choose an unreliable edition? At best, they will have to get by with minimal (if any) footnotes and a couple of typos. At worst, they could end up with a paraphrased version of the text. For example, in one errant edition of Daisy Miller, the opening lines are as follows: “At the little city of Vevey, in Switzerland, there’s a in [sic] particular secure inn. There are, certainly, many resorts, for the enjoyment of tourists is the business of the vicinity” (“Daisy Miller: A Study”). James’s text reads, “At the little town of Vevey, in Switzerland, there is a particularly comfortable hotel. There are, indeed, many hotels; for the entertainment of tourists is the business of the place” (Cornhill 678). A “secure inn” brings to mind an image completely different from “comfortable hotel.” The meaning and rhythm of the passage is lost. With so many unreliable editions of DM available, it is vital that we guide our students towards authoritative editions. Since there are multiple editions from established publishers to choose from, how do we decide which one to use in our classrooms?

When choosing an edition, we will likely consider cost, value, quality of critical apparatus (e.g., introductions, footnotes, appendices), and method of purchase. Let me suggest one more consideration: format. In today’s digital world, many students are

---

⁶ I define an “unreliable” publisher as one that is relatively unknown, only publishes digital titles, is clearly self-published, and/or has no website. Some examples of these publishers include “e-artnow books,” “Delphi Classics,” and “iOnlineShopping.com.”

⁷ I consider an “established” publisher to be one that is well-known and publishes both print and digital titles. The publishers I included were Modern Library (an imprint of Random House), Penguin, Skyhorse (an imprint of Simon and Schuster), Oxford University Press, Signet Classics (an imprint of Penguin), Cambridge World Classics, Start Publishing (an imprint of Simon and Schuster), HarperPerennial Classics (an imprint of HarperCollins), Norton, McGraw-Hill, and Bedford/St. Martin’s (an imprint of Macmillan).
turning to e-books for their affordability. Kindle is one of the most popular e-bookstores in the world because of its wide selection of books, its user-friendly interface, and its cross-platform availability: iOS, Android, Windows, Mac, Kindle e-readers, and web browsers (via Kindle Cloud Reader). Kindle editions are great for study because of their portability, adjustable text-size, excellent annotation tools, and search capabilities. They have the added benefit of being text-to-speech compatible, allowing persons with disabilities easier access (“Features Available in Kindle Books”). Some Kindle books even have Whispersync for Voice, a feature that syncs an audiobook (performed by a professional reader) to the text by highlighting each word as it is spoken. With all of these benefits, it makes sense for us to choose texts that are available as Kindle editions for our students.

However, not all students are tech-savvy or have digital devices of their own, making Kindle books less appealing to them. Some students (and many instructors) prefer print books because they are easier on the eyes, can be written on by hand, and are more practical for class use when referencing page numbers.\(^8\) It should be noted that there are two types of Kindle books: print replica and flowing text. A print-replica e-book is like a PDF—it matches the print copy exactly and includes page numbers. Annotation, search, and accessibility features still function, and students are able to follow along with the class if others are using print copies. The disadvantage to print replicas is that they are difficult to read on small screens, such as smartphones. Flowing text books are far better

\(^8\) Without page numbers, instructors have less flexibility when assigning readings. Instead of assigning part of a chapter, instructors would have to assign the whole chapter or “describe” where to stop. In class, rather than saying “turn to page 45,” instructors would have to say “open chapter twelve.” This is not a big deal unless one is trying to find a more specific passage. For this, the instructor would have to say a specific phrase for students to search, which likely will take more time than simply calling out a page number.
for this because the font and text-size are adjustable, along with brightness and contrast. Personally, I prefer flowing-text e-books because they allow me to read on any device, anywhere. I will often read on my tablet, then later switch to my phone. Flowing text is also better for split-screen reading, where students can have a document open on one half of their laptop/tablet screen, and Kindle on the other half. I use this feature frequently to help me find quotations while writing papers.

In summary, Kindle books are excellent in terms of portability, cost, and accessibility, while print books are better for those prefer “real” pages, taking handwritten notes, and having page numbers. To increase student agency and provide the most comfortable learning experience for all, we should choose editions that are available in both Kindle and print formats. This allows students and instructors to choose the version of the text they prefer. DM happens to have several editions that meet this criterion.

Of my sample of 150 Kindle editions, only 10%, or fifteen, were from established publishers. However, I soon discovered that being from a “good” publisher does not guarantee that an edition is of high quality. Several editions did not contain a “Note on the Text,” a passage stating which edition of DM was used as its copy-text. For the purpose of this study, I have identified several criteria for choosing an authoritative edition of DM: 1) it is from a well-known, large publisher with a good reputation; 2) it is still in print (which I define as being available brand-new in print from both the publisher’s website and Amazon.com); 3) it is available in both digital and print editions for maximum accessibility; 4) it includes a “Note on the Text” explaining which edition of DM was chosen and why; 5) it has footnotes; and, 6) it has a named editor. I have
found seven editions which meet these criteria: Bedford (2013); Broadview (2012); Penguin (2016); Norton (2017); Oxford (2013); Modern Library, which is an imprint of Random House (2002); and McGraw-Hill (2009). The Bedford uses the *Cornhill* 1878, while the Broadview uses the Harper 1878. The Penguin and the Norton both use the Macmillan 1879, but the Oxford, Modern Library, and McGraw-Hill all use the NYE 1909. Modern editors are thus divided between the earlier editions and the NYE, with the earlier editions having a slight majority (four out of seven editors chose them). The reason that I group all of the earlier editions together is because they contain no substantive changes.

I will now explain the pros and cons of each edition (see Table 2 for a summary of these). The Bedford (2013) edition, simply titled *Daisy Miller*, was edited by William Merrill Decker and is part of the Bedford College Editions series. The Kindle edition is a print replica and has explanatory footnotes on most pages. It contains an excellent critical apparatus which includes a brief chronology, introduction, images from the 1892 illustrated edition of *DM*, “Suggestions for Further Reading and Research,” and a “Glossary of Literary Terms.” It is the only edition I could find—reliable or otherwise—that uses the *Cornhill* as its copy-text. Decker’s rationale for choosing the *Cornhill* is as follows: “This edition restores *Daisy Miller* to the freshness of its initial appearance in 1878” (vi). It is a matter of editor preference, since Decker calls the *Cornhill* “fresh,” implying that the later editions are less so. However, there is a logical reason for using the first edition: it is the edition that people first read and discussed in James’s time. It was the edition that brought him unprecedented fame. Therefore, the *Cornhill* has the most historical value.
The Broadview (2012) edition, also titled *Daisy Miller*, initially did not make my cut of authoritative and easily accessible versions because it is not available in the *Kindle*

Table 2

Comparison of Modern Editions of *Daisy Miller*<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>Cornhill 1878</td>
<td>Harper 1878</td>
<td>Macmillan 1879</td>
<td>NYE 1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPERBACK</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-BOOK</td>
<td>Kindle</td>
<td>Google Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-BOOK TYPE</td>
<td>Print Replica</td>
<td>Flowing Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>Under $10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>Note on Text</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Chronology</td>
<td>Footnotes</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>Additional Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. For each edition I checked to see if it was available on its publisher’s website, Amazon.com, the *Kindle* store, and the *Google Play* store. I did so to make sure that the edition was still in print and cost less than $10 in at least one form (print, digital, or rental). I viewed digital copies of each text to determine their contents, along with print copies of the anthologies.
store, only the Google Play store. Google Play books are frustrating because the navigation and highlighting capabilities are not intuitive for Kindle users. However, the Broadview edition has so many resources that it cannot be reasonably ignored. Editors Kristin Boudreau and Megan Stoner Morgan outdid themselves with their critical apparatus; besides having the standard introduction, chronology, and footnotes, they include twelve appendices covering a wide variety of historical contexts. These include letters and other relevant excerpts from James, contemporary reviews of both the tale and the play, an excerpt from the play, background on the locations used in the novella, and even historical descriptions of “Roman Fever.” Another unique feature of this edition is that it is available in both print replica and flowing text formats, allowing students to choose the digital format they prefer (it is also available in print, as are all of the editions in my sample). Boudreau and Morgan’s rationale for choosing the Harper 1878, despite the NYE being “James’s definitive edition of the novella,” is that “many of James’s readers preferred his simpler earlier style” (39). They chose the Harper because it “ha[s] the benefit of James’s revisions while also being close enough to the date of its first composition that it reflects James’s earlier style” (39). This compromise of “original” and “revised” makes sense. However, the authors do not acknowledge that Harper printed DM in “the cheapest possible format,” which may diminish the reliability of the text (Anesko, Friction 43).

Daisy Miller and Other Tales was published by Penguin in 2016 and edited by Stephen Fender. It contains six “other tales,” for a total of seven in the volume. This edition includes an introduction, chronology, footnotes, “Further Reading,” and a “Glossary of Foreign Words and Expressions.” The footnotes in the Kindle edition are
pop-up style, allowing for an uninterrupted reading experience.\textsuperscript{9} Fender’s rationale for choosing the Macmillan 1879 is that he believes it is the “first book version of the tale” when it is actually the Harper. He states that the “principle behind this selection is that it preserves the benefit of James’s (almost always improving) revisions, while still preserving the chronological development of his thoughts around the international theme.” Since the Macmillan 1879 is a higher-quality edition than the Harper (hardback with a more legible font), it is a better choice of copy-text.

“Daisy Miller: A Study” in \textit{The Norton Anthology of American Literature} is a good choice for those who already use it as a textbook in their American literature survey courses. It was edited by Robert S. Levine, and he chose the text of the 1879 Macmillan, providing no rationale. This edition includes the frontispiece from the 1892 illustrated edition along with detailed footnotes. As with all Norton editions, there is headnote introducing the life and work of Henry James. The 2017 edition also includes “The Real Thing,” “The Beast in the Jungle,” and an excerpt from James’s \textit{The Art of Fiction}. It is a print replica edition, which is nice because it preserves the formatting and makes finding pages easy, since they match the print edition.

The Oxford edition of \textit{Daisy Miller and An International Episode} was published in 2013 and is part of the Oxford World’s Classics series. It was edited by Adrian Poole, who is the only editor in my sample to include an appendix on the variants between the \textit{Cornhill} and NYE. This feature is very helpful for instructors who wish to cover some of

\textsuperscript{9} Most \textit{Kindle} editions have hyperlinked footnotes that send the reader to the “notes” section of a book, and then one must tap the link that corresponds to the note he or she previously selected to go back to the earlier page. This can be frustrating for books with several footnotes. However, in both the Penguin (2016) and the Modern Library (2002) \textit{Kindle} editions, the footnotes pop up directly on the page rather than redirecting the reader to a different section. This system much more user-friendly and will likely encourage students to access the footnotes.
the main differences between the two editions. He also includes an introduction, chronology, footnotes, “Select Bibliography,” the preface to *DM*, and an appendix on “Stage and Screen Versions of ‘Daisy Miller.’” The fact that *An International Episode* accompanies *DM* in this edition, as it did in the Macmillan 1879, is fortuitous: not only are both stories examples of the international theme, but James actually intended for these tales to go together. According to Anesko, James “deliberately wrote ‘An International Episode’ as a counterpart to [*DM*] and quickly sold it to the *Cornhill* and *Harper’s* for simultaneous publication in December 1878” (*Letters* 134-35n6). Poole chose the NYE for both tales, providing no rationale for his choice. However, choosing the NYE makes sense if one wants to respect authorial intent, since the NYE was what James considered the “definitive” edition of his work.

The Modern Library edition of *Daisy Miller* was edited by James Danley and published in 2002. It includes an introduction by Elizabeth Hardwick, a brief “Biographical Note,” James’s preface to *DM*, and footnotes. It also has a “Reading Group Guide” containing excellent questions for class discussion that could be repurposed as writing prompts. Danley chose the NYE as his copy-text, with the simple rationale that it “incorporates the author’s extensive revisions.” He clearly sees the revision of the NYE as a positive, though not all editors do. This *Kindle* edition has hyperlinked footnotes that they pop up on the screen rather than sending the reader to a different page; making it extremely convenient for study.

The final edition in my sample is “Daisy Miller” in McGraw-Hill’s *The American Tradition in Literature* (2009). It was edited by George Perkins and Barbara Perkins. This edition contains a brief introduction to the tale in a footnote. The editors do not provide a
rationale for their choice of the NYE, but this omission is likely due to limited footnote space. The anthology also includes “The Real Thing” and “The Beast in the Jungle,” along with footnotes and a selected bibliography. This anthology is notable because it contains American literature from “the Native American Oral Tradition to Present” in a single volume. It is a print replica in the Kindle store, but the physical print copy has a cheap feel to it—the pages are more see-through than the Norton’s.

Each of the above editions has strengths and weaknesses. For those who wish to teach the original *Cornhill*, the Bedford is the best (and only) option. The Broadview is excellent for graduate students doing research, but I would not recommend it for undergraduates because the sheer amount of “bonus material” can be overwhelming. The Penguin is great if an instructor wants to cover several James stories on the international theme. It is also the most user-friendly edition of the earlier texts (it uses the Macmillan 1879) due to its flowing text and pop-up footnotes in the Kindle edition. The Norton provides better context and notes for “Daisy Miller” than the McGraw-Hill anthology, but the Norton uses the Macmillan 1879 and the McGraw-Hill uses the NYE, so it is up to the instructor to choose which anthology best suits his or her needs. The Modern Library edition is a good one to choose for those who only want *DM* (no other tales) and prefer the NYE text. This edition also has flowing text and pop-up footnotes in the Kindle edition and a helpful “Reading Group Guide.”

For my classroom, I will use two editions: the Penguin and the Oxford. Students will read the earlier edition of *DM* in the Penguin first (and likely a few other stories). Then I will show the “Textual Variants” section (from the Oxford) in class so that students can see the differences between the Macmillan 1879 and the NYE 1909. I might
ask students to compare two versions of a line or passage (depending upon time) and argue for which version they think is stronger and why. After the discussion, I would link it to strategies for revising their own papers, and show them that yes, even great writers like Henry James took the time to revise (something that most undergraduates are loath to do). Studying *DM* chronologically—by starting with the Macmillan 1879—will allow students to see James’s progression as a writer and enjoy the edition that first captured audiences in James’s day. The text of the earlier edition is 2,000 words shorter (so students are more likely to finish it), and the style is more accessible for undergraduates: the additional commas encourage students to pause and soak in what they are reading, and the diction choices are (usually) less obscure to modern readers.

**Conclusion**

John Lyon, editor of Penguin’s *Henry James: Selected Tales* (2001) chose the texts of NYE for all of the stories in the volume.\(^\text{10}\) His rationale is the most eloquent one I have seen in any edition containing *DM*. He acknowledges that

Any choice of one text over another involves losses as well as gains. What is lost here [in choosing the NYE] is the possibility first, to have direct experience of James the young writer and secondly, to see, moving from early tales to late, a broad view of his development as a writer. . . . The gain, in choosing the texts of the New York Edition, lies, first, in being true to the fact of revision as a central aspect of James’s creativity (never merely as an afterthought), and secondly – this point is admittedly contentious, a matter of taste and for critical argument – in

\(^{10}\) This is also an excellent edition of *Daisy Miller*. It would have been added to my sample of seven editions, but the hard copy is no longer in print. The e-book currently costs $14 on the Kindle and Google Play stores. This is a great edition if one does not mind that new print copies are unavailable. It includes an introduction, “Further Reading,” a chronology, footnotes, and nineteen James stories.
printing what the present editor believes are, by and large, better versions than their earlier incarnations.

When choosing between the earlier editions and the NYE, we encounter “losses as well as gains” no matter which one we choose. The earlier editions capture the excitement of the story that had readers divided into “Daisy Millerites” and “anti-Daisy Millerites.” It shows us James’s earlier, simpler style. However, if we choose to teach both an earlier edition and the NYE, we are able to see his “development as a writer.” The changes are significant enough to merit analysis. If students are willing to learn and time allows, the revisions may be used to provoke discussion. We can better understand and appreciate James as a writer if we take the time to analyze this “central aspect of James’s creativity.” Ultimately, it is up to the instructor to decide which edition students will read (or read first, if choosing two editions). On a broader note, this study shows that rationales and editor’s notes do not always agree and are sometimes not even accurate (as in the case of Wegelin and Wonham, editors of the Norton Critical Edition). Whenever we choose texts for our courses that are available in multiple editions, we should not simply read the “Note on the Text” and accept it as truth. We must think critically and challenge the opinions of editors, since their words are subjective. Even dates can be contested (as in the case of the Harper and Macmillan editions). If we want to be reasonably sure about the “facts” surrounding our chosen edition, we must compare notes.
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