“The emergence of mind in Henry James’s notebook material:
The case of the tales”

José A. Álvarez-Amorós
jalvarez@ua.es
University of Alicante

Published in *English Text Construction*
14.1 (2021): 68-93

Inscribed in the field of cognitive narrative theory, this paper asks, and attempts to answer, a number of questions about the early emergence of mind in James’s notebook material for his short fiction. These questions essentially turn on the metarepresentational and aspectualizing potential of notebook entries in genetic relation to the finished tales, that is, on their capacity to present the projected storyworld, from its very conception, as a function of the subjectivity of one or several characters in the cognitive role of metarepresentational sources, or else as a dementialized lump of content to be aspectualized later in the process of execution. Analysis of the relevant notebook material yields a polarity between epistemic and contentual entries, and reveals a set of cognitive phenomena based on the alteration or continuity of the primitive balance of sources which allows one to conclude that James’s characteristic concern with the mental dynamics of his narratives, rather than being a compositional addition, was deeply embedded in his earliest fictional projects.

Keywords: cognitive narrative theory, Henry James, metarepresentation and aspectuality, notebook material, tales

He “didn’t want to press her lest he should have seemed to attribute to her the cupidity they had both thought to *soustraire* him from”.

Notebook entry for Henry James’s tale “Lord Beaupré” (1892)

1. Points of departure

One of the foundational assumptions of cognitive narrative theory is that we read for the mind rather than for the plot. In line with the prevalent thesis that “[n]arrative is in essence the presentation of fictional mental functioning” (Palmer 2004: 177),¹ we are said to experience an overriding fascination with the mental dynamics of narrative works. We revel in watching how minds interact, recognize and recursively embed each other, form hypotheses about their contents, become

¹ These are some remarkably similar formulations of the said thesis: “without the ability to construct representations of other people’s minds we would be unable to understand, and much less to appreciate, stories” (Ryan 2010: 476); “every narrative consists of some literary means of representing other people’s minds” (Rembowska-Pluciennik 2012: 66); and “in many cases the very point of reading a fictional narrative is, it seems, to get access to the realm of other people’s minds” (Schneider 2013: 124). For a contrasting view see Grethlein (2015).

suddenly opaque or suffer episodes of “embodied transparency” (Zunshine 2008: 72–86), forge alliances which symbiotically operate beyond the somatic limits of the self until they enter upon a crisis and either survive or eventually dissolve, and so on. Our inborn ability to justify external behaviour in terms of the presumed mental design behind it—our theory of mind—turns us into active players of the game, thereby eroding the ontological distinction between real-life minds and their fictional counterparts and foregrounding many functional similarities (Pinker 1998: 541; Palmer 2004: 163, 198–200; Zunshine 2006: 166n18; Palmer 2010: 11, 19, 56; Ryan 2010: 477). Indeed, there is little difference between the ways in which we represent the minds of actual people, the ways in which we represent the minds of characters we read about in novels, and the ways in which these characters represent each other’s minds. A snub is a snub on either side of the fictional boundary, and the array of reactive states of mind it can trigger (irritation, indifference, derision, perplexity, etc.) is basically shared both by flesh-and-blood individuals and by the realistic inhabitants of storyworlds.

Though reading for the mind is held to be a universal feature of our engagement with fictional texts—even with ostensibly behaviourist ones (Margolin 2003: 284; Palmer 2004: 206–207)—it is undeniable that Henry James’s status as a novelist of consciousness, an artificer of mind-driven narratives, and a staunch advocate of the “psychological reason” in fiction (James 1970: 402) makes his work naturally amenable to this kind of approach. James’s treatment of novelistic consciousness has elicited a variety of responses for over a century. Early reviewers used to underline his reputed skill for “psychological analysis” and his relentless focus on “the complex psychology” of character (Hayes 2010: 295, 307). Emphasis was laid on the subtlety of mental dissection even when critics came to grips with *The Awkward Age* (1898–99), a novel widely noted for its alleged mindlessness (e.g. Gard 1986: 283; Hayes 2010: 333). In the late 1960s, Ross Labrie speculated that consciousness, for James, is “the power which allows a subject to assimilate the environment” (1968: 521), and, two decades later, Sharon Cameron anticipated the debate on the extended mind that would liven up the field of cognitive psychology at the turn of the century by arguing that, in James’s fiction, “consciousness is not in persons; it is rather between them” (1989: 77), is not a property of the self, of interiority, but of the social space that lies between selves. With this intuition, she heralded key notions such as the socially distributed mind, and pre-emptively opposed later descriptions of James as an internalist writer whose only concern is the solipsistic, private ruminations of highly individual characters (e.g. Palmer 2010: 164, 170–71, 181–82). In 1998, a synthesis of James’s approach to the constitution of fictional consciousness was attempted by Adré Marshall following Dorrit Cohn’s 1978 model of mental representation in the narrative text. On the whole, and despite Marshall’s taxonomic conscientiousness and the discovery in James of hitherto unidentified mind-reporting strategies such as the so-called imputed monologue (e.g. 1998: 160–63, 199–205), her contribution can be interpreted as a regression on Cameron’s intersubjective proposal, for it

builds on the standard assumption that consciousness is a private affair which can only be accessed via introspection or highly obtrusive and unnatural methods. The fact that scholarly opinion on James's view of consciousness should waver between externalism and internalism probably indicates that his treatment of mind straddles two epochs—the nineteenth-century classical novel from Austen to Eliot and beyond, where what counts is how minds interrelate and strive to figure out their respective contents, and the disconnected, fragmentary impressionism of modernist narrative, where minds are selectively exposed to the reader in self-sufficient isolation. Quite recently, the notion of “spiralling consciousness” has been proposed to account for those intense episodes of epiphanic revelation when Jamesian characters in the role of perceptual centres experience an epistemic lift and gain momentary “access to the authorial viewpoint” (Throesch 2017: 187), to an all-dimensional apprehension of life, though soon relapse into ordinary cognition, only with an expanded, potentially richer consciousness, very much like the successive arcs of a spiralling line.

It is against this dual backdrop of cognitive theory and typically Jamesian creative profile that I intend to explore how the construction of the interiority of characters in James's short fiction is prepared for in the notebook material, or, put differently, if his concern with the mental dynamics of a given tale is already inscribed, however embryonically, in the earliest notebook conception, or if it develops in the course of execution. In order to impart some shape and critical falsifiability to my discussion, and thus prevent it from becoming a set of trivial observations about the functioning of mind, I will carry out my enquiry on the theoretical template provided by the narratological assimilation of specific areas of the cognitive sciences.

Over the past two decades, narrative theory has borrowed a set of strategic concepts from cognitive psychology and employed them to gain better insights into the role of fictional consciousness in the construction of stories. Theory of mind, also known as mind reading; extended mind and distributed identity; social minds and intermental units; mental embedding, metarepresentation, and aspectuality—these are just some of the notions that have been invoked most often to model the operation of mind in fictional texts. Given the purpose of this paper, metarepresentation and aspectuality prove to be especially useful. Each in its own way, they respond to an essential dualism of experience in the field of cognition that generates meaning at the interface between abstract, unsituated content and human intentional acts. In my view, the pattern of regularities to be observed as mental experience emerges from James's notebooks is also dualistic. It involves the interplay between an external, dementalized world and the human factor which, in his case, tends to be present from the earliest stages of artistic conception. Thus, metarepresentation and aspectuality can provide a close fit between observed phenomena and method of enquiry, and this substantially improves the chances for a more relevant analysis of the former.

Like other compound words prefixed by the *meta*- morpheme, the term *metarepresentation* denotes some sort of second-order representation. It primarily refers to our cognitive ability to ascribe mental states to our conspecifics or to ourselves, to reason about somebody else's reasoning, and thus to decouple thought from reference via one or several interposing minds.² While conceiving of "A London Life" (1888) in his notebooks, James writes that one Mrs. D. S. "guesses that Laura's conduct has made a greater impression upon him than anything relating to her hitherto" (CN 39).³ Two states of mind are nested here (three if we consider James's own creative ideation)—Mrs. D. S.'s guess and the male protagonist's reaction to Laura's conduct. In writing this, James represents indeed the man's mental condition, but only through somebody else's mental functioning. This primary sense of metarepresentation is at the root of a secondary sense that is of major importance in the cognitive treatment of narrative texts. It is related to the human capacity to process information along with sources, and, in this regard, to be conscious of the provenance of a particular dataset is to meta-represent it. We mentally tag content with its origin and the specific circumstances of its acquisition, so that we can safely discriminate between information obtained by direct perceptual experience and information passed on to us by somebody else, or store in memory real-life information well decoupled from the information we have acquired from reading a novel (Cosmides & Tooby 2000: 69–74). James's brief passage just quoted above provides a good example of what I mean. To know that the male character in question is deeply struck by Laura's conduct has next to no significance unless we also know that the source of such information is Mrs. D. S. and that it is reported as a conjecture rather than as a positive fact. Of course, we could also consider that Mrs. D. S.'s guess about the man's impression is the object of James's *fictional* project, which provides a highly revealing additional source. If we lose track of the system of metarepresentational sources in this and in much more complex instances than this we are obviously open to misreading and deception.

Aspectuality, for its part, is the term used to denote that all elements in a fictional world result from concrete, situated, unique acts of perception and cognition, and, in consequence, that any fictional world is but the sum total of all of these acts (Margolin 2003: 282–83). When they are consensual, they reinforce each other and construct coherent worlds; when they are not, conflict arises in many degrees, which can range from mere discrepancy of opinion to serious clashes that may come close to endangering the ontological stability of a story-

² Among the ever-growing body of literature on cognitive metarepresentation, the seminal volume edited in 2000 by Dan Sperber still holds out; other valuable contributions are by Egeth & Kurzban (2009) and Bremer (2012). The metarepresentational ability to process information along with the circumstances of its acquisition has been applied to the analysis of narrative by Zunshine (2006), Iversen (2011), Phelan (2017), and Marsh (2018).

³ James's notebooks (James 1987) will be cited parenthetically as CN.

world. Focal concerns in James's fiction are often subjected to aspectualization — e.g. the supernatural component in "The Turn of the Screw" (1898) or "The Friends of the Friends" (1896); the existence and nature of a hidden pattern in Vereker's work in "The Figure in the Carpet" (1896) or of a disturbing black hole in Mrs. Dammerel's past in "The Great Condition" (1899); St. George's sincerity in "The Lesson of the Master" (1888); the absolute, extrasystematic quality of Limbert's work in "The Next Time" (1895); the true character of Mrs. Brash's beauty in "The Beldonald Holbein" (1901); Linda Pallant's personality in "Louisa Pallant" (1888), and so on. The fictional factuality of these central issues very much depends on whether we come to know of them *differently* in the notebook entries and in the finished narratives, and this may yield contrasting views of a storyworld in terms of overall significance and critical reading.

Cognitive metapresentation as the human ability to keep content connected to source thus plays a key role in the operation of aspectuality. Since the latter is a property of content that renders it knowable only from specific epistemic positions, the metarepresentational ability is an ideal tool to keep track of such positions and evaluate their effect on the representation of content. In combination, moreover, they allow for a more precise definition of my goal here. Do James's notebook entries present a sourceless, dementalized, monolithic lump of content which acquires a system of cognitive sources and a variable level of aspectuality in the course of execution, or are both system and level rudimentarily ingrained in the earliest design and then mapped out more or less faithfully onto the finished text? Does execution provide a chart of how information circulates in a certain tale, or does this chart already form part in some sense of the notebook material? And finally, to what extent are the celebrated indeterminacies of some of James's narratives an outcome of the acquisition of a system of sources and a level of aspectuality that problematizes a presumably inert lump of meaning as presented by the notebooks? The emergence of mind in Henry James's notebook material is contingent, I think, on the answers one can provide for these questions.

2. Notebooks and notebook entries

Despite D. J. Gordon's provocative claim that James's "*Notebooks* do not explain [his] works", but it is rather his works which "are needed to explain the *Notebooks*" (1950: 182), his literary jottings have not transcended the status of ancillary material regularly invoked by critics and commentators to elucidate — or complicate — his narrative ever since they became widely available in 1947. It was then that Francis O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock compiled an edition which printed, among other Jamesian preparatory writing, the nine literary notebooks he composed between November 1878 and May 1911. Forty years later Leon Edel and Lyall H. Powers brought out what purported to be a comprehensive, definitive edition of the notebooks. They restored some entries which were missing from the 1947 edition and appended a substantial body of material

hitherto unpublished; however, minor oversights pointed out by Michael Anesko (1988: 122–24) still persisted. The two editions reflect the contrasting academic personalities of their respective authors. The Matthiessen-Murdock edition is primarily the work of two critics who were more concerned with James's narrative art than with his biography and immediate social context; the Edel-Powers edition, on the contrary, entrusts critical commentary "to the alert reader" (CN xx), focuses on "the text and its context" in the belief that the notebooks are mainly "historical, biographical, geographical, and psychological" (CN v), and accordingly supplies the wealth of topical detail that one might expect from James's senior biographer. And yet both teams of editors explicitly agree that the obvious crudity of many initial sketches is fully remedied in transit to the finished narratives—for Matthiessen and Murdock, the shallowness of gossipy anecdote becomes "transformed into life" (James 1947: xv), no less, whereas for Edel and Powers the "easy way out" James seems to take in his early notes leads to "the clutter [being] swept away" and "the delicate touch applied" (CN xi) as the works approach completion.

Notebook entries for James's short fiction are generally brief and range from a few lines to one or two pages in the Edel-Powers edition; they also tend to correspond one-to-one with each finished tale. Exceptions occur, though. One can find much longer single entries, like those for "A London Life" and "The Great Condition", as well as stories that grew out of multiple sets of notes (e.g. "The Coxon Fund" [1894] and "The Friends of the Friends"); conversely, several fictions can be argued to originate in a single entry (e.g. "The Middle Years" [1893] and "The Great Good Place" [1900]), although evidence is less conclusive here and cases are open to thematic and contextual interpretation. In general terms, single notebook entries have three standard components—the inspirational *donnée* or initial idea, the fictional project evolving from it, and the comments offered by James on several aspects, textual and contextual, of his creative endeavour. Whenever the *donnée* is revealed, its discussion usually opens the entry; comments, however, are randomly scattered throughout. James's inspiration came from a variety of sources, whether direct or mediated. His professional experience and personal anxieties supplied ideas for "John Delavoy" (1898), "The Next Time", and "The Middle Years", for instance. Mediated experience reached him in the form of essays ("The Given Case" [1899]), non-fictional books ("Owen Wingrave" [1892] and "The Coxon Fund"), tales and novels ("Maud-Evelyn" [1900] and "Flickerbridge" [1902]), and letters ("The Marriages" [1891] and "The Papers" [1903]), or by direct social interaction in his inveterate role as an avid listener to all sorts of anecdotes and narratives which are recorded in entries at one, two, or even more removes with dwindling claims to authenticity.

One feature of the notebooks that may affect the analysis of the emergence of mind is the frequent occurrence in the entries of individuals who double as real-life people and fictional characters—they are one thing in the reported anecdote and become the other as James pushes forward his fictional project. Entries

growing from “true” anecdotes may thus contain a number of cognitive states and processes ascribed to ontologically different minds which display, however, strong functional continuity. This is especially noticeable (a) when anecdotes encroach on the fictional project they inspire and tend to occupy much of the space afforded by the entry, and (b) when the textual demarcation between anecdote and project remains uncertain. Different degrees of encroachment characterize the entries for “Georgina’s Reasons” (1884), “Brooksmith” (1891), “The Beldonald Holbein”, “The Birthplace” (1903), and “The Aspern Papers” (1888). Let us consider the entry for the latter. It opens with James’s recounting of an anecdote about Captain Edward Silsbee, a real-life personage (Wallace 1955: 46–80), and his scheme to obtain some “letters of Shelley’s and Byron’s” (CN 33) by lodging with the Misses Claremont, their owners, and awaiting his chance. The anecdote itself is much more substantial and detailed than the ensuing fictional plan which seems flimsy and fragmentary by comparison. James vividly presents Silsbee and his fascination with Shelleyana, and, what is more important, endows him with a sketchy mind, but a mind after all (“Silsbee knew that they had interesting papers”, “he had known it for a long time”, “[he] cherished the idea”, “he laid the plan . . . hoping”, “he had expected” [CN 33]). Some lines below, after James’s typical acknowledgement that “[c]ertainly there is a little subject there [i.e. in the anecdote]” (CN 33), he sets up a link between Silsbee and his fictional counterpart by calling the latter “the Shelley fanatic” (CN 33), and briefly represents his “hesitations” (CN 34) and his boundless desire to obtain the papers almost at any price. In fact, the term “hesitations” can be viewed as a signpost for the cognitive boundary between the real-life anecdote and James’s fictional project.

Let us consider now another example provided by the entry for “The Turn of the Screw” and its mixed status, midway between that of an inspiring narrative and a fictional plan. James reproduces here a vague, eerie story told by the Archbishop of Canterbury about the plight of some “young children (indefinite number and age) left to the care of servants in an old-country house” (CN 109). He ostensibly relates what occurred to them as if simply transcribing the salient points of the Archbishop’s tale with an emphasis on its imprecision, but, in the very last sentence, we read that “[t]he story [is] to be told — tolerably obviously — by an outside spectator, observer” (CN 109). Only then does one realize the dual nature of James’s preceding narrative, uneasily poised between the retelling of the children’s experience and the concoction of a creative project of his own. Even if the entries for “The Aspern Papers” and “The Turn of the Screw” present respective cases of encroachment and ambivalence, the result is similar — the motivating narratives, whether Silsbee’s anecdote or the Archbishop’s story, rather than external, clearly delimited quickeners of imagination, *become integral with the fictional projects they are just supposed to inspire*. This overlap renders the prefictional and fictional minds featured in each entry almost functionally indistinguishable and tends to obscure James’s cognitive intuition for a particular tale.

3. The polarity epistemic-contentual: regularities and contrasts

Supported by the instrumental notions of metarepresentation and aspectuality as outlined in the opening section, an analysis of the notebook entries for the sixty-odd tales whose early design left behind extant written evidence yields a polarity rather than a one-sided set-up. Entries range from highly *epistemic* to flatly *contentual* depending on whether the sources that metarepresent elements of the storyworld are internal or external to such entries, that is, whether James appears to delegate his powers for world construction and mind attribution to the characters he is designing, or else openly retains and wields these powers *in propria persona*. An entry gravitates to the epistemic pole when it shows concern for the fictional situatedness of information—how intelligence circulates or is blocked within the confines of the projected storyworld and how aspectuality is made possible and enhanced; or, in other words, how characters are given the capacity to act as metarepresentational sources and perhaps tamper with the ontology of things by reporting their states of mind as fictional facts. Contentual entries occupy the opposite end of the spectrum. Here James does not make any gesture towards what one might call the cognitive emancipation of character. *Données* take narrative shape independently of situated sources and methods of transmission, that is, regardless of which character thinks what, which feels, guesses, or imagines what, where one heard of what, how one knew of what, at how many removes and with what claim to trustworthiness, etc. In these entries there is no question that every bit of fictional content derives from one single, hypostatized origin—James himself—and makes up a solid, monolithic, non-aspectual whole which the resulting tale may eventually problematize by subjecting it to an array of sources missing from the entry and developed in execution. For James to note down that an emerging character is “very generous and beneficent to the suffering poor” (CN 21), a “little plain, quiet woman” (CN 29), “ashamed of her mother” (CN 49), a “little woman, devoted to her beauty, which she cherishes” (CN 125), “perplexed and dissatisfied” (CN 173) is to metarepresent his or her personality by pointing himself out as the source of content; but it is quite another affair to say that “[h]e is overwhelmed with melancholy and regret—which the fiancée *sees* as jealousy and resents” (CN 182; my italics), that “[e]ach *knows* that the other *knows*—each *knows* just how the other is *affected*” (CN 152; my italics), that “someone . . . *recogniz[es]* his rare, anomalous, magnificent, interesting, curious, tremendously suggestive character, vices and all” (CN 89; my italics), or that “[h]e *guesses*, and the wife *sees* that he has *guessed*” (CN 26; my italics). In these cases, James disclaims all or part of his responsibility for the state of affairs he outlines by subjecting it to an *ur*-system of sources inscribed in the storyworld and by aspectualizing it in the process. Between the epistemic and the contentual poles there runs, as can be expected, the entire gamut of combinations and mixed cases.

Most entries for James’s short stories qualify, even minimally, as epistemic in the sense suggested above. This does not mean, however, that all of them parade

elaborate systems of metarepresentational sources or thoroughly chart how information propagates in them. Take, for instance, the notebook entry for “The Middle Years”. Despite its compactness and high level of abstraction — there is no intimation of plot beyond the term “incident” — it shows some concern with sources and aspectuality:

[1] The idea of the old artist, or man of letters, who at the end, *feels* a kind of anguish of desire for a respite, a prolongation — another period of life to do the *real* thing that he has in him — the thing for which all the others have been but a slow preparation. He is the man who has developed late, obstructedly, with difficulty, has needed all life to learn, to see his way, to collect material, and now *feels* that if he can only have another life to make use of this clear start, he can show what he is really capable of. [2] Some incident, then, to show that what he *has* done *is* that of which he is capable — that he has done all he can, that he has put into his things the love of perfection and that they will live by that. [3] Or else an incident acting just the other way — showing him what he might do, just what he must give up forever. [4] The 1st idea the best. A young doctor, a young pilgrim who *admires* him. (CN 68; my italics except in “*has*” and “*is*”)

The entry as a whole hinges on the unresolved contingency success-failure, which turns out to be one thing or another according to the source that metarepresents it. In [1] James imagines an old man of letters who, at the end of his life, questions his own artistic achievement and wishes for a respite to really give all that is in him. One should note that, at this stage, James does not settle the issue as of his own extrafictional authority, but rather ascribes to the old man the sense of failure and the attendant conviction that more time could improve his chances of success, and this is done by using twice a standard metacognitive term such as “*feels*”. It remains an open question, however, whether the old artist might be wrong in the defeatist appreciation of his own achievements. As from [2] James complicates things a bit further by devising incidents that put both sense and conviction to the test from *within* the projected storyworld. First, he subjects the contingency success-failure to the judgement of a young admirer — a detail that will only become explicit a few lines below — with the result that the old man’s notion of himself and his belief that more time would give him a second chance are contradicted; then in [3] James proposes an unspecified incident that will confirm the old man’s pessimistic view; and finally in [4] he chooses between [2] and [3], and suggests the specific profile of the competing source that contributes to aspectualizing, and thus rendering problematic, the old writer’s achievement. In the particular case of “The Middle Years”, the primitive system of metarepresentational sources just outlined faithfully informs the finished tale, including the possibility — though not the probability, I think — that the young admirer is mercifully lying in order to ease the artist’s distress at the prospect of irremediable failure.

Many other epistemic entries for James's tales are less patchy and economical in stating the sources and paths of propagation of intelligence within the projected storyworld. Those for "The Point of View" (1882), "The Marriages", and "Lord Beaupré" (1892) display pronounced features in this respect, even if the former bears little or no thematic resemblance to the finished work. Each in its way, the three entries present notable acts of mind reading that condition the unfolding of plot and its resolution. The entry for "The Point of View" is based on a neat cognitive triangle whose vertices are occupied by the three characters. Information flows or is blocked along its sides, which originates marked differentials of knowledge leading to an unfortunate denouement:

[1] The girl is devoutly in love with a young man who is also in love with her — though no declarations or confessions have passed between them. [2] The young man at last makes known his feelings to the mother and asks leave to pay his suit. [3] The mother, thinking him an undesirable match, refuses consent, assuring him and herself that the girl doesn't care for him. [4] He declares that she does — that he feels it, he knows it; but [5] the mother insists that she knows her daughter best, that she has watched her, studied her; that the girl is perfectly fancy-free. [6] And she makes up [her] mind to this — desiring and determined to believe it. [7] The young man writes to the girl — three times; and the mother intercepts the letters. [8] The girl, suspecting nothing of this, cherishes her secret passion, and keeps up, out of pride and modesty, that appearance [9] which confirms her mother's theory of her indifference. (CN 11)

No character is placed at the top of the cognitive ladder, that is, no character seems to know all, though one — the young woman — does ignore all. The flows of information along two sides of the triangle are selectively blocked. First, the young woman is unaware that her love is requited; she has no confirmation and, besides, she is not attributed any mind-reading activity, whether successful or not. The young man, for his part, has no confirmation either, but uses his theory of mind, hypothesizes her mental state correctly, and "feels . . . knows" that his affection is not wasted. Second, there is no real communication between mother and daughter — the latter is left out of the loop, while the former reads her mind wrongly and constructs a comfortable image of it consistent with her dislike of the suitor and the sexual mores of the age. In a sense, [5] and [6], plus a tiny fragment from [3], form the cognitive key to the passage — [5] denotes, in principle, a massive failure of the mother's theory of mind and of her role as a trustworthy metarepresentational source, but [6] and two words from [3] ("and herself") add complexity to the picture revealing another area of the mother's mind in which her reading of the daughter's interiority is accurate and must be repressed with her unwitting collaboration as in [8] and [9]. At first sight, this entry could pass for a model instance of epistemicity — two very active thinking minds situated within the storyworld construct aspectualized, conflicted images of somebody else's

consciousness. This is not the case, however, at least not the whole case. In [1] James asserts his role as the source of the baseline ontology of the entry; and while characters might be entangled in a decentred web of minds, readers are *not*, for they can confidently attach truth values to the mental images circulated in the text within the referential framework of the said ontology.

The entries for “The Marriages” and “Lord Beaupré” are similar to that for “The Point of View” in their strong epistemic nature and in the role mind reading plays in their fictional projects. The notebook conception for “The Marriages” turns on a dynamic set of contrasting attitudes towards remarriage. An elderly widower wishes to wed his new love against his daughter’s opinion. He eventually gives way and changes his mind; then the daughter tells his fiancée a fabricated tale about her father’s unsuitability for marriage, so that the woman releases him from his engagement. All is well at first, but the man soon turns “sad, brooding, sombre” (CN 33), which drives the daughter to repent and confess her intrigues in an ineffectual attempt to win the woman back for her father. The whole entry swarms with criss-crossing mental attributions relative to its central thematic concern and carried out by the three characters from within the storyworld. Minds hold images of other minds, often recursively, and information is systematically made contingent on specific metarepresentational sources. The daughter has a “sense of the want of dignity of her father’s act [i.e. his intended remarriage]” (CN 32), “is delighted at what she has done” (CN 33), “begins to see a change in her father” (CN 33), and “perceives this change in him—that he is resentful and unhappy” (CN 33); the father, for his part, “is pleased at first—pleased that he has pleased his daughter” (CN 33), but soon begins “to wonder *how* she [his daughter] affected the lady . . . and to suspect that she *did* say something that was injurious to him” (CN 33). At this point, James hesitates between two resolutions, one cognitively neutral (the woman has accepted another engagement in the meanwhile) and the other founded on a remarkable feat of mind reading whereby “the intended wife has not really believed what she [the daughter] said—has seen through it as a manoeuvre—but *has* thought that the father has lent himself to it and despises him accordingly” (CN 33), thus refusing to resume their relation.

The entry for “Lord Beaupré” resembles that for “The Marriages” in its cognitive layout. Mind reading here also conditions the denouement, but through utter failure rather than success. The two characters act “at cross purposes” (CN 64), suffer reciprocal mind blindness, painfully fail to interpret the presumed external clues to their respective states of mind, and are thus unable to coordinate their behaviours towards a hypothetical future of connubial bliss. As in “The Marriages”, however, mental interaction within the storyworld is ubiquitous, relevant chunks of content being often expressed as situated states of mind rather than as externally sourced authoritative statement:

[1] A young nobleman—or . . . commoner of immense wealth, *feels* himself, on the eve of the London season, in such real discomfort and peril that makes a compact with a girl he has known for years, and likes, to see him through the wood by allowing it [2] to be *supposed* and announced, that they are engaged . . . [3] He doesn't *dream* he is hurting her [the girl]. She consents and the device succeeds. But in the middle of the season she gets a real chance to marry—[4] by *feeling* that there is a man who would marry her if it were not for its supposititious engagement. So she asks the *parti* if she mayn't drop the comedy. She *thinks* he *may* refuse—ask her to make it a real engagement. But he doesn't refuse—he is inconvenienced, reluctant—but he lets her go. She marries her *real* suitor—[5] though she is *secretly* in love with the *parti*—and [6] he afterwards *finds* that they were at cross purposes: she was *really* in love with him—and he has become so with her—[7] but didn't *want* to press her *lest he should have seemed to attribute* to her the cupidity they had both *thought to soustraire* him from. (CN 64; my italics except in “*parti*”, “*may*”, “*real*”, “*really*”, and “*soustraire*”)

Three thinking minds make up the system of sources operating in this entry—two central and one peripheral. The former are obviously individuated and belong to what James calls the *parti* and to the young woman who poses as his fiancée; the latter is collective and formed by well-to-do London society and concretely by the host of mothers plotting hard to marry off their daughters to advantage (“the really formidable assault of the mothers, and the *filles à marier*” [CN 64]). Whereas the metarepresentational role of the two central minds is constantly foregrounded by associating them propositionally with metacognitive lexis (*feel, dream, think, want, attribute*), that of the collective mind is much more tenuously indicated—just an impersonal passive phrase like “[allowing it] to be supposed” in [2] which expresses an underlying proposition of the type “*x* [is allowed to] suppose[s] *y*”, *x* being, in this case, the host of scheming mothers, and *y* the fact that the *parti* has already made his choice. The flow of intelligence between these three epistemic positions is heavily curtailed: not only do we have minds within minds, but secrets within secrets too. On a first level, man and woman share a portion of information unknown to others, but, on a second level, they also keep their feelings to themselves which leads to misfortune, a fact that could even be read, on an ethical plane, as retribution for the act of protective dishonesty they have executed together. The entry closes with a sentence that encapsulates a true mental labyrinth [7], probably the most intricate entanglement of minds in James's notes for his tales and perfectly framed to rival any similar passage to be found in such tales. Three minds interact here—the man's, the woman's, and an intermental unit formed by both in order to carry out their petty conspiracy. The man mistakenly reads the woman's mind, and concludes that declaring his love would be interpreted by her as a move to attribute to her the same mean purposes which they had schemed together to save him from. At least, three layers of intentionality converge in these two lines (the man thinks that the woman thinks that the man thinks *x* is the case), further complicated by the operation of an ephemeral

intermental unit. As epistemic entries go, it is difficult to imagine greater intensity in the picturing of minds at work within a projected storyworld.

Not all notebook conceptions for James's tales, however, are so attracted to the epistemic pole. If we turn to the entry for "The Liar" (1888), we face a fairly different experience:

One might write a tale (very short) about a woman married to a man of the most amiable character who is a tremendous, though harmless liar. She is very intelligent, a fine, quiet, highy, pure nature, and she has to sit by and hear him romance—mainly out of vanity, the desire to be interesting, and a peculiar irresistible impulse. He is good, kind, personally very attractive, very handsome, etc.: it is almost his only fault though of course he is increasingly very *light*. What she suffers—what she goes through—generally she tries to rectify, to remove any bad effect by toning down a little, etc. But there comes a day when he tells a very big lie which she has—for reasons to be related—to adopt, to reinforce. To save him from exposure, in a word, she has to lie herself. The struggle, etc.; she lies—but after that she hates him . . . (CN 28)

It would not be extravagant to describe this as the contentual entry *par excellence*. Its central concern, that is, the wife's attitude to her husband's ethical shortcoming, emerges as a lump of content, unsituated, unattributed to any system of sources, however primitive or sketchy, and hence devoid of any aspectualizing potential. Despite the abundant ascription of mental traits to husband and wife effected by James to create contrasts and tensions, there is no trace of metacognitive vocabulary (*think, believe, feel, guess, know, etc.*) or of distancing expressions (*apparently, as if, it seemed that, in his/her opinion, etc.*) used to metarepresent the said central concern by making it contingent on a source within the fictional realm. As the entry stands, and with no hindsight, one would be hard pressed to imagine the cognitive complexity—and resulting density of meaning—that the finished tale acquired in execution. In this regard, two changes were fundamental. First, and contrary to what happens, for instance, in "The Middle Years", a new character is added and, more importantly, he becomes the central consciousness or higher-order source. This move has vast consequences—unchallenged facts in the entry, such as the woman's suffering at her husband's vice or the causal link between her disposition to cover for him and her lie, simply become mental states of the newly-introduced source and are processed with a glaring tag pointing to his subjectivity. Second, the woman's mind, which is transparent in the entry ("she suffers", "she tries to rectify", "[t]o save him from exposure . . . she has to lie herself", "she hates him"), grows opaque in the narrative and her interiority is only accessible via the biased conjectures of the intervening observer. This is how a straightforward, authoritatively finalized block of meaning becomes aspectualized and thus problematic when execution subjects it to metarepresentational processes within the limits of the fictional world.

Although I have occasionally hinted at the cognitive make-up of finished narratives—just as with “The Liar” above—my focus has mainly narrowed on the early emergence of mind in epistemic entries in brief, illustrative contrast to what happens in contentual ones. Completeness of treatment, however, calls for the extension of contrastive analysis to the migration of mind *between* entries *and* what James made of them through execution. This will be the object of the next section.

4. Projecting and realizing minds: five case studies

Cognitive phenomena that can be predicated on the genetic relation between entries and tales come in a variety of flavours. Respectively characterized by change and continuity, two of these phenomena, which I propose to call *source remapping* and *mind-function entailment*, are particularly alluring and merit some commentary. Their critical potential may even reach beyond the bounds of this paper and underpin the study of how successive versions and revisions of (narrative) texts face the issue of mind as themes and formal resources evolve to fit the new authorial vision. On the one hand, we have the subtle alteration of the cognitive design of an entry in transit to the finished product, an alteration which often materializes in the ascription of the *same* block of meaning to a *different* source and results in narratives whose interpretation may be at odds with the original notes. On the other hand, and in line with the idea of continuity, it is distinctly possible that the shaping of minds in the entries—basically the types of mental states and information-processing strategies attributed to them—can foreshadow the narrative role to be assumed by a given character in the final work. This may reveal a tendency in James to silently earmark characters as narrators and/or centres of consciousness from the earliest compositional stages by endowing them with characteristic minds. I am not referring, of course, to James’s explicit discussion of these figures in the notebooks, but rather to a deep, tacit understanding of their mental functioning within the narrative text that led him to sketch their minds as he did.

4.1. *Source remapping: altering the balance of sources in the process of execution*

Nuanced versions of source remapping can be seen at work as the entries for “The Lesson of the Master” and “The Death of the Lion” (1894), among others, develop into full-blown narratives. In terms of the polarity proposed earlier, both qualify as epistemic, since significant thematic issues are made contingent—in varying degrees—on metarepresentational sources within the storyworld, and both issues and sources must be processed together by readers when attempting to understand the point of a set of notes. The entry for “The Death of the Lion”, moreover, has the added bonus of a brief, pithy discussion of the narrative agent as an ethical

and cognitive embodiment, which will surprisingly evolve to undermine his projected role as “the *consciousness of the moral*” (CN 87) in the finished tale.

“The Lesson of the Master” turns on a recurrent Jamesian theme with strong biographical roots—i.e. marriage as detrimental to art. After reporting a conversation with Theodore Child on this issue, James conceives of “a very interesting situation” about “an elder artist or writer, who has been ruined (*in his own sight*) by his marriage”, and imagines “his position in regard to a younger *confrère* whom he *sees* on the brink of the same disaster” (CN 43; my italics except in “*confrère*”). James obviously acts here as a non-fictional, higher-order source, but the basic concern with artistic ruin being inflicted on him and others by marriage is openly attributed to the elder writer and thus aspectualized: it is *his* mental state—his belief, his fear—rather than abstract, monolithic fact. Curiously enough, the epistemic design of the entry is wholly reversed in execution just by shifting the intradiegetic metarepresentational source.

Three interdependent changes occur in the tale—first, St. George, the elder writer, is displaced from the narrative focus by Paul Overt, his “younger *confrère*”, who is associated now with countless metacognitive terms and other attributive expressions indicating that represented content has become a function of his mental outlook; second, St. George’s mind grows inaccessible, his true stance on marriage and art being no longer transparent, but rather the object of Overt’s anxious conjecturing often evinced in the text by pointers such as “apparently” (CS 3.563), “seemed” (CS 3.591), “appeared” (CS 3.599, 3.604), and “as if” (CS 3.596, 3.602, 3.604)⁴; third, as a result of St. George’s mind turning opaque, the vital issue of marriage and art is superseded in the story by that of his *sincerity*, which remains a constitutional uncertainty up to the end of the narrative and beyond.⁵ Overt’s attempts at reading St. George’s mind are ineffectual not because he can be proved wrong, but because there is evidence in the tale *for* and *against* any conclusion he may draw regarding the moral consistency and rectitude of purpose of the elder writer. And yet one could argue that even if the indeterminacies of “The Lesson of the Master” got activated by the remapping of sources just outlined, they were embryonically present in James’s early choice to bind the issue of marriage and art to the subjectivity of one of the fictional participants via metarepresentation rather than introducing it as source-free, absolute fact.

The case with “The Death of the Lion” is not substantially different. In two consecutive notebook entries, James devises a narrative intended to decry the superficial lionization thrust upon conscientious artists by crowds of socialites who, instead of reading their works, only wish to be associated with their public images for their own furtherance. Unlike in the notes for “The Lesson of the

⁴ References to James’s stories (James 1996-1999) will be given parenthetically as CS indicating volume and page.

⁵ In her 1977 book on Jamesian ambiguity, Rimmon placed this tale in the choice set of James’s four logically ambiguous narratives (79–94).

Master", James discusses here "the person telling the story . . . an observer and spectator of the drama" (CN 87), and makes a strong case for him as an admirer and a protector of the elderly, besieged artist so that he can conclude his *magnum opus*. In the entry, James reports the motives that lie behind the narrator's behaviour, which happen to agree with the state of mind unequivocally ascribed to the writer who "wants time and strength still to do" what is described as "the project of a splendid new unwritten thing" (CN 87). So the narrator's protective stance is geared in the entry to the writer's express wish to be protected, to be enveloped in the right conditions for creative work. But this is not the case in the tale where the two minds do not seem to march in unison: while the narrator grows into a zealot and possessively resents any contact between writer Neil Paraday and society at large, the mind of the latter is sealed off—as that of St. George's—and we can only experience it via the narrator's increasingly suspect metarepresentations. Paraday's self-appointed protector soon becomes an expert at constructing the writer's interiority according to his own preconceptions—among them that Paraday loathes social intercourse, that his malady is bound to recur if not isolated from the crowd, and that what he really wants is to be left to himself in his literary sanctum:

"This is Mr. Morrow", said Paraday, looking, *I thought*, rather white. (CS 4.364; my italics)

"Already?" I exclaimed *with a sort of sense* that my friend [Paraday] had fled to me for protection. (CS 4.364; my italics)

. . . Paraday's own face met [my] question reassuringly, seemed to say in a glance *intelligible* enough: "Oh, I'm not ill, but I'm scared: get him out of the house as quietly as possible". (CS 4.367; my italics)

. . . a question had formed itself in his [Paraday's] mind which reached my *sense* as distinctly as if he had uttered it . . . (CS 4.369; my italics)

He [Paraday] had not told me he was ill again . . . but I had not needed this, and I *found* his reticence his worst symptom. (CS 4.381; my italics)

In the story, however, there is no evidence that Paraday's mind functions as hypothesized by his ardent admirer, and so we tend to process the latter's attributions as next to groundless, as sourced from a mildly paranoid, self-centred consciousness. This does not imply that the narrator's account is cognitively dishonest. He never conceals that his representations originate in his own subjectivity, which means that his metarepresentational ability is in place, and recognizes that *his* Paraday might just be a biased construct (e.g. "I was frankly, at the end of three days, a very prejudiced critic" [CS 4.360]), that the writer's aversion to celebrity could be a misguided presumption, for he "surrendered himself much more liberally [to lionizing] than I surrendered him" (CS 4.381), and also that, in Paraday's ears, the "mere dirge" of his baleful popularity actually rang as "the bells of his accession" (CS 4.381).

Apart from problematizing a straightforward notebook plan to denounce the outrageous treatment of artists by wealthy philistines, the tale also subverts the ethical role ascribed to the narrator by James as he assumes in his notes that defending the artist is a moral imperative. Looked at from this angle, “The Death of the Lion” rather tells a story of egotism than of sacrifice. The narrator’s attempts at appropriating Paraday are, in themselves, quite revealing to the reader; but they are also identified as such by other characters. In a letter to Miss Hurter, the narrator confesses that Mrs. Wimbush, the leading lionizer, has called him “selfish” and “insincere”, has accused him of plotting “to monopolise Paraday in order that he may push [him] on”, since “[t]o be intimate with him is a feather in [his] cap” (CS 4.382). These charges—which could also be levelled at Mrs. Wimbush herself—are candidly admitted to by the narrator, especially when the unfinished manuscript of Paraday’s “glorious book” (CS 4.391) is lost amid general indifference, and the narrator’s regret assumes a disturbing form. “In the event of his [Paraday’s] death”, he fantasizes, “it would fall to me perhaps to bring out in some charming form, with notes, with the tenderest editorial care, that precious heritage of his written project” (CS 4.391). Unthinkable in the ethical context of the entry, this reaction is consistent with the source remapping effected in execution, and suggests, moreover, James’s preference for achieving epistemic depth rather than simply framing a direct, unproblematic parable foregrounding the pitfalls of *fin-de-siècle* authorship.

4.2. Mind-function entailment: foreshadowing narrative roles in the tales

If variation in the handling of metarepresentational sources between entry and tale is the keynote of the cases just discussed, the idea of continuity broadly typifies the cognitive process to be outlined below. To this end, however, a basic distinction between two classes of mental states must be invoked. In James’s notes for “The Chaperon” (1891) we come across this passage: “Type of the girl . . . *clever, quietly resolute, reticent and imperturbable* . . . being very *serious, indifferent* to vulgar success. She is *proud* and she is *in love*” (CN 58; my italics). Theorists of mind and cognitive narratologists usually differentiate “in love” from the mental states denoted by the other italicized terms (Palmer 2004: 58; see also White & Younger 1988: 293). While “clever”, “imperturbable”, or “proud” indicate latent states of mind, reasonably stable, abiding, and characteristic, “in love” is an immediate mental event, transient and circumstantial. In information-processing terms, if a narrator says that the heroine of a fiction is in love, such a statement may be true or false at the time it is made; but if a narrator depicts a character as proud, the truth or falsity of this description is not limited to the character’s mindset at the moment of utterance. The opposition between these two types of mental states, which classical narratology respectively theorized under the headings of *consciousness* and *characterization*, has been branded artificial and its neutralization proposed within the more encompassing category of *mind* (Palmer 2004: 58).

Further refinement of this opposition would call for subdividing the class of immediate mental states into intransitive and transitive ones, or those which simply indicate a mental condition (mind reported — as in “he has a terror” [CN 182]) and those which have metarepresentational properties in the sense that they occur in association with episodes of metacognition, mind embedding, and thinking about thinking (mind reporting — as in “that will increase her presumption that I *may* betray her” [CN 46]). The distribution of these types and subtypes of mental states among emerging characters in notebook entries can anticipate the narrative and even thematic roles played by such characters in the tales. In this regard, a regularity obtains — minds called on to be significant in the finished product tend to be constructed in the entries mostly by the attribution of immediate mental states, of concrete episodes of current consciousness, and much less by the attribution of latent mental states. In fact, one could even speak of an incompatibility between the two types whereby the former displaces the latter to the point that, occasionally, we hardly know *what* a mind is like in the long run, but only *how* it functions in specific circumstances. This is the case, I would suggest, with “A Round of Visits” (1910), “Sir Dominick Ferrand” (1892), and “The Real Thing” (1892).

Although in differing degrees, the entries for these tales are all epistemic since they feature acts of metarepresentation whose sources are internal to the story-world. In the two most substantial entries for “A Round of Visits”, *no* latent mental state is ever attributed to the young man who roams London with a heavy heart, but, in contrast, the attribution of immediate events of consciousness, intransitive as well as transitive, is overwhelming. Just for the sake of illustration, the young roamer has “some secret sorrow, trouble, fault” (CN 88), “something on his mind . . . a secret, a worry, a misery, a burden, an oppression”, which he “suffers from the incapacity to tell”, “he forgets his own [trouble]”, “his own ache passes from him”, “his troubled spirit” (CN 94), he “roams restlessly, nervously, in depression” (CN 179), and so on. The absence of other relevant characters renders this entry more introspective than interactive with the result that metarepresentational processes not only involve several minds, but especially different levels of the same mind.⁶ Thus, transitive mental events are often the young man’s representations of his own feelings:

He *tries* to communicate it [his worry], in the belief that it will relieve him. (CN 94)

. . . as to his feeling for whom [a woman] he has been by no means sure? (CN 94)

He thinks it clears up that feeling that now, instinctively, it is to *her* his imagination turns most. (CN 94)

He takes this as a *sign* . . . declaring to himself . . . that it will settle the matter for him . . . (CN 94)

⁶ On the theory of same-mind embedding and higher-order thought, see Rosenthal (2000).

A similar pattern holds in the notes for “Sir Dominick Ferrand”, save for the arguable occurrence of *one* latent mental disposition — “a strange indefeasible instinct” (CN 66) — which conditions the behaviour of “a poor young man of letters” (CN 66) as to the publication of some compromising papers. For the rest, we have the same amalgam of immediate mental states ascribed to him, whether intransitive (“He appreciates [the papers’] value”, “He is tempted, strongly, being . . . not in sympathy . . . and almost *consents*”, “he falls in love” [CN 66], etc.) or transitive in the form of two self-representations of his own interiority (“depressed by his conscious[ness] of failure”, “conscious of an insurmountable feeling” [CN 66]). In this case, as in that for “A Round of Visits”, no other minds are worth embedding, and so central figures tend to invest their metarepresentational skills in tracing back their motives to their own subjectivities and weighing them up in self-reflective fashion.

The entry for “The Real Thing”, however, perceptibly departs from this introspective pattern. Five minds are at least minimally constructed and seen to interact in it, which promotes a wider variety of mental attributions and more aspectualizing potential. Apart from some socio-aesthetic observations on the uselessness of aristocracy, James’s notes for “The Real Thing” bring to life an artist who illustrates books and magazines for a living and his four sitters—a married couple of gentlefolk (later the Monarchs), a young, uneducated woman, and an Italian pedlar. Paradoxically, while the Monarchs are poor models for pictures of aristocrats, the woman and the pedlar play this role to perfection. But what really matters is how different kinds of mental states are attributed to these five figures and, in this regard, a few facts should be noted. First, the Monarchs, on the one hand, and the woman and the pedlar, on the other, are often constructed as two intermental units, that is, mental states are jointly ascribed to them as if they were two individuals with one single consciousness. Second, the artist’s mind is *never* described in terms of latent mental states; one can infer that he is compassionate, for instance, but what we are actually told is that he is “willing to try to work them [the Monarchs] in—for he takes an interest in their predicament, and feels . . . the appeal of their type”, that he is “willing to give them a trial” (CN 56), and that it is only when he “finds he shall lose his great opportunity” (CN 57) that he gathers the nerve to dismiss them. Third, the construction of the models’ minds involves the attribution of latent and immediate mental states, but in contrary proportions. Major Monarch is thrice represented as “melancholy” (CN 56), while he and his wife are jointly endowed with abiding, long-term dispositions such as “stiff and stupid” and the lack of “pictorial sense” (CN 56)—and that’s all. Both, however, feel “bewilderment, vagueness, depression”, “failure to understand”, “disappointment”, “surprise”, “silent amazement”, “incomprehensibility”, while “wondering” (CN 56–57), moreover, at the abilities of their competitors. The female sitter, for her part, is “clever . . . of aptitude, of perceptions”, has “the pictorial sense”, and, along with her Italian workmate, is “vulgar” enough (CN 56). To these latent dispositions, James adds just *one* immediate mental state ascribed

to the intermental unit formed by both—that “they are overwhelmed with derisive amazement” (CN 56) on discovering the graceless role played by the Monarchs in the artist’s studio. Thus far, in brief, the kinds of minds conceived by James for the three tales in question.

In the course of execution, “A Round of Visits” and “Sir Dominick Ferrand” became heterodiegetic or third-person narratives with internal focalization, which means that the teller is not part of the storyworld, but adopts, more or less closely, the experiential outlook of a specific character. “The Real Thing”, by contrast, was developed as a homodiegetic or first-person narrative, being told by one of the participants in the storyworld. From the angle of how information is obtained and circulated, however, the disparity between the two narrative situations is not vital, for homodiegetic narration is also based on a duality teller-experiencer, the only difference being that these two figures are existentially linked (in plain terms, they are the *same* person), though the temporal or ideological gulf between them can grow fairly wide. The distribution of the telling and focalizing roles in the notebook entries has three modalities: explicit identification of the role and the character who will play it in the finished work (e.g. “The Author of *Beltraffio*” [1884]); absence of allusions to either role or character, both being added, as a kind of afterthought, in execution (e.g. “The Aspern Papers” and “The Liar”); and open discussion of the character, but *not* of the role to be assumed, as in the three stories under review now. In the latter case, the differential attributions of mind carried out at notebook stage are tacit indicators of which characters will become narrators or focalizers in due course.

In “A Round of Visits” and “Sir Dominick Ferrand”, there is little room for doubt given the introspective way in which the minds ascribed to the two young men—Mark Monteith and Peter Baron—have been shown to function via immediate mental episodes rather than latent dispositions or long-term thinking habits. They are the central consciousnesses of the two tales in characteristic Jamesian fashion, which typically involves departures from the expected norm and perplexing glitches, as when the third-person narrators report thoughts that “didn’t even occur to him [Baron]” (CS 4.200) or facts that another character—*not* Monteith—“couldn’t surely have suspected” (CS 5.919). But it is “The Real Thing” which proves to be the most compelling case on account of the variety of minds it mobilizes. In the entry, the young female sitter and her Italian colleague were not attributed especially active minds, and they do not occupy a focal position in the ensuing tale—they are little more than convenient foils to emphasize the practical uselessness of aristocracy. The Monarchs, for their part, fare somewhat better. As evinced above, the blocks their minds are built with are mainly immediate episodes of current consciousness; husband and wife, however, form a closely-knit intermental unit in the entry, and this is not the best condition to assume the first-person telling role in a formally conservative story. The only character whose mind keeps cognitive autonomy and gets exclusively constructed via immediate mental states—and so we know how it works rather than what it is like—is that of

the unnamed artist. From such precedents, it naturally follows that the homodiegetic narrative role, both as a teller and a higher-order metarepresentational mind, should fall to him in the finished tale.

5. Final remarks

In *A Theory of Narrative*, originally published in German in 1979, Franz Stanzel offers an engaging discussion of how narrative mediacy materializes as notebooks and authorial synopses develop into finished works. He identifies the absence or zero grade of mediacy with “the narrative material in its earliest stage, perhaps the first rough sketch of plot” (31), and its presence with the gradual growth of a *reflector*, be it the experiencing self of a first-person teller or the character whose representation of the storyworld is adopted when the tale is narrated from without, that is, heterodiegetically. Although such transition is, for Stanzel, a valid general tendency, his comments turn on James’s notebook material for “The Lesson of the Master”, “The Friends of the Friends”, and, especially, *The Ambassadors* (1903). Stanzel, however, works within the conceptual framework of an updated version of structural narratology, and his enquiring lens may not be fully adjusted to finer, more subtle evidence which the cognitive paradigm can expose and address. For James to discuss in his notes the first-person narrative agent or the location of the centre of consciousness is obviously to show an early concern with the role of mediacy; but to sketch minds endowed with meterepresentational and aspectualizing potential is also to show the same concern, only less explicitly, and this may escape inspection if the right toolkit is not used. Stanzel argues, for instance, that the notebook synopsis for “The Lesson of the Master” “contains no information whatsoever as to how the recorded situation could be narrated” (30). This is not entirely accurate, it seems to me, since James does emphasize the elder writer as the subject of mediacy (“in his own sight” [CN 43]) by indicating whose mind metarepresents—i.e. takes responsibility for the truth value of—the detrimental effect of marriage on art. The fact that this attribution shifts as the tale is composed does not mean that mediacy is absent from the original entry; it simply reveals a change of strategy. And, of course, this process intensifies in much more epistemic entries than that for “The Lesson of the Master”.

Aided by a compact set of instrumental notions supplied by cognitive narrative theory such as metarepresentation and aspectuality, this paper has addressed the issue of how the minds of realistic characters take early shape in James’s notebook material for his tales. From a speculative angle, it contributes the notions of *source remapping* and *mind-function entailment* which can account for the mental dynamics of genetically related texts in a wider context than that of James’s short fiction. They could, for instance, frame an approach to his retrospective understanding of mind in the prefaces as he revisits the originating circumstances of his works. In critical terms, and allowing for local irregularities, it shows that James’s concern with the mental complexity of his stories is not a compositional addition, but tends

to be present, in differing degrees, from the moment he first conceived of them—even if the original balance of minds was later modified in execution. To be given a crude lump of content, wholly disconnected from a diegetic system of sources, as in the notes for “The Liar”, is an exception rather than the rule. This does not mean, however, that the enhanced epistemicity of synopses such as those for “The Point of View”, “The Marriages”, “Lord Beaupré”, “A Round of Visits”, and several others, can actually represent the entire body of notebook material. The foregoing account of the diverging ways in which inner experience is treated in epistemic and contentual entries, along with its gradual evolution into full-blown minds either by source remapping or by mind-function entailment, can contribute a fresh stroke to James’s received picture as an anatomist of “deep and startling cognitions” in the apt expression of one of his contemporary reviewers (Gard 1986: 91).

References

- Anesko, Michael. 1988. Review of *The Complete Notebooks of Henry James*. *American Literature* 60 (1): 120–124.
- Bremer, Manuel. 2012. How are semantic metarepresentations built and processed? *Kriterion: Journal of Philosophy* 12: 22–38.
- Cameron, Sharon. 1989. *Thinking in Henry James*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cohn, Dorrit. 1978. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cosmides, Leda & John Tooby. 2000. Consider the source: The evolution of adaptations for decoupling and metarepresentation. In *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Dan Sperber (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 53–107.
- Egeth, Marc & Robert Kurzban. 2009. Representing metarepresentations: Is there theory of mind-specific cognition? *Consciousness and Cognition* 18: 244–254.
- Gard, Roger (ed.). 1986. *Henry James: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gordon, D. J. 1950. Review of *The Notebooks of Henry James* and *The Art of Fiction and Other Essays*. *The Review of English Studies* 1 (2): 179–183.
- Grethlein, Jonas. 2015. Is narrative “The description of fictional mental functioning”? Heliodorus against Palmer, Zunshine & Co. *Style* 49 (3): 257–284.
- Hayes, Kevin J. (ed.). 2010. *Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iversen, Stefan. 2011. States of exception: Decoupling, metarepresentation, and strange voices in narrative fiction. In *Strange Voices in Narrative Fiction*, Per Krogh Hansen et al. (eds.). Berlin: de Gruyter, 125–146.
- James, Henry. 1970. The art of fiction. *Partial Portraits*. New intr. by Leon Edel. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 375–408.
- . 1987. *The Complete Notebooks of Henry James*. Leon Edel & Lyall H. Powers (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1947. *The Notebooks of Henry James*. F. O. Matthiessen & Kenneth B. Murdock (eds.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996–1999. *Complete Stories*. 5 vols. New York: The Library of America.
- Labrie, Ross. 1968. Henry James’s idea of consciousness. *American Literature* 39 (4): 517–529.

- Margolin, Uri. 2003. Cognitive science, the thinking mind, and literary narrative. In *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Sciences*, David Herman (ed.). Stanford: CSLI Publications, 271–294.
- Marsh, Huw. 2018. Narrative unreliability and metarepresentation in Ian McEwan's *Atonement*; or, why Robbie might be guilty and why nobody seems to notice. *Textual Practice* 32 (8): 1325–1343.
- Marshall, Adré. 1998. *The Turn of the Mind: Constituting Consciousness in Henry James*. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses.
- Palmer, Alan. 2004. *Fictional Minds*. Lincoln and London: The University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2010. *Social Minds in the Novel*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Phelan, James. 2017. Toni Morrison's determinate ambiguity in "Recitatif". In *Somebody Telling Somebody Else: A Rhetorical Poetics of Narrative*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 150–167.
- Pinker, Steven. 1997. *How the Mind Works*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Rembowska-Pluciennik, Magdalena. 2012. The narrative poetics of mindreading. In *Texts and Minds: Papers in Cognitive Poetics and Rhetorics*, Alina Kwiatkowska (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 57–69.
- Rimmon, Shlomith. 1977. *The Concept of Ambiguity: The Example of James*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenthal, David. 2000. Consciousness and metacognition. In *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Dan Sperber (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 265–295.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. 2010. Narratology and cognitive science: A problematic relation. *Style* 44 (4): 469–495.
- Schneider, Ralf. 2013. The cognitive theory of character reception: An updated proposal. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies* 24 (2): 117–134.
- Sperber, Dan (ed.). 2000. *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenthal, David. 2000. Consciousness and metacognition. In *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Dan Sperber (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 265–295.
- Throesch, Elizabeth L. 2017. Exceeding "The trap of the reflexive": Henry James's dimensions of consciousness. In *Before Einstein: The Fourth Dimension on Fin-de-Siècle Literature and Culture*. London: Anthem, 167–194.
- Wallace, Irving. 1955. *The Fabulous Originals: Lives of Extraordinary People Who Inspired Memorable Characters in Fiction*. New York: Knopf.
- White, Peter A. & David P. Younger. 1988. Differences in the ascription of transient internal states to self and other. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 24: 292–309.
- Zunshine, Lisa. 2008. Theory of mind and fictions of embodied transparency. *Narrative* 16 (1): 65–92.
- . 2006. *Why We Read Fiction: Theory of Mind and the Novel*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.