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Everything in a picture, it must be added, depends on the composition; if it be the subject that makes the interest, it is in the composition that makes, or at any rate expresses, the subject. By that law, accordingly, our breath of ghosts "compose," hang together, consent to mutual relation, confine, in fact, to mutual dependence. If it is a question of living again, they can live but by being each other's help, so that they close in, join hands, press together for warmth and contact.

Henry James, William Worrall Story

From birth to mourning after death, law takes hold of bodies in order to make them in text. Through all sorts of initiations (in rituals, at school, etc.) it transforms them into tables of the law, into living tableaux of rules and customs, into actors in the drama organized by a social order.

Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life

Reading Henry James and the theatricality that so often structures his scenes challenges the reader to shed expectations generated by today's mindbending high-culture theater (that quaint, creepy thing springing from a proscenium stage to expensive seats acquired at a discount by savvy consumers). The most successful readings, such as Peter Brooks' The Melodramatic Imagination, take that structuring theatricality generically and historically, with reference to the practices, conventions, and conditions of the nineteenth-century melodrama. Other readings pursuing the melodramatic strain have taken us quite far and provide a location for phenomenological and Foucauldian standpoints in the James conversation. Yet alongside the melodrama another, competing strain is discernible, grounded in the vogue for private
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theatricals which began in James’s boyhood and continued nearly unabated until the turn of the century. Structures of this private theatricality operate on a distinctly countersurveillance trajectory in the late career and support a non-Cartesian epistemology based on intersubjectivity (rather than monadic subjectivity), helping to get past that now-familiar image of James as inevitably the (re)producer of techniques of mastery and control.2

Broadly speaking, the present effort associates a melodramatic theatricality in James’s oeuvre with the scenes of knowing that feature a traditional Cartesian epistemology, of isolated knowing subject, and object universally knowable and situated within a general body of knowledge. The solo “discoveries” of the Cartesian epistemological adventure are taken exactly as the “discovery scenes” of the public stage; the cry of Eureka! that attends E = MC2 also accompanies the exposure of Miranda and Ferdinand playing at chess. Considered as an epistemological structure, the melodrama enforces the chasm between the subject and object of knowledge—the fourth wall perpetually separating the spectator as subject-only-subject, the actor as object-only-object. Private theater, by contrast, complicates the relationship between spectator and performance. As in the masque, the spectator belongs to the scene, no longer gazer unseen, becomes knowable by the performer. The performers become equally spectators, the spectators equally performers. By imbricating in a field of shared experience the subject-also-object and object-also-subject of knowledge, private theater has at least the potential to establish an alternative, intersubjective scene of knowing. Not so much a scene of “knowing the other” as a scene of knowing with others, this epistemology which proceeds between subjects is predicated on the understanding that knowledge is produced and not “discovered,” that this production is neither individual nor impersonal (neither objective nor wholly determined by society, culture, or dominant ethos), but rather collectively granted in a scene of shared, overlapping subjectivity. This second scene is not a market. Not a scene of transaction but of manufacture, it enables mutually constitutive and interpellated subjects to renegotiate the borders of tabulated knowledge-space.

Privacy in this sense does not, of course, mean the individual or the personal. It is a limit-condition of publicity and implies a network of relations.3 The many other-than-public theater genres (masque, proces-
political content—entirely proscribed melodramas such as "The Taxidermist and the Schoolgirl!"—but the performances nonetheless provided the location for affiliation, combination, resistance [Peterson]. Stemming from the association of gender with genre—masculinity with melodrama, femininity with private theater—the assumed correlation between private theater and the domestication of the subject obscures the almost inescapable conclusion that the practice by nineteenth-century women of producing other-than-public theatricals in war benefits, amateur clubs, political meetings, and private homes represents resistance to domestication and not compliance. At minimum, theatricalizing a panoptic space produces mimicry with a difference; if the nineteenth-century home is already "like" a theater in reproducing the specular relations characteristic of the public stage, altering its organization by practicing an other theatricality in it needs to be understood as at least a potentially resistant tactic (as the fiction and various performances of Louis May Alcott surely suggest). The class of performance here described as private theater relaxes the fourth wall, dismantling monologal relations within the scene, while stiffening the four walls round about, articulating the limits of the combination and the dominance to be resisted. This is much less a question of political theater than it is of a "politics of place." Despite "The Cereus" well-known and trenchant objection that the desire for an "own place" is in itself a "Cereusian attitude" and a "panoptic practice" (Practice 36), a kind of politics of place (or at least of location) appears often to support successful acts of resistance. For example, of the many genres of other-than-public theatricals emerging in the nineteenth-century U.S., the union theatres scripted in the 1840s by activists and sensational novelists like the radical reformer George Lippard and the poetess E.Z.C. Judson were among the earliest, most explicitly political, and most successful at producing around them a resistant collective. They belonged to a vast class of theatricals which, like the schoolroom theatricals helping to shape what might be termed Bronson Alcott's "opposition pedagogy," resisted the coercions and discursive formations of the national, liberal public. The desire of the group for an "own place" (really a discursive space but discursively comfortable, like a dwelling) does not reproduce possessive individualism so much as it helps—as in Spivak's call for the resistant intellectual to elaborate a relation to collectivity by way of a "strategic essentialism" ("Subaltern"
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205)—to locate the group for the group in a site of resistance, enabling its affiliates to enact an agency proceeding from the border-negotiations of the collective.

The present effort supports Ross Posnock's conclusion that a "politics of non-identity" drives late Jamesian epistemology, especially insofar as politics seeks to evade identification with the tabulating structures of the public. Nonetheless non-identification, that gesture of dislocation, functions chiefly as a prologue to an alternate identification and re-location; mobility for its own sake is not for James the marker of successful resistance. In evading identification with the regime of the "ledger page" which Spender Bryden experiences on his return to New York ("Jolly Corner" 163), the Jamesian subject generally turns to an alternative order such as that supported by "the law of Gnosticism" and "the really great ease of really great ladies" ("Velvet Glove" 198, 211). Already in the 1870 pair of essays contrasting the hotel-driven specular regime of "dope, vulgur, democratic" Saratoga to something understandable as the discipline of Newport, James describes the alternative to the dominant hotel-civilization of The American Scene: "At Newport, life is public, if you will; at Saratoga it is absolutely common. The difference, in a word, is the difference between a group of indiscriminating hotels and a series of organized homes" ("Newport" [1873] 67).

The product of that alternative Newport discipline, a social drama "which should depend more on smiles than tears," cannot be extricated from James's lifelong fascination with the border communities of his experience such as Newport and Chester, England, places insulated by sea and wall, collectives marked by otherness, and yet more open to those admitted beyond the barrier. The walls of the English city, James observes, enable "the good Chesterians" to "know their city more intimately than their unbuckled neighbors" ("Chester" 104). But the wall is not the only architectural peculiarity which excites James's admiration: "Next after its wall—possibly even before it—Chester values its Rows," James writes approvingly, "a running public passage tunnelled through the second story of the houses" (197). Not separately, but together, these architectural peculiarities of Chester—the stiffened border surrounding the collective and the perforated domiciles within—offer a representation of James's sense of the rich intersubjective possibilities of private enactment; within the wall, that is, a deepened "civic
consciousness" has seen fit to render borders osmotic. The effect of this twofold discipline is to interrupt the dominant relations obtaining "outside" the scene, while achieving "multiplied relations" among those within, producing in James's view a nonviolent and an ethical scene—something more like a village phenomenology ("Happy oligarchs of Newport") than the fluidity of urban modernity—even in an urban setting, whether turn-of-the-century New York, or William Wetmore Story's Rome ("Newport" [1870] 68, 73).

Throughout James's career, resistance to the discursive formations of the liberal public is not an individual project. It is always a group effort, as his approving quotation of Story's 1855 invitation to Lowell makes evident: "Let us ... all go to Newport and live there—or go somewhere and live together" (December 30, qtd. Story 1: 103; ellipses James). The epigraph at the head of this essay mark the distinction between the public discipline characterised by contemporary francophone theories and the alternate Newport discipline. The administrative structures which today's thinkers describe as isolating the subject in "living tableaux of rules and customs" are associated with James's horrified descriptions at the turn of the century of Ellis Island and the Bowery melodrama—or Saratoga in 1870, which created a liberal public of "splendid social isolation ... people who know no one, who have money and finery and possessions, only a few friends" ("Saratoga" 59). By contrast, the alternative composition and its law, which also might be said to express the subject, does so in a field of "consent to mutual relation, confession to a mutual dependence." Once persuasively described as "a subjectless biography" which instead reconstructs "an extinct subculture" (Redford 215, 219), James's account of the Story subculture is less subjectless than intersubjective. It is not a question of dissolving the subject, but of bordering the field of its relations so that in a tacile knowing relation, the collective's subject-positions overlap and interpellate: "they can live but by being each other's help, so that they close in, join hands, press together for warmth and contact." Despite the evident eliten and the incapable operation of wealth in these conceits in evading the "emphazized rule of the rabo" (Story 1: 183), James's ethical valuation of the scene features something very much like a returning democracy, albeit one predicated on the repression of egoism and the deconstruction of the Columbian imperial self: his five-page meditation on the alternative regime represented by Story's remarkable cit-
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cle of expatriates concludes, "we were equally great and happy, or still more, perhaps, equally nothing and nobody" (Story 2: 208, emphasis James).

It is perhaps, then, no accident that James's recorded experiences of private theater unfolded in relation to Story (who dedicated one of the rooms in his apartment at the Palazzo Barberini to private theater production [Stempel 236]) and Newport, the city "most perfectly guarded by a sense of margin and mystery"—and the summer Newport of the later years ("these blank days in which margin has been consumed"), but the winter Newport in which a "handful" of like-minded souls "hibernated" apart from the "broad American world," playing bridge and producing private theater (AS 231–24). James's own recollection of private theatricals begins in his New York boyhood—the topic of his earliest surviving letter is an amateur dramatic club, and his first literary productions were short dramatic sketches—but takes on a special emphasis during the peripatetic years when the family most often resided in Newport. During this period, William, Henry, and Alice James are all left traces of their participation in private theater. Henry's most vivid associations among the spectacles characterizing the "round of pleasures" in Newport during the war were of "performances, dramatic and musical, at ever so much a ticket, under the advantage of rare amateur talent, in aid of the great Sanctuary Commission, that walked in the footsteps and renewed various forms the example of Florence Nightingale" (NSB 49).

The fact of the war looms large in any effort to understand private theater in the United States as a historical phenomenon. Private theater in fashionable, frontier, and reform communities developed in the early part of the century, and there is some evidence of changing attitudes in the wider public toward amateur theatricals (especially as connected with the classroom) by the 1830s. However, benefit theatricals performed in support of the Union hospital efforts appear to have been decisive in shifting civic opinion from a Romantic suspicion that private theater was the same thing as public theater—"theatricality invading the home"—to the conviction that private theater was another thing altogether. In 1914, James's still-vivid recollections of the Newport benefits document the twin vectors of the emerging acceptance of an other theatricality, recording both the "noble scorn" of the elder Mary Temple for the benefits as "one of the forms of ancient piety lost
to us,” and the contrary conviction that by her performances, and as hostess of performances in her Lawton’s Valley residence, Julia Ward Howe had “served the State” (NSB 484, 486). The war theatricals, as James’s account emphasizes, were something much more than entertainment. By November 1863, even Sanitary Commission propaganda, interspersed with Christian tract-distribution accounts, actively encouraged “getting up” tableaux and concerts as a fundraising practice (23), and the venues for these productions ranged from homes and schoolhouses to the great halls of the city-wide Sanitary Commission Fairs (Dutchess 10; History 36–38). Alcott’s extensive benefit-performance schedule after 1863 makes quite clear that the progress of the war saw a steadily increasing valuation of the real work of these performances; Sanitary Commission propaganda emphasized the “collection of funds” over all “other labor” (such as needlework), singling out benefit performance as a tactic employed by aid societies “particularly ‘on the alert’” (23). Indeed, the women’s amateur theatrical company which Alice James joined in 1868 (later serving as its president) originally formed as a sewing circle on behalf of the Union war effort (Strouse 79).

From James’s noncombatant standpoint, the association of gender and genre in the wartime theatricals produces a sense of agency on a vector contrary to domestication. By their association with these performances, or an aid society sponsoring them, women were able to represent a participation in the war which was also real. Highly visible in communities across the Union, the women’s work of the Sanitary Commission (its leading figures of both sexes deeply associated with the Newport circle) had a tremendous effect on the war experience of soldiers and their families, not excluding the wounded Wilky James (Lewis 144). If the noncombatant William fondly patronized Alice James in this period “as an idle and useless young female” (qtd. Strouse 78), this diminishment must in part have proceeded from his own awareness that her bandage-rolling and like activities placed her in a direct and useful relation to the war effort in a way that the entire society and the local community recognized but was unavailable to himself and Henry. The women of theames family appear to have participated in the war effort much more visibly and actively than has been previously acknowledged; all of the adult women in the James home played founding roles in the Newport Women’s Union Aid Society, which made its first public appeal in the Newport Daily News a few days after Henry James

Sr.’s patriotic oration for the Independence Day celebrations of 1861.12 James’s own anxiety regarding his nonparticipation has been much remarked upon; here his own gestures to similarly represent a participation are tinged with embarrassment: the gift of money to a soldier in the Portsmouth Grove hospital camp, the price of a benefit ticket. The prominence of money-transactions in these recollections probably marks an association in James’s mind with the practice of wealthy draftees paying a substitute to soldier for them. The small sums in question perhaps can be contrasted with Alcott’s satisfied notation of the thousands of dollars raised by her performances; certainly we know from the memoirs that James, the aspiring author, did not fail to note that—despite the restricted scope of her early entertainments and the anonymity of her initial publication of “The Battle Hymn of the Republic”—these performances eventually made Julia Ward Howe famous. Nor can he have viewed with anything but an equal pang the success enjoyed by family friends Katherine Worneley and Louisa May Alcott in the immediate publication of their accounts of their activities in Washington hospitals.13

Struggling even decades later to shape his relation to those “battle-haunted seasons,” James found that, marked by femininity and collectivity, the Newport theatricals and other Sanitary Commission activities provided an alternative to the ideology of personal heroism from which he found himself painfully alienated. His rendition of the Newport benefit performances emphasizes the enactment through them of a localized collective consciousness. He insists that Julia Ward Howe served the state “scarce better” by her eventual personal fame than by her Newport activities; sponsoring Christmas theatricals in the Newport set as early as 1855, the “mistress of the Valley” in ways much like her namesake “mistress of the revels” Julia Dallow of The Tragic Muse, Howe in James’s view undermined the various other affiliations of her guests, creating in them a new, collective Newport awareness: “the infancy of a finer self-consciousness seemed cradled there” (Notes 485–86). Unable to enact an unmediated citizen-soldier’s individualist, heroic relation to the state, he turned to the alternate means of identification emphasizing a collective relation.14 The “finer self-consciousness” emerges only in a restricted field of relations, corresponding to James’s enthusiasm for architectural enclosures (the “defensive verandah”) that “by not taking the whole world into their confidence, have
not the whole world's confidence to take in return" (AS 168). It is not a separation for its own sake which he endorses, but a tactical separation that enables the group to shape its relation to "public stress." Just as Foucauldian structures of publicity elaborate themselves in private space, Jamesian structures of private theater unfold in the field of publicity, mediating and mediating the conditions of that field.

James's sense of the intersubjective as a field of consciousness producing subjectivity needs to be understood not just as emotional affiliation, but as an episteme. Enabling the subject to evade being framed by the public, the field of collectivity emphasizes local, intersubjective knowledge over the ideology of the Cartesian adventurer; the special character of James's remembered Newporters was that "they all could make discoveries from within the frame itself" (AS 220). Of course, knowing in this sense, knowing between persons—the sense that chiefly mattered for James—cannot be "only" an epistemology, for the same reasons that Luce Irigaray scoffed at the claim that the psychiatric session could be "only" a scene of analysis (133-46; Schutte 65-60). As Paul Armstrong has well demonstrated, Jamesian knowing is experiential and relational, so that "the epistemological and the moral are ... systematically related to one another" (5). By insisting that the analyst can't transcend the session and must be recognized as performing toward the analyst (just as she performs toward him), Irigaray did more than dismiss the simple binarism of subject and object which had previously organized the psychiatric scene; she opened that scene to ontological and enlarged ethical consideration. Where James's scenes of knowing can similarly be described as mutual performance, they likewise portray the known as enacting an ethical relation. In fact, it's this last emphasis which is primary; nowhere is it evident that Henry James "intended" to distinguish between public and private theatrical. His intentions were to distinguish between ethical and unethical scenes of knowing.

JAMES AND THE DRAMATIC TABLEAU

As early as the international novellas of the 1880s James articulates a revolution from oppressive spectator structures; vividly, for example, Littlemore in "The Siege of London" (1888) refuses the opera glass: "I don't mean that I want to stare at her with that beastly thing, I mean—
to see her—as I used to see her.... On the back piazza, at San Diego"

(190). Now, it is largely through such gestures of renunciation that this alternate way of knowing appears throughout the early and middle periods of James's fiction, as the absent term of an ethical posture. In "The Siege of London," it is presumably just this alternate scene of knowing Mrs. Headway—the "piazza view"—that drives Littlemore, despite the fact that he finds her "not respectable," to insist that "she at least is somebody. She's a person, the subject and not the object of his gaze" (904). And yet James never actually represents this alternate scene of knowing in this or the other novellas of this period. This piazza view remains a kind of negative ideal; Beatie Alden, we learn, is not to know her sister Lord Lamberth from the woxworest at Madame Tussaud's ("An International Episode" 1898). But the accompanying question, how she is successfully to know him, or how the Lady Barberins (1884) and her husband were ever to have known one another, is left unanswered.

In these novellas James might be said to be dramatizing the failings of the prevailing ocular-theatrical metaphors for the scene of knowing. But in order to develop an alternate knowledge technology—as he will in 1898 with The Turn of the Screw representing a community whose bonds were "music and love and... private theatricals" (58)—he needs to restructure the Enlightenment's featured scene of knowing, the discovery scene or tableau that had grown into the dominant display technology for the "tabulated space." Such space Foucault calls the "centre of knowledge in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries" (Order 75), and it is consistent with the grid spreading over the "discovered space" of the nineteenth-century United States, whose citizens were imagining themselves as a community in the person of "Columbia"—the discoverer (Side 338-40). When Foucault speaks of tableau, he is eliding the sense of a table, the favored representation of statistical or taxonomic analysis, with the dramatic or curricular tableau, which began to appear on the French classical stage in the late eighteenth century as a painterly effect in answer to Diderot's vigorous criticism—a moment something like freeze frame, in which actors ceased declining to the audience and struck a naturalistic pose, counterfeiting absorption in the scene (see Barthes, Fried 71-105, and Meisel 58-51).

Lasing a second or two, the stage tableau grew into the most recognizable feature of melodramatic narrative. Many of these dramatic tableaux functioned allusively, referring to an actual picture, but they increasingly performed technological functions, especially as the vehi-
cle of melodramatic teleology; through tableaux, the melodramatic scene in climax and closure reliably drove toward stasis and immobility. The appeal of the dramatic tableau was its suppression of dramatic action in favor of a painterly image which would interpret everything that came before it. The tableau crystallized gesture into alphabet, serving up in picture-text a clear, readable summing-up of the scene with the force and function of epiphany: sudden, complete illumination. These techniques functioned not only formally, but culturally, in ways obvious from the form's degraded and degrading cultural corollaries, particularly (but not exclusively) as they concerned women: the New Orleans slave mart, the fetish tableaux of the Parisian bordello, and the statueque ideal of feminine grace. As Edith Wharton's narration of Lily Bart's performance suggests to most readers, the realization tended toward reification; the performer playing an art object submits to commodification. The spectator was similarly affected; the tableau functioned pedagogically, producing the effects that Laura Mulvey speaks of as "structures of fascination" (18) that more subtly but with equal effect straitened the bearer of the look. The melodrama seized upon the tableau because it amplified the pedagogical possibilities of theatrical presentation. The seconds spent by the actors in tableau posture have no duration for the characters, only for the spectators, so that the scene served metaphorically as the technology through which the drama was compressed by the corps into dramatic significance, and through which that significance—as the play's "meaning"—most efficiently circulated to the spectator. "A tableau was visible, it could be said to exist," Michael Fried notes, "only from the beholder's point of view" (96).

Aping the dramatic tableaux, Victorian novelists repeatedly threw their characters into attitudes of mute immobility, made a living picture out of them, for much the same purposes that the theater cast its troupe into waxworks: for emphasis and effect, to highlight reversals of fortune and show unspoken relations, to portray reaction and discovery, to establish or to end a scene. The instructive potential of the narrative tableau has attracted attention from the critical perspective of reader response; the reader reacts to these "pictures on the wall of the text," Mary Ann Caws observes, as bearing greater authority than the rest of the narrative, as the agents or operators of the narrative text, "the bearers of meaning and intensity," heuristic markers for the work as a whole (7–8). This insight has obvious implications for novelists like Dickens,

Balzac, and Thackeray—and also Henry James, who remembered composing his juvenile literary efforts only on quarto sheets, "specially purchased for the purpose," so that each work consisted of precisely three pages of story and dialogue which drove headlong ("I painted toward the canvas") to the fourth page, upon which he would sketch an "explanatory picture" (Small Boy 148). From the earliest published stories to The Aspern Papers, many of James's scenic effects can be understood by reference to the dramatic tableau—and most of them, like similar effects in Dickens and the sensation novelists, share the teleological emphasis James ascribes to the fourth-page picture capping his juvenilia. One of the best instances is the famous climax of the latter story, in which the full malignance of the narrator's venality is revealed in the lamplight glare of Juliana Bordereau's gaze. It's night—the narrator rifling the cabinet for Jeffrey Aspern's private papers—he turns to look over his shoulder:

Juliana stood there in her nightdress, by the doorway to her room, watching me; her hands were raised, she had lifted the everlasting curtain that covered half her face, and for the first, the last, the only time I beheld her extraordinary eyes. They glared at me; they were like the sudden drench, for a caught burglar, of a flood of gaslight; they made me horribly ashamed.

(546–47)

Miss Bordereau's gaze has the effect of headlamps on a deer: freeze-frame, snapshot; she makes the narrator into a picture. Bordereau becomes bordereau; her stare, overwhelming the narrator's privilege of bordering the action, closes the frame around him.

A handful of sophisticated critics have recently worked with scenes like this to develop persuasive accounts of a kind of homeopathic feminist voyeurism, in which James's female characters become the bearers of the gaze which just previously had held them as objects (Rowe, Smith, Torsney). It also suggests the line of criticism recently developed by Litvak in which "making a scene" interrupts the larger hegemonies of realistic narrative and the gender regime (this is the subversive performativity which it seems to me might be characterized as saying, "You are not spying on me. I am showing myself to you"). While James is playing profitably with structures of melodramatic vision in scenes of this sort—the investigator exposed—it remains pointedly the
"gaslight" beyond the raised "curtain" of the public stage which luridly illuminates them. The scene still belongs to that category of effect which demarcates a genre shift on the Diderotian model; drama stops, picture begins. Rather than organizing alternatively meliorative structures, scenes of this sort depend on an absorptive aesthetic and, in the service of a kind of retributive justice, reproduce oppressive spectator structures in a different class of subjects.

THE DYNAMIC TABLEAU:
TOWARD A CONVERSATION OF GESTURES

Shaped by the performance conditions of the drawing-room tableau, these alternative specular structures do eventually appear in Junot's prose and radically reform the economies of time and space. On the public stage, the pressure of the spectator's gaze, like the gaslight beams from Juliana Bordreau's eyes, holds the object of the glare in mute immobility; a paralysis so extreme that it can be assuaged only by the curtain's fall. Anonymity helps to enforce the epistemological relation of subject and object so that the end result of this sort of stage is tableau as pornographic performance (e.g., the tavern back-room displays of "model-artists" realizing various iterations of "Venus Rising From the Sea" which provided a staple scene of city-mysteries and sensation fiction). In the drawing room, however, the gaze of the tableau model returns to the spectator, with whom she is generally acquainted, and who has at least the opportunity (not always exercised) to recognize her as a person. The muteness of the scene is relieved by mutuality. The epistemological condition of acquaintance expresses a kind of local, experiential dynamic from a scene otherwise generalized, anonymous, and static. The drawing-room performance does not present an exclusively semiotic scene; it creates a location for what sociologists describe as face-to-face interaction, "that class of events which occurs during co-presence and by virtue of co-presence" (Goffman, Interaction). Conditioned by the fact that so much in our communicating depends on the assumption of extraordinarily close relationships, the small behaviors of "habitual gestures, expressions of the eyes [and] face" in a scene of co-presence render communication a function of local knowledge—of small groups knit by shared experience (Hoggart 14-15). As giving gives way to integrating, representation gives way to a dramatic economy, creating the possibility of a significant interplay, however mute, with the epistemological value of speech or more.

By the late 1880s, this principled insistence on an intersubjective specificity has brought about a tendency in James to reconceive the public stage in the terms of private theatrical. On the very brink of his own dramatic endeavors, he writes a scene for the actress Miriam Root in which she analyzes herself to Lady Hamilton, the notorious progenitor of the nineteenth-century vogue for tableau-vivant, subsequently comparing Nick Dymmer to the painter who captured Hamilton's tableau, George Romney (Tragic Muse 444). A few pages later, she points out to a startled Peter Sherringham that while it's true she displays her body to the audience, they equally offer themselves as a spectacle for her:

you should see some of the creatures who have the face to plant themselves in the stalls, before one, for three mortal hours! I dare say it would be simpler to have no bodies, but we’re all in the same box. . . we’re all showing ourselves all the while, only some of us are not worth paying. (474)

Miriam takes down the fourth wall; in the theatrical moment, Miriam claims, the spectacle and the spectator share a space inflated by the footlights but not divided by them. Everybody performs—though James might disagree with the promiscuity of Miriam's claim; while it's true for him that almost everybody performs for some other people, only a professional actor or a character likewise constituted and equally suspect performs for all other people. It's important that James doesn't imagine a theater without walls, an unlimited, universal scene of knowing. He just re-draws the frame of the scene, insisting that the relevant four walls aren't those around the object of knowledge, but those which mark the location of the subject and object of knowledge.

Balking at the idea of a universally legible body of knowledge (that "simpler" scene of knowing which Miriam dismissively postulates, where knowledge circulates independently of knowers and their bodies), James here articulates the central ethical principle of his late epistemology. Ethical Jamesian knowers recognize that the others in the scene are the subjects of knowledge. They recognize in the eyes of the other the mark of a subject looking back. Unethical Jamesian knowers share the habit of the social butterfly Lady Castledene in The Golden Bowl: "She didn't
distinguish the little protuberant eyes of smaller social insects, often endowed with such a range, from the other decorative spots on their bodies and wings" (360). The realization of the contrary principle marks Maggie's ethical development. At Lady Castleton's dinner party she for the first time understands that, even while she had been engaged in surveilling the others, she equally "had become with them an object of intimate study," that "she was something for their queer experience; just as they were something for her" (355, 357). Shortly after Miriam's speech, a scene of private theatricals at the Dallow estate affords Nick and Julia (and their respective families) the opportunity of reconcilia-
tion, in a theatrical environment shaped just as Miriam insists, in which Julia shows as the observer-also-participant, and Nick, comple-
mentarily, in his appreciation of her as "splendid" in her directorial role, as the participant-also-observer (513–14). Much more like Maggie Ver-
ter than her father, Julia in her role of revels-mistress can no more be considered outside the play than a queen outside her masque.

A fully fledged private theatricality emerges in the late prose, marked by the consistent deployment of the mutually held stare. The simultaneous gaze announces the mutual legibility and radical, though contingent, accessibility of subjects constituting themselves as per-
former-spectators in conformance with the scenic principle articulated by Miriam Rooth. In Dickens, Balzac, and the early Henry James, glances meet and then jitter away from one another. In the late prose, glances meet and hold, pressing and probing, establishing a "commu-
nity of vision" as James terms it in the preface to The Wings of the Dove (11). Nearly all of the fiction produced after the disastrous opening of "Guy Domville" in 1893 employs this technique, but it is in The Turn of the Screw that we see its earliest, clearest, most pervasive application; nearly everything that "happens" in the short novel occurs when the characters are "doing" nothing but holding each other's gaze. The story discards the one-way stare and announces the new, engaged, two-way stare at its outset, in the framing narrative. "He continued to fix me," writes the narrator of the acquaintance who possesses the manuscript: "I fixed him too" (5). However melodramatic its substance, The Turn of the Screw unfolds in a theatrical space distinguishable from the public stage, "a cloud of music and love and success and private theatricals" (58). The chief scenes of the story proceed as a series of tableaux in which the governess is fixed by the stare of the ghostly butler and Miss

Jessel, and fixes them in return. Neither moves; neither speaks. Noth-
ing happens between them except the exchange of "their straight mu-
tual stare" (25). The governess insists on the purity of their gaze; to her astonishment, the apparition's gaze has the identical note of "scurity" as her own. If the apparition has for the governess the fascination, as she says, of "spectacle" (25), she's compelled to admit that she's equally spectacle for him. The ghost has an animated gaze, a "bold hard stare," with which he "looked at me hard all the while," and "even as he turned away still markedly fixed me" (37, 35). Shattering the fourth wall, the Screw tableaux do not merely reiterate but fully realize the ac-
tress' startling claim, "we're all in the same box."

Under the pressure of the returning gaze, the drawing-room tableau does not merely represent an event. It is an event. It has duration, and unfolds in time. Throughout, the governess remains sensitive to duration: We were confronted quite long enough," long enough to ask her-
self "how long" these situations have lasted. "Well," she continues writ-
ing, "it lasted while I caught at a dozen possibilities. . . . It lasted while I braced a little. . . . It lasted while this visitor. . . seemed to fix me" (24–25). The Screw tableaux preserve all the features of picture — they are for the reader visually realizable as static compositions (the tale's first edition was in fact illustrated, by John LaFarge). But they also pre-
sent a dramatic transaction; however minutely, the ghost and the gover-
ness communicate in moments the governess terms "interruption" (30), as "ridiculous and as human as a real interview" (60). The mel-
dramatist, employing the term tableau as a stage direction, meant sim-
ply, freeze frame. The similarly Diderotian tableaux in Dickens, Balzac, and Thackeray, or in James's earlier fiction — such as the moments of "mutual absorbed gaze" between Gilbert Osmond and Madame Merle that "left them more closely face to face than either ever was with any-
one else" (Portrait 295) — take no more than a few lines of text. In the late fiction these episodes go on for pages just as they do in the re-
markable Screw tableaux, but now between characters who can't be read as hysterical or apparitional. Taking the moment of mutual ab-
sorption and opening it out, entering into it, James no longer represents merely the fact of absorption, but the events, limits, and negotiations of its duration — which is to say, he represents what happens between per-
sons who are, as it is said, "absorbed in one another." Characteristically, these scenes proceed without speech or motion on the part of the char-
acters, in a silence rich in experience, "neither awkward nor empty nor harsh, but on the contrary quite charged and brimming," as James writes of one such instance in "The Velvet Glove" (1909). These moments have two values. On the one hand, they elaborate the semiotic concept that the novelis-heros of "The Velvet Glove" articulate, "they could communicate... by the mere light of their eyes" (205). On the other, this communicative function is interchangeably understood experientially, as "deep communion," both expressing the wish, and acting upon it, "to use together every instant of the hour" (205).

In Diderotian terms, the late tableaux, despite the apparent stillness of the occasion, are also coups de theatre; they happen between the characters and contribute to the plot. The point can be illustrated by reference to contemporary film practices. In his film version of The Age of Innocence, Martin Scorsese made use of allusive, stop-action tableaux. Alexandra Stanley, a New York Times reporter, was on the set:

The day the ballroom scene was being filmed, Mr. Scorsese was instructing the cameraman—for the 11th time—exactly how to pan past the dancers and pause "for a beat" before a group of three women draped over a couch. The resulting tableau vivant [sic] of gaudily-dressed extras was positioned to exactly mimic Sargent's portrait "The Wyndham Sisters." The director held a photograph of the original in his lap. (Sec. 2: 12)

Like the melodramatic tableaux, Scorsese's allusive film beats (a "tableau" of a sort but not a "tableau vivant") belong to the metanarrative. They are experienced by the spectator, but not by the characters. The "extras" on the set pretend unconsciousness of their arrangement and function iconographically between Scorsese and his audience just as the tableau of Madame Merle and Gilbert Osmond operates between James and his reader. Though mediated by the subjective realization of Isabel, the Merle-Osmond tableau still largely functions within the economy of exposure: its significance is as it symbolically exposes the whole character of their relation to Isabel and the reader—not as an event between the lovers. It has no interior economy, no special significance for Merle and Osmond—only for the observers of the scene. James' late tableaux are much more akin to the three-way gunfight at the climax of Sergio Leone's The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly. Once the gunfighters have backed into position around three points of a cir-

cle, nobody moves; nobody speaks. Yet through montage Leone elaborates the duration of the picture so that the moments preceding the gunplay are packed with event, in fact are the event: every nuance of the composition (glance, gesture, attitude) has vital significance for the characters inside the scene. Their composition, however static, has narrative duration: they're reading each other; their lives depend on it. The climactic scene of Maggie Verver's story plays similarly to Sergio Leone's camera study of Lee Van Cleef, Eli Wallach, and Clint Eastwood armed on the alkali flat. It is not the shattering of the golden bowl that bears the significance of the scene, but the surrounding moments in which the motionless trio (Maggie, Amelio, Fanny Assingham) become "communicants"—mutely interchanging, exchanging glances in "the rapid play of suppressed appeal and disguised response" (Golden Bowl, 423). In describing the dynamic interplay of this climactic scene the narrator explicitly refers back to the first narrated tableau of the novel, between the Prince and Mrs. Assingham, in which the similarly "portentous stillness" through which the pair conducts their silent "interchange" is analogized to "enacting a tableau-vivant" (59).

Featuring a similar triadic speciality, a scene early in the novel represents the operations of visual semiotics as (shared) experience. When Maggie and others enter upon her father's tête-à-tête with Mrs. Rance, Adam enjoys a "mute passage with Maggie," in which he sees her, with some of the others, read "exactly what had taken place in her absence"—but also sees her noticing his awareness of her realization. Nor was this yet his "intensest perception," the narrator confides, because he subsequently notices that Fanny Assingham had seen "what they were both seeing" (147–49). It is not a question of Fanny performing voyeuristically; she belongs to the scene and the field of relations (as the Luteshes, for example, do not, or only faintly), and her observation is inextricable from her participation in that field of relations. Gayatri Spivak remarks that "only a native can know the scene" (Outside 9), and Fanny's shared experience with Maggie and Adam constitutes her as a native, not spectactorially knowing, but participating in the production of knowledge in the scene, so that this activity of "seeing with" (not "seeing into") asks to be understood experientially, as extending the shared field. In the late prose, it is evident that picture serves to discriminate the occasion, but a montage of intersubjective speciality functions to elaborate the picture into events for the characters.
studies of late-Jamesian epistemology, the way conversation functions as a “satisfying exchange of thoughts.” This “joint image-making” and “mutual creation of metaphors” often tends to create in the reader the “solipsistic” impression of the “private meditations” of a “single mind” (52–57, 70–71). This picture of characters being, as it were, of one mind—mutually producing a joint consciousness—seems, often, to be an intended effect of the topos of gesture, “the community of vision” creating what James describes in the preface to The Wings of the Dove as “a practical fusion of consciousness” (11).16

The ontological status of knowing highlights the importance of selecting an appropriate epistemological partner. To one degree or another, all of James’s characters participate in both public and private theater-structures in the manner of Kate Croy (who performs as the object of Mrs. Lowder’s surveillance while trying to shelter her relation to Merton Densher beneath that performance). Yet most characters seem to favor one epistemology or another, in a way that makes ethical sense of the late prose. While permitting the Ververs to collect him, for example, the Prince himself is generally the agent of, and agent through, the alternative private gestural scenes described here (successively with Fanny Assingham, Charlotte, and Maggie). Similarly, despite the occasional participation in an interspecular scene, Adam Verver generally tends to create himself as the viewing subject of a Cartesian pairing, even with Maggie, who by a “trick . . . mainly of his own mind,” the narrator tells us, he sees statuesque, “impersonal,” “generalized,” and with “blurred absent eyes” (172). This generalized standpoint is Adam’s most characteristic posture, consistent with his final perception of Charlotte and Amerigo as “human furniture,” complacently striking attitudes for his appraisal, “a pair of effigies of the contemporary great on one of the platforms of Madame Tussaud” (574). Sharing her father’s museum view, Maggie notes wonderingly by contrast his “so marked peculiarity of seeming on no occasion to have an attitude” (572, emphasis James). Adam’s lack of a gestural posture, and the disembodiment implied by evading localization in an attitude, pairs him neatly with Charlotte, whose talent, at stairways, balconies, and so on is exactly the striking of an attitude for his consumption. Like the specimen-gaze of Lady Castledean, Adam’s vision creates its object as waxwork, completing a thematic contrast to the interspecular structure of the living tableaux. The novel’s final epistemological pairings leave
Maggie and the Prince mutely gesturing at one another in hopeful prospects while Adam and Chatrone enact a bleak future as the crippled Cartesian couple.

There is so much going on in the three late novels that the epistemological significance of the pairings and groupings is easy to overlook. But the short fiction raises the question as a central preoccupation. White-Mason, the old New York hero of the late story "Crappy Cornellia" (1990) enacts these alternatives in his relations with his intended, a Mrs. Worthingham, and with Cornelia Rasch of the title. A painful publicity characterizes his relations with the former; a refreshing privacy is evident in his experience of the latter. As the story opens, White-Mason entertains the rather fantastic hope of imposing a painlessly "wash of privacy" on his relations with the widow Worthingham (238). On this hope he founds his expectations of marriage, but his subsequent revived connection with Cornelia Rasch, an acquaintance of his youth, makes evidence to White-Mason that Mrs. Worthingham's complete lack of shared experience made it impossible for her to know him; she "has no data," he realizes. "She doesn't know anything that we know" (243, emphasis James). What separates White-Mason and Mrs. Worthingham is not only the different data; it is their modes of knowing. White-Mason describes her way as a version of being "in the know," a semiotic mode which assumes a general body of knowledge in which all participate to a greater or lesser degree, the degree of ability to read the signs of that knowledge producing in those enjoying the greater quotency "an amused ironic view" by contrast to what White-Mason takes as his own more gentle and affiliative version of the Aspasia tableaux, painting his reaction of anguish—as if he "had been 'snap-shotted' on the spot"—to the panoply of brilliantly brilliant objects d'art with which Mrs. Worthingham has furnished her house to signify her taste, wealth, and position (234). Mrs. Worthingham's home is a scene where the experience of symbols is substituted for experience mediated by symbols. It is one of those locations of which James complains in The American Scene that the trees must give rise to the occasion, and not the occasion to the trees: "In worlds otherwise arranged . . . the occasion itself, with its character fully turned on, produces the trees. In New York, this symbol has, by an arduous extension of its virtue, to produce the occasion" (165). Cornelia's "small show" is instead a gestural scene (and one where the collaborative aspect is visible, by contrast to the constant ant display in the dogfight/gunfight analogies). As the narrator portrays Cornelia understanding White-Mason to be "woefully describing it" ("This was the kind of thing that was in the air whether he said it or not"), their encounter is characterized as "help[ing] each other" through "a finer economy" than "the comparatively clumsy method of sound and statement" (244–45).

White-Mason rejects Mrs. Worthingham solely for her unsuitability as an epistemological partner. With Cornelia he understands that the "certitude" and "absolute" knowing characteristic of the brilliantly lit Worthingham symbolism sounds for him "through several thicknesses of some wrong medium" (240). The widow's Enlightenment epistemology obliterates Jamesian vagueness, the "rich gloom" characterizing his relations with Cornelia. "With you," White-Mason says to Cornelia, "I haven't to wear a green shade" (345). In the enabling dimness White-Mason and Rasch turn their eyes more fully upon each another; knowing, even knowing-as-seeming, becomes tactile (his impatience to see her is so that "he might touch her"), so that the eyes of each engage the other geometrically, in a rich vague tactility. This gestural conduct is not a reaching after a new or better language at all, but the late rise blossoming of an alternative knowledge technology in which epistemic agency is collective; "One wants a woman," White-Mason finally declares to Cornelia Rasch, "to know for one, to know with one. That's what you do now" (246, emphasis James).

Even those stories most often read with a psychological emphasis reveal the usefulness of an intersubjective hermeneutic. For example, in "The Jolly Corner" Spencer Brydon's "van egon" is collectively produced, in the "communities of knowledge" he shares with Alice Staverton (164a, 164). Of course the collective production of narcissistic self-representation is a general feature of the American scene, but "The Jolly Corner" (1908) is quite definite regarding the dependence of Brydon's egotistical scene of knowing upon Alice Staverton's collaboration—"their knowledge (this discriminating possessive was always on her lips)" (164). When Brydon shilly confesses his fantasy of an "other self," she admits to having shared the identical fantasy for weeks. "I believe in the flower," she says encouragingly, "I feel it would have been quite splendid" (171). Much more than it ever could be grounded in either "America" or Brydon's "individual" mental state, the alter ego is
a product of their shared experience, including their past, the time apart, and the present reunion. They produce local knowledge with the explicit aim of resisting "the mere gross generalization of wealth and force and success." The pair's "communities of knowledge" unfold in the "small still scene" of Alice Stoverton's garden, understood as an alternative to the tabulated space of the city: "the dreadful multiplied numberings which seemed to him to reduce the whole place to some vast ledger-page" (164, 165).

The collective character of epistemic agency is not a general collective, a "society at large," or even the marginally smaller liberal "ethnos" valorized by recent neopragmatists. Instead, it is a highly particular, mobile, and tactical collectivity, constituted in a field of overlapping and contradictory relations. The circle around which Jamesian relations famously "appear to stop" is in this way tactical and contingent (Preface 1841, emphasis James). Characters in the late prose choose their epistemic fellows carefully and lavish their energies on the development of epistemic protocols. In choosing Cornelia over Mrs. Worthingham, White-Mason makes a happy epistemological decision, in sharp contrast, for example, to John Marcher's perverse adherence to the discovery scene in "The Beast in the Jungle" (1993). By denying experience and insisting that knowledge consists only in the sudden, sharply defined clarity of revelation, Marcher misses the epistemological potential. Marcher gets his revelation, and he gets it as he always insisted—sharper incision than ever the open page of his story. The name on the gravestone is here brilliantly, of course, the message: "Psst was knowledge" (107, emphasis James). But even the sudden realization—the discovery—literally shieled in stone has duration ("the pieces fit and fitted"). The marriage of Marcher's desperate efforts to the contrary ("he tried to fix it and hold it") even the knowledge of the stone tableau won't hold still (106-7).

The recognition of the collective production of knowledge and its contingence, experiential character has formidable ethical force in the late prose, and it is in the context of this principle that Maggie's relation to power asks to be read. In the well-known scene of the bridge game at Fawne, Maggie watches the play of the others and is struck by the fantasy that "they might have been figures rehearsing some play of which she herself was the author" (489). Maggie's authority does traverse this scene; she knows that she can create Marcher's stone tableau, "that she might round out their doom in a single sentence" (457). As a kind of Queen, she can with a word substitute antimasque for masque; the game is "a scene she might make people, by the press of a spring, either with serenities and dignities and decencies, or with tears and shames, and ruins, things as ugly as the formless fragrances of her golden bowl" (488). But this fleeting perception does not accurately reflect Maggie's ethical posture, or her sense of the right exercise of her power and the epistemological status of the scene. She understands that—as James once wrote approvingly of the role of the "clever, cynical, democratic multitude" shaping the scene of French theater—"The director is not an absolute but a constitutional ruler; for he shares his powers with the society itself, which has always had a large deliberative voice" (Scene Art 101, 71–72). Just as James deprecates Napoleon's efforts to reform the theater autocratically, Maggie declines to shape the scene by fiat. When joined by Charlotte at the window, Maggie faces the temptation to handle the occasion sentimentally, and show her the tableau as moral instruction ("in righteous iron, in reproof too stern for anything but silence"), but abandons the ironic stance, instead permitting Charlotte to show it to her. Charlotte then indicates the group at just such a moral tableau—policing not Maggie's behavior, but her own.

In evading the discipline of this standpoint, just as it later evades her father's museum view, Maggie both rejects the tabular theory of knowing and articulates an alternative which is contingent, hermeneutic, and relational. On the one hand, she muses, "the full significance" of the picture Charlotte is trying to show her "could not be no more than a matter of interpretation, differing always for a different interpreter" (493). Determining her sense of the scene is "the sharp-edged fact of the relation of the whole group, individually and collectively, to her" (486). The scene is not knowable from the spectatorial standpoint, but only in the group's "rare complexity of relations." So far from recirculating supervisory structures of girded Cartesian space, Maggie's relation to power appears to be that of guaranteeing epistemological multiplicity. Her queerness is undeniable, but it is the queerness of a masque in which the social order is understood not as "reflected" by
the masque and its evident symbolic order, but negotiated in the interstices between. The Diderovian epistemological regime adhered to by Adam and Charlotte is a theatricality which denies itself: "this is not representation," claims their performance, "this is real." But the epistemological protocols established between Maggie and her husband admit the theatricality of real relations. In the aftermath of the shattering of the golden bowl, Maggie's willingness to permit Amerigo to "compose his face" announces a shift in their protocol. She decisively abandons the American epistemology of discovery with this decision, embracing instead the European social epistemology which has always been characteristic of the Prince, marked by what Goffman describes as "co-operation in face-work": "The person not only defends his own face and protects the face of others, but also acts so as to make it possible and even easy for the others to employ face-work for themselves and him. He helps them to help themselves and him" (Interaction 27).

What had previously appeared as a largely adversarial character in their mute scenes—"the high fight"—becomes collaborative, in mutual recognition of the theatricality of the scene. By permitting him to arrange his face, the narrator says, Maggie has "fairly got into the labyrinth with him," inviting him to "work with" her. "She had done for him, that is, what her instinct had enjoined; had laid a basis not merely momentary on which he could meet her." The result: "there occurred between them a kind of unprecedented moral exchange over which her superior lucidity presided" (455). Maggie does not, in thus "presiding," impose a moral order as Charlotte attempts to impose on her—it is an "exchange"—nor does she, like Adam, seek to view disembodied and invulnerable. She reflects later that she too had performed in the scene of Amerigo's face-work, "as some panting dancer of a difficult step [in] an empty theater, to a spectator lounging in a box" (479). In providing the basis of their meeting, Maggie scruples also to take the risk of performance. In the field of their mature relations, neither Maggie nor the Prince have a domineering connection to power. In the epistemological regime of this accomplished partnership, it is no longer a question of knowing the other, no longer a matter of a single investigative consciousness, nor of exposing the truth about oneself; it is a shared search for the means of living with the knowable. Together in their dynamic tableaux, Maggie and the Prince enact a precarious ontology predicated on intersubjectivity. In their earnest mutual inven-

tiveness, the couple are not progressing toward exposure or revelation, but simply toward an understanding; their gesturings at one another are not true in themselves, but only a component of making truth.

Indiana University

NOTES

1. Brooks extends the melodramatic into James's late prose, where previously it had been seen as characteristic only of the earlier (Baran) and middle (Levy) phases.

2. What might be called the strong-Foucauldian readers are very often exactly right to observe that "the techniques of representation in James's works express a complicity and a rigorous continuity with the larger social regimes of mastery and control which traverse those works" (Seltzer 13). But the strong Foucauldians are certainly exaggerating with the further claim that James always, and inevitably, "reinvents" the technologies of supervision (Seltzer 16). Rowe surveys this line of criticism (147–87).

3. While viewing "the inclination to theatricality" a little narrowly as a structure of publicity and an effect of market society, Agnew characterizes Jamesian privacy as "the indispensable condition of familiarity upon which the fragile structure of human community is formed" (76). Bell points out that James's distaste for publicity emerges exactly from its tendency to collapse an important distinction between the personal and the private: "it is precisely the effect of publicity to render 'private and personal' interchangeable, and hence impoverished in their relation to 'public'" (132).

4. Anselm Strauss usefully discusses Mead's vision as elaborated by the subsequent sociological study of functioning groups: "They can be rooted in or transcended space. They can be tiny or enormous in membership. They can have relatively discernible, 'tight' boundaries or permeable, 'fluid' boundaries. . . . The members of different sub-worlds are always joining forces so that there is an alliancing, merging, coalescing, which processes may lead sub-worlds to dissolve, disappear, or at least pull out from the original world" (Mead, Introduction xix–xx).

5. Bhabha, for example, is eloquent: "the moment of the subject's individualization emerges as an effect of the intersubjective—as the return of the subject as agent. This means that those elements of social 'consciousness' imperative for agency—deliberative, individuated action and specificity in analysis—can now be thought outside that epistemology that insists on the subject as always prior to the social. . . . The iterative and contingent that marks this intersubjective relation can never be libertarian or free-floating, as Eagleton claims, because the agent, constituted in the subject's return, is in the dialogic position of calculation, negotiation, interrogation: Che vuoi?" (184).

6. It does seem to make more sense to associate agency and resistance with, for example, the melodramatic heroics of an Edwin Forrest, the democratic-imperial individual. But enacting a subversive posture does not necessarily produce effective
resistance: quite the contrary, in fact, as recent studies of sensation fiction (Looby) and rock posturing (Frisch) have concluded.

7. Nonetheless the sense that domestic theater inevitably perpetuates domestication continues to exert paradigmatic influence almost universally in Alcott criticism, in whose novels instances of parlor theater are frequent. For example, Hallumns when writing of an ungendarred, national subject, characterizes parlor theatricals in the 1850s as a liberatingly antisenstimental practice (Confidence Men 174–90). Writing later about Alcott, however, Hallumns describes the Cambridge novelist's association with domestic theater very differently, as "emblematic" of a perceived failure to retain an agency associe with her passion for melodrama ("Domestic Drama" 234).

8. Of course it is de Certeau's own theorization of intersitital spaces of resis- tance that leads to a heterological epistemology which relies on "the lived experience of the other," as Godrich notes ("Introduction," de Certeau, Heterologies xvi). But de Certeau's emphasis on practices of evasive mobility doesn't address the difficulties of the individual agent's resistance by means of structures of collectivity.

9. The provincial theater similarly appears to support a negotiation of resistance of subcommunities. In Davenport, Iowa, for example, the minority German community began an active amateur theater in the 1850s—performing in beer gardens and giving Sunday performances, incurring the displeasure of the dominant anglophone community on both counts—and succeeded in obtaining the repeal of antitheatrical ordinances, even as the anglophone theater opportunities were largely restricted to temperance dramas; at the death of John Brown, the German company draped their new theater space in black, defying the anglophone community's vocal anti-abolition sentiments (Schick 87ff).

10. At this time William begins his friendship with Newport native Jim McKay, later a successful playwright, actor, and producer of civic pageantry; a page from one of William's 1864 plays still survives in his papers (Lewis 103; reproduction 234c). Alice writes of participating in a play in 1860 and charades in 1865; she joins an amateur dramatic club immediately after the war, later serving as its president; in October 1867, her correspondence features a family episode as a dramatic sketch starring Henry (Strouse 56.95: 133–34, 114).

11. Harvard's Hasty Pudding first substituted a play for the traditional mock trial in December 1844, giving only very occasional performances in "private houses in Cambridge, Brookline, and Chickering's in Boston" chiefly during the 1854–55 season, "but it was not until after the war that such performances became customary."

12. The roster of the Executive and Finance Committees published by the Newport Daily News (July 29, 1861) included Henry's mother, Mary Walsh James, and his aunt Kate, his cousin Mrs. Edmund Tweedy, his friend Katherine Prescott Wormley, later prominent as a translator of Balzac, and Mrs. Wormley's mother. (It seems likely that James's acquaintance with Wormley, later recognized as a translator of Daudet, Balzac, and other contemporary French literary figures, begins at this time, rather than two decades later as has been previously assumed.)

13. Henry Sr. praised Alcott's popular 1853 Hospital Sketches; Worsley's anonymous dispatches in the Newport Daily News were followed by a commissioned pamphlet history of the Sanitary Commission and a signed memoir, The Other Side of the War.

14. The hundreds of chiefly feminine collectives which organized themselves in affiliation with the Sanitary Commission provided a site of alternate identification and often effective resistance to structures of dominance embodied in surgeons and Army administrators, community leaders and church officials—both during the war and after, in hospitals and in communities far from the front lines (Schultz passim). Similarly, Louise May Alcott's conversion of a section of the hospital ward under her charge into a "pleasure room" (33) featuring private theatricals, constituted a profound act of collective resistance by patients and nurses to the surgical regime. Strouse's account of Alice James's Cambridge women's amateur dramatic circle persuasively emphasizes that the group, despite its continuing aid activities, functioned most importantly for its members as a site of affiliation (154). Just as structures of private theater enabled Alcott's patients and their nurses to know one another in ways unavailable to the surgeons, in a theater which excluded men, the women of Alice's "Bee" became knowable to each other in ways otherwise impossible.

15. This "negative ideal" might also be expressed as an ideal of negativity: Auchard develops the link between "structural silences" (such as the tabeaux discussed here) and various iterations of Jamesian negativity.

16. In two of the most accomplished James studies of recent years, Cameron and Sedgwick have exhaustively anatomized the exteriority of consciousness in James. Frequently both critics attribute to the intersubjective consciousness a largely dominant or violative quality. Sedgwick argues that the coincidence of thoughts, understood genealogically as a development in the homoerotics of the romantic and Gothic knowing double, is both desired and feared. Cameron's Hutterian and convincingly anti-psychological study sometimes portrays consciousness as a kind of totalizing Hegelian spirit and at other times as a kind of freely circulating Foucauldian administrative structure. In both studies, the personal consciousness tends to retain privilege, as if requiring and deserving protection from collective structures. But—at least in the dynamic tableaux featuring an intersubjective specularly which are the topic of the present effort—these fusions of consciousness are almost never represented by James as the dominant, or domineering, mode of knowing.

17. It is useful in this connection to remember that the grotesque antimasque was generally performed by professional actors (Orgel 40).
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