Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

Unreliable Narrator, (Un)reliable Translator: Comparison of Two Spanish Translations of Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*

Laura Sanz Olivares

Tutor: Carlos Herrero Quirós

Curso 2020-2021

ABSTRACT

Given the relevance of textual interpretation for the task of the literary translator, it could be argued that such an ambiguous work like Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw* is especially problematic. The translator of the work must convey the same message as the original author intended, as well as the style characterizing the source; however, in the case of this nineteenth-century classic this message is not any clearer than the tale's nature itself. Nearly a century of debate on the reliability of the novella's narrator has not yielded definitive conclusions. The present graduate thesis undertakes the comparison of two Spanish translations of James's work so as to assess the extent to which the translator's personal interpretations mould their respective versions by making them more univocal than the source text; or if, conversely, being aware of the narrative's ambiguity, the translators succeed in retaining the original's deliberate obscurity.

Key words: *The Turn of the Screw*, Henry James, textual analysis, unreliable narration, narrative ambiguity, literary translation.

Dada la relevancia de la interpretación textual para la tarea de un traductor literario, se podría argumentar que una obra tan ambigua como *Otra vuelta de tuerca* de Henry James resulta especialmente problemática. El traductor debe transmitir el mismo mensaje del texto fuente con el mismo estilo; sin embargo, en el caso de este clásico del siglo XIX, ni este mensaje ni la naturaleza del relato están claros. Casi un siglo de debate sobre la fiabilidad de la narradora de la novela no ha arrojado conclusiones definitivas. El presente Trabajo de Fin de Grado aborda la comparación de dos traducciones españolas de la *novella* de James con el fin de evaluar en qué medida las interpretaciones personales de los traductores moldean sus respectivas versiones haciéndolas más unívocas que el texto fuente; o si, por el contrario, los traductores, conscientes de la ambigüedad de la obra, logran mantener la deliberada oscuridad del original.

Palabras clave: *Otra vuelta de tuerca,* Henry James, análisis textual, narrador falible, ambigüedad narrativa, traducción literaria.

INDEX

1. Introduction

Henry James, born in New York in 1843 and deceased in London in 1916, is one of the greatest representatives of British Gothic literature. He is considered by many a transitional figure between realism and Modernism both in British and in American literature – he is a predecessor of Modernism due to his revolutionary use of point of view in narration and the importance of the character's consciousness in many (if not in all) of his fictional works (Ranjan 2017, 45). He changed radically the point of view from where the story is told, displacing the author as the principal omniscient narrator and replacing the authorial perspective by the homodiegetic viewpoint of a character. This leads inevitably to debates over the reliability of that character-narrator, which is precisely the case of the work under examination in this graduate paper.

The Turn of the Screw is a novella in which the reader peruses the journal of a young governess who narrates the incredibly horrifying events that marked her first labor experience – the governess is sent to Bly Manor to take care of two beautiful children when she witnesses two apparitions: the deceased valet, Peter Quint, and the governess, Miss Jessel. Through a first-person point of view, the reader gets an insight of how the governess tries to save her two disciples from the influence of the ghosts while also perceiving that the governess gradually loses her sanity. James's uncanny tale has been surrounded by controversy and debate among scholars for decades, a debate that still remains unresolved. The question is whether this is a simple ghost story as it appears at first sight, or if, instead, it is the story of a deranged governess haunted by her own hallucinations. In other words, the debate deals with the reliability of the governess as the focalizer of the story.

Sections two and three of this graduate paper attempt to explain some theoretical concepts that are relevant for the analysis and comparison carried out in sections four and five. More particularly section two seeks to elucidate the relevance of literary analysis and text interpretation for the purposes of literary translation, while section three is concerned with the definition of unreliable narration and the characteristics a narrator must have to be considered a fallible one. Section four, in turn, elaborates on the two main interpretations posited in order to make sense of Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*, following some brief background on the context of publication of this work, relevant for

the understanding of the two prevalent readings of the tale. Finally section 5 and the subsections within study and compare two Spanish-language versions of Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*. One was made by José Bianco, who published the first translation of this work into Spanish in 1945; and the other one was signed by José Luis López Muñoz, in much more recent times, since it appeared in the year 2000. As a translator must inevitably be an interpreter of the work s/he is rendering into another language, this comparison will try to ascertain whether the translators in this case allow their own interpretation of the novel to visibly shape their work - thus favoring one reading or the other - or if, on the contrary, they were aware of the intentional ambiguity in James's novella and, therefore, strived to preserve it in their translations. Perhaps, as the modern discussions of *The Turn of the Screw* saying that both interpretations – the psychoanalytic and the 'ghost' ones - are possible started to be published from the 1980s onwards, it could be expected that José Bianco translated the novel following his distinct exegesis of the tale's narratological complexities, while José Luis López Muñoz produced a more ambiguous rendering of the work. A particular sub-hypothesis within this framework is that José Bianco, personally favoring one interpretation over the other, was also aware of the debate and decided to produce an especially literal translation of this book so as to secure an 'impartial' or even 'faithful' approach to the original. Therefore, this graduate project will examine how the personal interpretation of a work so controversial as the one discussed in the following pages may hamper the task of the translator.

2. General considerations on translation

Translation both refers to a process and to the result. In technical terms, a definition of translation as a process is the act of transforming a Source Language Text (SLT) into a Target Language Text (TLT) (Torre 2001, 7). Within this definition, we find that there are two trends: those translators (or translation theorists) who advocate for a more "faithful" or literal translation, and those who insist on producing a freer or more "literary" (i.e. creative) rewriting (122). Theodore Savory (cited in Torre 2001, 121-22) draws a comprehensive classification of the translator's choices articulated in the following binary positions: a translation must reproduce either the words or the ideas of

the original text; it must read like a brand-new work or like a translation; it must reflect the style of the author or the translator's; it must read like a work written in the period when the original was written or as a contemporary work to the translator; it can or cannot have additions or omissions; and as regards the particular case of poetry translation, it must be written in prose or in verse. These six oppositions represent the two broad positions concerning the standard of perfection. Still, neither of the two options is better than the other one - one might prove too literal for the reader, so that the ideas or the effect sought by the author in the reader may be lost, and the other might make the translator forget that he is just a translator and not the writer of a new text.

Nida and Taber (1982, 25) distinguish between translation targeted at a formal equivalence (which would correspond with the above-mentioned category of "literal" translation) and a translation oriented towards a dynamic equivalence (representative of the "literary" typology of translation). As the authors explain, the second type of translation is meant to preserve the original effect in the reader by adapting the work completely to the TL readership – an undertaking performed along three levels (Torre 2001, 124). In the first level, Carlo Buzzeti places linguistic and cultural conformity to make the reader think he/she is not dealing with a translation but an original text. In the second level, he places contextual conformity, which takes into account tone and register. Finally, in the third level, Buzzeti situates what he calls receiver-type conformity (125), which focuses on such things the period or speech community the translation's readership belongs to so as to change whatever is necessary to produce the same effect as in the ST (126). However, and as stated by Torre, the translator must be careful and not forget that he must try to produce the same effect in the reader without making unwarranted changes in the original message - he cannot translate "*Is it raining?*" as "*¿Tienes hambre?*" ("When is your friend coming?") even if both sentences produce the same perlocutionary effect in the receiver: eliciting a specific answer.

Also seminal as regards the conceptual framework of translation and the differentiation between its general strategies or methods is the dyad proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet, who distinguish between direct or literal translation and oblique translation (Vinay & Darbelnet 1973, 30). These two modes equate to the "literal" and "literary" positions discussed earlier. The difference is that Vinay and Darbelnet do not

define their two modes as mutually exclusive - a translator may combine both by using the best technique in each particular case.

Literal translation includes techniques such as loans and calques, which, according to Vinay and Darbelnet, involve a purely linguistic transference and should only be used when possible (Vinay & Darbelnet 1973, 30-40). Oblique translation in turn includes more complex techniques, namely transposition, modulation, equivalence, adaptation, compensation, amplification, specification, and omission. Peter Newmark names a few additional techniques, like synonymy or naturalization (1988, 82-84). However, since the focus of this thesis does not concern a thorough analysis of such procedures in the texts under examination, the topic need not be further labored in these lines.

2.1.1. Literary translation: specificities and issues. The role of interpretation

Leaving aside purely pragmatic or communicative translation, the activity of translation is often subdivided into two broad categories. These are technical translation and literary translation (Valero 1995, 15). The former involves the translation of texts belonging to the domains of science, technology, law, politics, economy, etc., which obviously fall outside the scope of this paper.

Literary translation, on the other hand and as is self-evident, takes place when the source of the documents exhibits to one or another degree the conventions of literature and style and expression are foregrounded. According to Carmen Valero (1995, 15), within literary translation, two groups of texts should be differentiated - one dealing with literary works proper, like novels, poems, etc.; and another including texts like journalistic articles, correspondence or speeches, among others. Regardless of whether a particular newspaper article or a simple letter should be considered as work for a literary translator or not, what is clear is that the latter possesses its own peculiarities. Literary translators must not only be knowledgeable about translation and literature (Ballesteros 2015, 17): their required skills fall into a bread range since theirs is a complex task. In the words of Valero, "(a) translator, when approaching a literary work, is first a reader and then a translator" (1995, 15 [our own translation]). This means that before beginning the job, they must carefully read and interpret the work - Helena Cortés (2008, 91) distinguishes between content interpretation (the meaning or intention behind the text)

and stylistic interpretation (concerned with the form, stylistic devices, etc.). This means that all those features and nuances of style and technique (in the case of narrative fiction, for example, the often subtle markers of point of view) that the text presents must be reflected in the translation following a long and complex transcodification process.

All of which, incidentally and in terms of the literary translator's skills profile, requires a high level of qualification as well as imagination, sensibility, and a high interpretative capacity, a top-level command of both languages and a strong capacity to express all the ideas and feelings of the original without losing meaning and stylistic peculiarities (Valero 1995, 16). A literary translator must be highly skilled, very creative and flexible, with the capacity to read between the lines and perceive ambiguities, and enough humility (Ballesteros 2015, 18) to realize that he is just a translator and not the original writer. All of these inputs have an important bearing on both the interpretation and the translation processes - translation is a transcultural phenomenon, and all the knowledge a translator possesses is determined by the culture in which he has been educated (Valero 1995, 34). The translation is ultimately geared towards the target text's demands, since "the function of a translation is dependent on the knowledge, expectations, values and norms of the target readers, who are again influenced by the situation they are in and by their culture" (Kussmaul 1997, 149). Depending on all these the translation will be more faithful, or rather, literal, or more of an adaptation.

What is then discernable from all of the above is that a literary translator must make a lot of personal choices will have an influence on the final product. This involves numerous challenges and a certain amount of risk, as Amelia Gamoneda (2008, 58) points out. The first decision the translator faces is interpreting the literary work. Literary interpretation is highly subjective, and it is sometimes said that some works as put by Oliver Evans (Aristar Dry and Kucinkas 1991, 72) have as many interpretations as readers, which is the case in *The Turn of the Screw* by Henry James as it will be discussed later. This means that each translator will produce a different version of the same text (Valero 1995, 15), and, in some cases, choices will have to be made between maintaining the message or the form (Cortés 2008, 91). To this one should add the natural differences that exist (grammatical, lexical, semantic and phonetic) between the two languages involved, which means that it may be nearly impossible to achieve total semantic equivalence (Gamoneda 2008, 58). Indeed the tension between these differences, which

in an informative translation can be dissolved by a number of naturalizing strategies, and the exquisite attention to details of style required by renderings of literary texts lies at the core of literary translation.

Even if it may appear that the best choice a translator can make is to translate the SL text as plainly and literally as possible to avoid the perils of a subjective interpretation, it hardly ever is. As Helena Cortés (2008, 92) argues: "[i]n literary translation, correctness is never a synonym of quality, as we all know that a translation that is perfectly 'correct' can be at the same time an awful one, plain, gray, lifeless, that has simply killed the text." In her own words, the translation must be a "living object;" or, as claimed by Valentín García Yebra, "[it] must include everything the original says, and not include anything that is not on the original; and it must do so with as much correctness and naturalness the target language allows" (cited in de Miguel 1994, 119, [our own translation]).

3. The unreliable narrator

The concept of unreliable narrator was first introduced by Wayne C. Booth in 1961 in his book *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. In this volume, he classified a narrator as reliable "when he speaks or acts in accordance with the norms of the work (which is to say the implied author's norms)" (Booth 1961, 158). Therefore, an unreliable narrator is that who does the opposite – one who differs from the norms of the implied author. A similar definition is provided by Chatman (cited in Álvarez 1991, 42), who says that a narrator is unreliable when his or her values "diverge strikingly" from those of the implied author's. This means that, if there is an unreliable narrator, this narrator will tell a story that is at odds with the implied reader's suppositions about the story's intention.

However, as the topic of unreliable narrator continued to be explored by critics, the role of the reader in building an unreliable narrator theory started to gain importance to the detriment of that of the implied author. This is especially notable in the new conceptualization developed by Ansgar Nünning, who posited the presence of an unreliable narrator in a given novel or story is a "reader-dependent issue" (Hansen 2007, 227) and that the figure of an implied author was not even necessary in accounting for the functioning of the narrative (Zerweck 2001, 151). The unreliable narrator, according to

Nünning, is thus understood "in the context of frame theory as a projection by the reader who tries to resolve ambiguities and textual inconsistencies by attributing them to the narrator's unreliability" (cited in Zerweck 2001, 151) - it is a strategy of interpretation, of reading, in which the reader includes his or her own conceptual frameworks or frames or reference involving the real world, the conventions of the literary genre, or a mix of both (Zerweck 2001, 154-55) to assimilate the text. This means that the 'norms' or values Booth set in contrast with the ones of the narrator are not those of the implied author's (235), nor the implied reader's, but of the 'real' reader of the fictional work. Nünning's theory is based on pragmatics, and more specifically, on the theory of 'naturalization' developed by Culler in 1975. Culler indicated that a reader 'naturalizes' a text by "bringing it into relation with a type of discourse or model which is already, in some sense, natural and legible" (cited in Zerweck 2001, 153; Hansen 2007, 235). This 'discourse' or 'model' Culler refers to is, according to Nünning, the conceptual framework that each reader brings to the text (228, 235).

Among the reasons why a narrator might seem unreliable to the reader, we might find knowledge limitations due to young age, immaturity, or cognitive disability; incoherent value schemes resulting in psychological and moral flaws; naivety, excessive good faith; or personal involvement (Álvarez 1991, 42). All of these can be related, to a certain extent, to the narrator of the work discussed in this graduate project, but this will be explained in more detail later on. From all the above reasons, only the last one is discussed at length by Booth in his first theorizing on the unreliable narrator theory. In *The Rhetoric of Fiction,* Booth argues that the author (conscious or unconsciously) creates an unreliable narrator every time he/she decides to tell a story through a character (with varying degree of participation in the story), because, by doing so, he inevitably loses some credibility or objectivity, making the reader wonder whether what this character is narrating is true or not (1961, 175). However, as stated by Zerweck (2001, 156), a first-person homodiegetic narrator - a character participating in the story - does not necessarily make an unreliable narrator. This would only apply to those in which the reader can sense something is off with his/her narration. It is also important to indicate that Booth (1961, 228) explicitly excludes as unreliable narrators those who consciously lie or who "indulge in large amounts of incidental irony." Lastly, unreliability can also come from the presence of contradictions and inconsistencies at the textual levels.

Finally, Bruno Zerweck (2001, 156-158)) enumerates some characteristics the unreliable narrator must have. One of them is that an unreliable narrator must be highly anthropomorphized, that is, personalized - he or she must have human-like attributes like knowledge, perception, or understanding (attributes which must belong to one of the various personality models that are part of the reader's "world-knowledge base") - so an unreliability factor can be attributed to him/her. Another one is that the unreliable narrator must unintentionally incriminate himself or herself as unreliable, i.e., through means of dramatic irony, the narrator is continually giving clues to the readers that make them doubt him/her as the actions described by the narrator do not coincide with those grasped by the readers. In addition to these two characteristics, Zerweck explains that unreliable narration is a cultural and historical phenomenon - the naturalization of a narrator by the reader as unreliable depends on his/her personality models, values, and beliefs, so that what is traditionally perceived as unreliable about a narrative voice in one culture or at one historical period may not have the same attribution in another which possesses a completely different set of values and norms.

4. *The Turn of the Screw*

4.1. Context of publication

The Turn of the Screw was first published in *Collier's Weekly* magazine in installments from the 27th of January to the 16th of April of 1898 (Moss 2009, 134). It was published in book format for the first time in October 1898 in *The Two Magics* and then in volume 12 of his 1908 *New York Edition* (Makarenov and Segalovitz 2020, 7), and ever since then controversy has accompanied this novel. One of the reasons that has been typically given to explain the presence of ambiguity in this work is the serialized format of the original publication. This is the case of Laura Moss (2009, 134), who indicates that ambiguity is there to create suspense so the readers would be waiting for the next installment.

Some critics have also explained the ambiguity of the work in terms of retaliation. In 1895, just three years before the publication of *The Turn of the Screw,* Henry James

presented to the public his latest play - *Guy Domville*. However, it was not well received by the public, who did not appreciate James's work. James was frustrated with a readership to which he had made "the most strenuous concessions (...) which demanded maximum simplification and transparency of meaning" (Levy 1956, 289). Besides, he had just bought a house, and he needed money to pay it (Beidler 1989, 14). This would mean that *The Turn of the Screw* would serve two purposes: it would provide a way to obtain money swiftly after his latest fiasco by publishing a story full of suspense in installments, and it would be an instrument of James's revenge on those same readers who had not appreciated *Guy Domville* by luring them into buying all the magazine issues only to find out that all the ambiguities he intentionally introduced in the story never got resolved. Now, it was him who was "unpredictable and arbitrary" and not the public (Levy 1956, 289).

There is even controversy about where Henry James found the inspiration to write his novella. In 1898, Henry James sent a letter to Arthur C. Benson telling him that the source of the tale narrated by the governess in *The Turn of the Screw* is based upon a story his father, Edward White Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, had told him some time before (Ives 1963, 185; Jones 1959, 117). This story James heard involved ghosts of dead servants and children, just like the governess's story, and this fact is typically used as an argument by the critics who support the 'ghost' interpretation. However, Ives (1963, 186) indicates that both A. C. and E. F. Benson - Edward White Benson's sons - denied the possibility that their father could have told him a story containing, as James referred to it, the "germ of anything so odious and hideous" (cited in Lee 2007, 12). In addition to this and to make a more solid argument, critics favoring the 'ghost' interpretation use the fact that Henry James was probably familiar with all the new advancements in physical research (i.e. investigations into paranormal activity) through his brother William James, who was not only a member of the Society for Physical Research but its President in 1894 (Ives 1963, 188). During his time as president of the Society, William published a record of cases involving visual, tactile, and auditory hallucinations or apparitions called "Report on the Census of Hallucinations." Beidler (1989, 76) recognizes that even if it was possible that Henry James did not explicitly read the ten ghost stories that were available to him at the moment of writing his novella, he certainly must have been familiar with

them as there are too many similarities between those cases and the activity described by the governess to just be coincidental.

It is nevertheless important to note that Oscar Cargill, one of the critics who has interpreted *The Turn of the Screw* in a psychoanalytic manner and called Henry James a "Freudian pioneer" (Jones 1959, 115), has placed the story's origin in a case of hysteria suffered by a girl, Lucy R., that occurred in 1895 (Lee 2007, 11). This was only three years before the publication of his novella, and, although it can be considered as a possibility that Henry James came across Lucy R.'s story, the chronology is the only evidence Cargill gives to build his argument. It is perhaps more likely that he knew about the ghost-sighting reports that were circulating at the time than about these pre-psychoanalytic cases. As stated by Fagin (1941, 198), "Freudian psychology was something Henry James could not have been conscious of dealing with" because it was fully developed decades later. Besides, it was James himself who placed the origin in a ghost story as discussed in the previous paragraph, so it seems that Cargill took his argumentation a step too far.

4.2. Interpretations of the novella: an open debate

The two main interpretations revolve around the sanity of the governess - some critics say that there is no deeper purpose behind *The Turn of the Screw* than to tell a ghost story, and others see it as a psychoanalytical tale of a deranged governess who has hallucinations. They essentially question whether the apparitions of Peter Quint and Miss Jessel are real or are a product of the governess's imagination. In other words, the debate is whether the governess is to be trusted as a reliable narrator, or if, on the contrary, she is to be regarded as unreliable.

4.2.1. The 'ghost' theory

This interpretation, referred to as the "romantic position" by Ives (1963, 183), supports the opinion in which Peter Quint and Miss Jessel are real presences haunting Bly and not mere products of the governess's imagination.

Some of the arguments given by the critics supporting this interpretation invoke the Preface, not only the one given by James in his New York edition but the one

introducing the governess's tale narrated by a man called Douglas. In James's Preface, he defined his work as a "fairy-tale pure and simple" in which, after hearing about "the spirits of certain 'bad' servants, dead in the employ of the hose," he wanted to "cast [his] lot with pure romance" to create a ghost story with the perfect dose of "dear old sacred terror" that he missed in all those new 'physical' ghost-sighting reports published by the Society for Physical Research (cited in Ives 1963, 183). In other words, in the Preface to his New York edition, Henry James talked about writing a typical, old-school ghost story that caused the terror that this kind of narrative used to inspire. On the other hand, in Douglas's Preface, the way he describes the governess - "a most charming person (...) the most agreeable woman I've ever known in her position; she'd have been worthy of any whatever. (...) she struck me as awfully clever and nice" (James 1986, 5) - is for those critics sufficient proof of the sanity, reliability, and veracity of the girl (Jones 1959, 113).

Putting now the focus on the text 'written' by the governess - that is, the main story of the novella -, their main argument has to do with the governess's detailed description of Peter Quint. Indeed, it is so detailed that Mrs. Grose, the housekeeper, can recognize him immediately just by hearing it from the governess. It is important to say that, until this point, Peter Quint had not been mentioned once and the governess had seen no pictures of him - she did not even know of his existence. This is the only argument that the supporters of the Freudian interpretation have not been able to refute, and all attempts to do so have been in vain. The main counterarguments deal with the fact that Mrs. Grose manages to identify him by focusing only on very general aspects from the governess's report. The governess gives indeed a very precise description of the man- he's tall, handsome and:

> He has red hair, very red, close-curling, and a pale face, long in shape, with straight good features and little rather queer whiskers that are as red as his hair. His eyebrows are somehow darker; they look particularly arched and as if they might move a good deal. His eyes are sharp, strange - awfully; but I only know clearly that they're rather small and very fixed. His mouth's wide, and his lips are thin, and except for his little whiskers he's quite clean-shaven. (James 1986, 35-36)

However, the definite clue that makes Mrs. Grose so sure the governess has just seen Peter Quint and not any other man (a servant or a person walking by) is the fact that "[h]e wore no hat" (James 1986, 35) and that he was wearing "somebody's clothes," "smart" but not "his own" (36). Nevertheless, it is very difficult to argue that Mrs. Grose

simply ignored the rest of the details provided by the governess and that she only focused on his dressing code.

Some critics, like John Silver, went perhaps too far in trying to explain this (Álvarez 1991, 58). Silver argued that when the governess answered Mrs. Grose's question about the man being from the village with "[n]obody - nobody (...) I made sure," that meant that the governess went to the village and asked about Quint. In that way, she was able to know how Quint looked like so that she could give such a thorough description to Mrs. Grose. However, that does not explain where the governess learned of the existence of Quint if nobody, not even the children, ever mentioned him. Besides, there is the fact that this trip to the village was not recorded by the governess in her story, so there is no evidence it was ever made. Another objection made to Silver's argument is that she could have asked the other servants at Bly instead of going to the village (Jones 1959, 115).

Peter G. Beidler is probably one of the most important critics favoring this 'ghost' theory. In his book *Ghosts, Demons, and Henry James: The Turn of the Screw at the Turn of the Century*, he provides a series of arguments to prove that *The Turn of the Screw* is simply a ghost story, with no deeper implications. What he does in this monograph is take all the arguments used by the 'nonapparitionsts' - as he calls them - and counter-argue them. One of his most important assertions is that Peter Quint and Miss Jessel's ghosts are too realistic to be hallucinations. He says that Henry James would probably have not troubled himself in making them realistic if he had not wanted them to be real (Beidler 1989, 107). To illustrate this, he enumerates fourteen motifs that James's story presents that are also seen in other real ghost-sighting reports, and he comments on these real-life cases. The fourteen motifs are: ghosts appearing to two children, noises in the night, a face in a window, the apparition of only the upper part of the body, fixed stare, the precise description of ghosts, the 'sad face', the felt presence of the ghosts, the apparition in ponds, tables and stairs, a feeling of cold, cold winds, extinguished lights, and selective seeing of ghosts (77). As it is seen, all these motifs are present in *The Turn of the Screw* - for instance, during Quint's first apparition, the governess was only able to see the upper part of his body, and Miss Jessel was described as having a sad countenance. In addition, both Miss Jessel and Quint are said to fixedly stare at the governess. The other motifs are

only understood if it is interpreted that the children lied when they denied having seen the former valet and former governess and that they are possessed by them (12).

4.2.2. The 'madness' theory

The opposite interpretation to the one that has just been discussed is more common and more extended and has to do with the unreliability of the governess. She is considered unreliable due to her unstable mental state, making her unable to describe her own actions faithfully as she is not full aware of them. This problem is represented through her hallucinations, namely, Peter Quint and Miss Jessel. The majority of analyses that argue for the governess's madness mainly use a psychoanalytic approach to interpret James's story. They started to be published in the 1920s and 1930s (Makarenov & Segalovitz 2020, 4; Lee 2007, 1), when Freud's theories were most popular.

Edmund Wilson is probably the most important figure supporting this interpretation. In 1934, in his essay "The Ambiguity of Henry James," he explains that Peter Quint and Miss Jessel are not real and that they are a product of the governess's imagination as she suffers from "neurotic sex repression" (Lee 2007, 10; Jones 1959, 113-14). As the governess is young, naïve, and innocent – as both inexpert and virgin-, she falls irrevocably in love with the master of Bly - the uncle (Makarenov & Segalovitz 2020, 4). Wilson claims that Peter Quint appearing for the first time on a day the governess was thinking about her employer is sufficient proof for his interpretation - the governess projects her sexual attraction for the children's uncle into a "physical embodiment of sexually deviant 'ghosts'" (Lee 2007, 11). However, Wilson's arguments find many detractors. A.J.A. Waldock said in 1947 that Wilson's theory was not plausible as he could not explain how the governess manages to provide such a detailed description of a man she never met and of whose existence had not heard of before her arrival at Bly (Lee 2007, 16). As proof of the veracity of his interpretation, Wilson turns to James's Preface in which he wrote that the governess reports many instances in which "so many intense anomalies and obscurities" (cited in Ives 1963, 184) happen, but that the nature of such anomalies would not be explained. For Wilson, the fact that James did not provide this explanation demonstrates the author's intention to not make it explicit what is otherwise true, i.e. that the governess is insane. Still, even if Wilson resorted to James's

Preface, it certainly seems as if he was completely oblivious of those parts in which James attributes the origin of his novella to a ghost story, as well as the passage in James's notebooks in which he wrote that *The Turn of the Screw* was a ghost story itself (Jones 1959, 114). In fact, these arguments embody a common criticism to Wilson's analysis.

That said, Edmund Wilson is not the only critic supporting the hallucination theory. Only ten years before him, in 1924, Edna Kenton argued that "the whole sequence of events was merely a flight of the governess' disordered fancy" (Jones 1959, 113). She saw the interpretation of *The Turn of the Screw* as "lazy" (cited in Beidler 1989, 14) and was part of that group of critics who argued that the novella must have had, just as the rest of Henry James's narrative output, a more serious intent (Fagin 1941, 197). Nevertheless, Beidler (1989, 14) observes that it is possible that Henry James wrote a more 'basic' story, with no such hidden meanings, in order to earn some quick cash for the reasons already outlined in section 4.1. It could even be argued that Edmund Wilson expanded Edna Kenton's analysis by adding the "sex repression" label to the governess's mental state. Whether this is true or not, it cannot be denied that both critics started a debate that is still unresolved nowadays.

The proponents of this theory further elaborate their arguments by using some passages in the novel that encourage the reader to question the reliability and sanity of the governess/focalizer. Two such passages are when the governess lies to Mrs. Grose about her encounter with Miss Jessel in the classroom, and Miss Jessel's sighting in the lake: an episode in which Flora and Mrs. Grose's inability to see the ghosts becomes apparent. In the first of these episodes, the governess tells Mrs. Grose that she has seen Miss Jessel sitting at her desk in the classroom and that she has had a conversation with her in which the former governess confessed her evil intentions regarding little Flora (James 1986, 85-86). However, the reader knows that this conversation never took place. Critics supporting this interpretation say that this is undeniable proof that the governess is a pathological liar and a mentally unstable person (Beidler 1989, 15). However, Beidler refutes this statement by saying that, when Mrs. Grose asks the governess if they really talked, her answer is "It came to that" (James 1986, 86), which is certainly ambiguous and can be interpreted as the governess saying that it was not a 'verbal' exchange (Beidler 1989, 15): it simply "amounted to that" (Jones 1959, 121). Besides, for Beidler, her lying to Mrs. Grose about her conversation is not enough proof to classify her as a pathological

liar – in this case, she is simply attributing her thoughts to a third person, Miss Jessel, in order to make sure that Mrs. Grose believes and supports her.

The second passage is found in Chapter 20 - Flora, who has escaped from the house and is found by the governess and Mrs. Grose by the lake picking flowers, is shocked after the governess asks her where Miss Jessel is. At that moment, Miss Jessel appears in sight, and the governess alerts the other two of her presence, but both Flora and Mrs. Grose claim they see nothing (James 1986, 101-03). To the supporters of the 'madness' theory, this is enough evidence that the 'ghosts' are merely hallucinations of the governess: if nobody else can see them, then it is obvious that they do not exist. However, once again Beidler (1989, 101) explains that this is possible since, as many paranormal researchers say, in this case, Thistleton Dyer: "Some persons have the peculiar faculty of seeing ghosts, a privilege which, it would seem, is denied to others" (cited in Beidler 1989, 102). Therefore, the fact that the governess alone can see the ghosts is not proof of her insanity - only that she possesses a special gift that allows her to do so.

4.2.3. Other analyses

Generally speaking, then, the discussion can be boiled down to the question as to whether the governess is a reliable or an unreliable narrator. If we take into account what Booth said about first-person narrators, that they lose objectivity and, consequently, credibility by narrating from their own point of view, then the governess is clearly an unreliable narrator. She certainly fulfills many of the requirements enumerated in section 3: she is young, it could be said that she is immature as it is the first time she has gone out of her home, she gets excited easily causing her insomnia, she is pretty innocent, and she is without doubt personally involved in what she is narrating. In addition to all this, the reader ultimately perceives that she jumps to conclusions too easily - she has no proof that Quint and Miss Jessel (if they are indeed real) are after the children, but she is quite sure of it. All these flaws the governess presents are used as undeniable evidence that the governess is not in her right mind and thus Peter Quint and Miss Jessel are not real. However, it could be argued that, as the reader can see later on in the story, the governess's flaws become accentuated towards the end of the narrative, which could be

expected in a person who is constantly being haunted by spirits - one could not expect the young governess to go on with her life as if nothing has happened in that situation.

But this either-or debate over *The Turn of the Screw* has evolved from the 1980s onwards to a more inclusive discussion in which both interpretations are recognized as equally valid and non-exclusive (Makarenov & Segalovitz 2020, 4). Critics supporting the all-interpretations-are-possible stream argue that Henry James wrote a novel that is intentionally ambiguous and that it is the reader who must decide to say whether s/he has read a ghost story or the tale of a deranged governess. To make this decision, readers are forced to rely on their background information - their education, beliefs, values, etc (Álvarez 1991, 59).

Attempts have been made to interpret from many other perspectives. Some scholars employ concepts from the field of literary theory, such as the possible worlds theory as explained by Albadalejo Mayordomo (Álvarez 1991, 44). By using this theoretical framework together with the definition of narrative ambiguity by Rimmon-Kenan – it is the convergence of exclusive disjuncts, "finalized hypotheses," which is "the most abstract equivalent of the coexistence of mutually exclusive fabulas in a *sjuzhet*" and in the surface of the text it looks like the "coexistence of mutually exclusive systems of gap-filling clues" (Rimmon-Kenan 1982, 21) – Álvarez (1991) establishes that the reader must make three readings of James's work - one in which the reader sees a ghost story, a second one in which some inconsistencies are grasped by the reader that make him/her doubt on the governess's reliability, and a third one in which s/he decides which interpretation is the more correct of the two (62-64). Therefore, both interpretations are plausible, and the reader is in charge of deciding, after analyzing the clues present in the novel and realizing that there are clues that support both interpretations, if the ghosts are real and the governess's articulatory world is factual, or if, on the contrary, they are the product of her imagination and thus her articulatory world is fictitious (61). In the first case, the governess would be a reliable narrator and in the second, an unreliable one.

5. A comparison of two translations

The four passages selected for the comparison are typically used by different critics from both sides to argue in favor of their interpretation. The first one is Quint's first appearance in Chapter III; the second one, the governess and Mrs. Groses's conversation about Miss Jessel; the third one, the episode at the lake in which Miss Jessel appears and both Flora and Mrs. Grose affirm to see nothing; and lastly, the fourth one, the final chapter in which the governess ends up killing Miles of asphyxiation.

5.1. Chapter III: Quint's first apparition

In the last part of this chapter, the reader is presented with the governess's account about the first time she sees Peter Quint. What she can note is that this is a man she has never seen before and that this man is fixedly staring at her. I will argue that it is precisely in those sentences that describe their encounter from her point of view where we find the greatest differences that could be induced by the translators' alternative interpretations.

	Henry James (1986)	José Bianco (1945)	José Luis López Muñoz (2000)
(a)	(...) **the man who met my eyes** was not the person I had precipitately supposed (24)	(...) el hombre **que veían mis ojos** no era la persona que yo, aturdidamente, había supuesto allí (36)	(...) el hombre **con el que se tropezaban mis ojos** no era la persona que, en mi precipitación, había supuesto (41)
(b)	The figure **that faced me** was (...) as little any one else I knew as it was the image that had been in my mind (24-5)	La figura **que se alzaba ante mí** (...) era tan diferente de cualquier persona conocida como de la imagen que tenía en la cabeza (36)	La figura **que tenía en frente** se parecía tan poco (...) a cualquiera de mis conocidos como a la imagen que tenía en la cabeza (41)
(c)	The man **who looked at me** over the battlements was as definite as a picture in a frame (25)	El hombre **que me miraba** por encima de las almenas se recortaba con tanta firmeza contra el cielo como un retrato en su marco (36)	El individuo **que miraba** por encima de las almenas era tan preciso como un cuadro en su marco (41-2)
(d)	It lasted while this visitant - (…) in the	Duró lo bastante (…) para que esa visita que no	Duró (…) todo el tiempo que el visitante – y

	sign of familiarity of his wearing no hat – seemed **to fix me** (25)	llevaba sombrero – extraño signo de familiaridad que no dejó de sorprenderme – pudiera **observarme** (37)	recuerdo que advertí en él un elemento de excesiva desenvoltura por el hecho de ir destocado – empleó en **examinarme** (42)
(e)	It was intense to me that during this transit **he never took his eyes from me** (26)	Yo tenía la intensa sensación de que, durante su tránsito, **no dejó nunca de mirarme** (37)	Advertí con gran claridad que durante aquel tránsito **nunca apartó de mí los ojos** (43)
(f)	Even *as he turned away* he still **markedly fixed me** (26)	Continuó **mirándome con insistencia** *hasta desaparecer* (37)	Mientras *se daba la vuelta* aún seguía **mirándome con fijeza** (43)

Table 1. Sentences describing Quint's stare

As seen in section 4.2.1., one of Beidler's fourteen characteristics that both real ghosts and the apparitions in *The Turn of the Screw* share is that they stare fixedly at the people they are appearing to, and this is largely emphasized in this passage. As can be seen in Table 1, the translations for items (a) and (b) describe an action other than Quint staring at her. In the case of example (a), both translators convey that it was her eyes who met Quint's figure, when in the original it is said that Quint's eyes met hers – i.e., that he is deliberately and fixedly looking at her. Something similar happens in example (b) - where the original says that Quint was facing her (i.e., looking at her), both translators play down the meaning of this verb by suggesting that Quint was simply in front of her. It is true that these two examples are somehow ambiguous and could perhaps lend themselves to different interpretations, which is precisely what has happened in these two translations. But a close examination of example (c) will make our point clearer. In the original English version, Henry James explicitly wrote that Quint was looking at the governess: a phrasing that Bianco translates pretty literally. However, López Muñoz's rewording of this statement follows a different strategy – while stating that Quint was looking over the battlements, he does not specify what he was looking at. This might seem as a minor, nearly irrelevant difference, but in the framework of Beidler's account of the characteristic ghost stare, this apparently minor nuance gains relevance - by not emphasizing as James did the fact that Quint keeps his gaze fixed on the governess during

the whole scene, Muñoz's rendering makes Quint less of a "canonical" ghost in the terms of the reports of the Society for Physical Research indicated by Beidler. This is problematic insofar as message equivalence is not enough in literary translation, which demands close attention to detail. In other words, the hypothesis of the 'ghost' interpretation for *The Turn of the Screw* is effectively weakened. In the above instances, the translators do mention that Quint was looking at the governess, but while in examples (d) and (e), the focal meaning of the sentence revolves around that precise action, this information in the previous sentences is given as presupposed and is not central.

The last example is important for a different reason. This sentence is followed by another sentence which reads "He turned away" (James 1986, 26). This is a strategic utterance inasmuch as these two sentences close this chapter by repeating the same phrasal verb, making the reader wonder what happened next. What is interesting is the lexical choices made by the Spanish translators in rendering the idiomatic phrase 'to turn away.' In English this verb means to move facing the opposite way, or to move further away in the opposite direction to where you are. In the first sentence (example (f)), López Muñoz translates this unit by its Spanish equivalent 'darse la vuelta.' However, Bianco renders it as 'desaparecer,' which has an added meaning. It is true that in the previous lines, the reader is informed that Quint is already moving, and, therefore, with this 'turned away,' James could have meant that he finally moved out of her sight. But simply stating that he 'disappeared' could give the feeling that, just like a prototypical ghost, he did not simply move out of her sight but that rather he disappeared into thin air - one minute he was there and the next he was gone. Interestingly, right in the next sentence, when this phrasal verb is repeated, both translators use the Spanish perfect cognate for 'disappear': 'desaparecer'. In conclusion, Bianco employs this word twice in the chapter's coda and López Muñoz uses it only once. This could be said to counteract the weakening of the 'ghost' interpretation discussed above as a result of not emphasizing the action of staring in the examples seen in Table 1. By contrast, now we have a very 'ghost-like' verb to describe the way Quint leaves the scene. It would appear, therefore, that the translators, just like the original author, favor (purposely or not) one interpretation over the other and counterbalance any possible understatement thereof with additional clues elsewhere in the text.

5.2. Chapter XVI: The governess and Mrs. Grose about "the talk" with Miss Jessel

As mentioned in section 4.3.2. of this graduation project paper, this scene has a particular interest for critics regarding the two interpretations under examination. The focus of our analysis now lies on the answer the governess gives to Mrs. Grose concerning whether or not there was real verbal exchange between the two women. Let us remember that in the ST the governess's reply is certainly ambiguous, which makes its translation particularly tricky in term of retaining the same sense of openness that has been discussed earlier on.

	Henry James (1986)	José Bianco (1945)	José Luis López Muñoz (2000)
(a)	'A talk! Do you mean she spoke?' '**It came to that**' (86)	- ¡Conversar! ¿Quiere decir que ella habló? - **Eso mismo**. (127)	- ¡Conversar! ¿Quiere usted decir que habló? - **Algo parecido**. (137)

Table 2. Translation of "It came to that"

As it can be seen in Table 2, the translation of the ambiguous sentence differs completely between both versions. Bianco resolves the ambiguity and simply translates it by unequivocally stating that Miss Jessel did speak to the governess, while López Muñoz maintains the sentence's vagueness by translating it as "something like that." By resolving the ambiguity, Bianco seems to endorse the psychoanalytic interpretation of the story, according to which the governess is a pathological liar. On the contrary, López Muñoz maintains the ambiguity created by James (she lied, but it is as if she were telling a half-truth – Miss Jessel did not utter a word, but it was as if she had done it). Once again, Bianco's translation renders inapplicable one of the most important arguments of the 'ghost' theory supporters.

The rest of the chapter presents little ground for discussion, since the conversation between the two characters does not provide much room for alternative choices that may critically support one or another interpretation. There is one instance at the end of this section, however, where both translations differ in a way that could seem interesting. This has to do with the translation of the verb in the sentence "She wants Flora" (James 1986, 86). Bianco used the verb 'buscar' and López Muñoz, chooses instead the verb 'querer.'

This could be significant as the verb used by Bianco does not involve the same sense of urgency - Miss Jessel is simply "looking for" Flora, but for what reason? Maybe she just wants to see the child, to talk to her; perhaps she does not have any evil intention concerning her. By contrast, the verb chosen by López Muñoz, a desire verb which is the literal equivalent of the English one, entails a meaning of volition and a sense of need that gives the reader the feeling that maybe she does want to do something evil to the girl. By maintaining the urgency in the verb, it could be argued that López Muñoz's translation favors Beidler's interpretation as in Miss Jessel and Peter Quint are demonic spirits wanting to take hold of the children with obvious 'diabolical' purposes because of their nature, meanwhile the 'softening' of the verb in Bianco's version would maybe favor a psychoanalytic analysis if it is interpreted that Miss Jessel is actually a personification of the governess's longing to be loved by Flora, thus Miss Jessel is just looking for Flora's attention but without overtly evil intentions.

5.3. Chapter XX: Miss Jessel's sighting in the lake with Mrs. Grose and Flora

Throughout this chapter, the reader learns that the governess is the only one able to see the ghosts, at least apparently - some critics argue that Flora is lying and that the reader is made to understand that the girl simply pretends to be frightened by the governess. In fact, the description of Flora made by the governess is certainly suspicious. The reader is witness to the transformation of Flora from an angelic figure to an almost demonic one.

	Henry James (1986)	José Bianco (1945)	José Luis López Muñoz (2000)
(a)	Flora continued to fix me with her small mask of **disaffection** (103)	Flora continuaba mirándome con su pequeña máscara de **reprobación** (154)	Flora seguía mirándome con su máscara infantil de **mala voluntad**(163)

Table 3. Description of Flora's transformation in this scene by the governess

In example (a) of Table 3, the governess describes Flora as wearing a mask of 'disaffection.' This word refers to the attitude that a person has when they stop supporting something or someone. In this case, it would mean that Flora's face plainly shows that she had stopped trusting the governess and that the girl's idealized image of the latter has

fallen apart. This could explain Bianco's translation of the word as 'reprobación,' however, it does not justify López Muñoz's translation of the term as 'mala voluntad.' Flora is disappointed with the governess's attitude in this moment and she is scared of her, but to say that she is openly hostile towards her is perhaps an overstatement. However, in the light of Beidler's discussion of this novella, where he construes the strange behavior of the children as the result of demonic possession, it could be argued that the mask of ill-will is not Flora's but Miss Jessel's inside the girl's body. This would mean that López has translated this sentence in complete accordance with this. In example (b), it is Bianco who recreates James's words.

	Henry James (1986)	José Bianco (1945)	José Luis López Muñoz (2000)
(a)	(...) this was a stroke that somehow **converted the little girl herself into a figure portentous** (102)	(...) era un golpe que en cierto sentido **transformaba a la niña misma en la verdadera presencia que podía hacerme desfallecer** (152)	(...) fue un golpe que, de algún modo, **convertía a la niñita misma en una figura profética** (161)
(b)	(...) **I took the measure**, more than all, of **what** I should have from this instant to deal with in the astounding little attitude of Flora (103)	(...) **me daba cuenta**, por encima de todo, **del peligro** que tendría que afrontar ante la pasmosa actitud de la pequeña Flora (154)	(...) **pude calibrar lo que se me venía encima** a partir de aquel momento, más que por ninguna otra cosa, por la asombrosa actitud de la pequeña Flora (162)
(c)	'She's there, you little unhappy thing – there, there, *there*, **and you know it as well as you know me**!' (102)	- ¡Ahí está ella, pequeña desgraciada, ahí, ahí, *ahí*, **y tú la ves como la vemos nosotras**! (153)	«¡Está ahí, pobrecita desgraciada, ahí, ahí! **¡Y la conoces tan bien como me conoces a mí**!» (161)

Table 4. Important changes in translation in Chapter XX.

Table 4 includes the two most relevant changes between the three texts. In example (a), the governess perceived a transformation of Flora from an innocent little girl to a "figure portentous" (James 1986, 102). López's translation is more faithful insofar it just mentions a prophetic figure. Even if 'prophetic' is not a full equivalent to

'portentous', it does not posit an interpretative problem. However, Bianco conveys that Flora has turned into a presence that could make the governess faint, namely, Miss Jessel. His translation is indeed compatible with both theories. On the one hand, it could be consistent with Beidler's reading (even if Beidler's argument postdates by 44 years Bianco's version): Flora is possessed by Miss Jessel and the governess is aware of it. On the other hand, Bianco's rephrasing of this fragment is congruous with the suggestion that the governess is once more seeing hallucinations, in this case, that the facial features of the little girl are beginning to resemble Miss Jessel's. This would explain why he translated "what I should have (...) to deal with" as literally 'the danger I would have to face' in example (b). If Flora is becoming Miss Jessel, or so she thinks, then she feels threatened, and her frame of mind becomes more alert, making her at the same time a more unstable person. In example (c) both translators must have dealt with a very important choice. The verb 'to know' in English has a double sense, 'be acquainted with' and 'be aware of,' but this double sense is not found in any Spanish verb. Therefore, Bianco chose to translate it according to the 'be aware of' sense, while López sticks to the meaning of 'be acquainted with', which considerably changes the utterance's signification. In the original sentence, the focus is on Flora being able to see the former governess but not admitting it, and this same sense is conveyed by Bianco in his translation. However, this meaning is completely transformed in López Muñoz's translation, where the focus is Flora's degree of acquaintance with both governesses. This sounds almost absurd, because the reader does not necessarily know how much the child is familiar with the governess or that she was acquainted with the previous one for that matter. The translator appears to not quite grasp the meaning and the implications of the original sentence. By putting the focus on the fact that Flora can see the ghost and is lying, the governess would be placed in the position of a victim: one where everyone (except for Mrs. Grose) is against her. Conversely, it could also be argued that this makes her sound even more insane – a woman who is used to jumping to conclusions when she has no evidence whatsoever.

5.4. Chapter XXIV: the last dinner

This is perhaps the most important chapter in the whole novel. It begins with Miles's reaction to the governess's question about whether he has taken the letter she

wrote to his uncle. In this precise instant, Peter Quint appears at the window. Just as in his second appearance, he remains outside while staring into the living room. A comparison of the two Spanish translations of this passage suggests that López seems to understate some of the actions described by the governess - James uses a more impactful language that Bianco makes even stronger in some parts of his text, while López does the opposite. The overall impression when reading both renderings side by side is that López Muñoz provides a much more guiltless and saner version of the governess, an image of a woman in complete control of her body and her actions: the contrary of James's (and Bianco's) portrayal. In fact, as seen in Table 5, Bianco emphasizes on the physical strength that the governess applies when first clutching Miles in her arms and then letting him go - he accentuates the action by using verbs as "apretar" (in examples (a) and (b)) and "aflojar" when James wrote that she let Miles go a little (in examples (c) and (e)); or adverbs like "violentamente" (in example (f)) or "locamente" (in example (b)). In fact, in example (e), by presenting the action of loosening her arms as a passive, involuntary reflex, it could even be argued that she does no longer possess hold of her own body. López, in turn, uses verbs denoting gentler motions, like "abrazar" (in examples (b) and (g)), and he even makes the governess admit that some of her actions were excessive (in example (d)), something which an insane person who does not know what they are doing would exhibit.

	Henry James (1986)	José Bianco (1945)	José Luis López Muñoz (2000)
(a)	(...) a stroke that at first (...) reduced me to the mere **blind movement** of **getting hold of him, drawing him close** (120)	(...) un golpe que, al principio (...) me redujo **al ciego movimiento** de **tomarlo entre los brazos, de apretarlo contra mí** (179)	(…) un choque que, en un primer momento (...) me obligó simplemente, **en un gesto instintivo**, a **atraerlo hacia mí** (190)
(b)	At this, with this moan of joy, **I enfolded, I drew him close**; and **while I held him to my breast**, (...) I kept my eyes on the thing at the window and saw it move and shift its posture (120-1)	Entonces, con un gemido de felicidad, **lo abracé <u>locamente</u>**, y **mientras lo tenía apretado contra mi pecho**, (...) continué vigilando al personaje de la ventana, lo vi moverse y cambiar de postura (180)	Al oír aquello, con un gemido de alegría, **acercándolo más a mí, lo abracé**; y **mientras lo sujetaba contra mi pecho,** (...)no aparté los ojos del ser al otro lado de la ventana y vi que se movía y cambiaba de

			postura (191)
(c)	(...) **as I held him off a little again** (121)	**Aflojé los brazos**; otra vez, **al separarlo un poco de mi lado** (181)	**Lo aparté un poco de mí** (192)
(d)	(...) my hands – **but it was for pure tenderness** – **shook him** (122)	(...) Pero mis manos -**por puro cariño- lo sacudieron (**182)	(...) mis manos, sin embargo -**aunque sólo por un exceso de ternura**-, **lo zarandearon** (194)
(e)	Paralysed, while it lasted, by the mere brush of the question, **I let him go a little** (123)	Quedé paralizada cuando me rozó ese pensamiento y **se aflojaron mis brazos** (183)	Paralizada, mientras duró, por el simple roce de aquella pregunta, **permití que se apartara un poco de mí** (195)
(f)	(...) yet it made him avert himself again, and that movement made *me*, with a single bound and an irrepressible cry, **spring straight upon him** (124)	(...) sin embargo, lo indujo a separarse de mi lado, y ese movimiento hizo que yo, incorporándome de un salto y lanzando un grito irreprimible, **lo tomara violentamente entre mis brazos** (184)	(...) pero impulsó a Miles a apartarse **de nuevo**, y aquel movimiento hizo que **yo saltara sobre él** con un grito irreprimible (196)
(g)	(...) I shrieked to my visitant as **I tried to press him against me** (124)	(...) grité al visitante, **mientras intentaba retener al niño entre los brazos** (184)	(...) grité a mi visitante **mientras abrazaba al niño** (197)

Table 5. Instances of the governess getting hold of Miles in Chapter XXIV.

All in all, it is arguable that Bianco chose to present a much more violent and deranged version of the original governess in an attempt to secure the "right" interpretation of this character, i.e. he accentuates all the governess's negative traits that resurface in this chapter. In this way, the reader of the Spanish translation would get a final impression of the governess a bad enough to suggest that she has eventually killed Miles due to her insanity. At the same time, by toning down these faults, López manages to place the readers in a position in which they can conclude that the governess is ultimately innocent, and that she has killed the child by accident.

6. Conclusion

The task of a translator must always begin with the interpretation of the work to be translated – s/he must search for the intention of the author (if distinct enough) and the message conveyed. But then at the same time the style is a paramount factor in literary translation, since, in the words of Michael Rifaterre (1959, 167) "language expresses, style stresses." Therefore, having in mind the style of the original author and being especially cautious in this regard as unwarranted stylistic changes can lead to an adaptation of a literary work instead of a translation, the translator must render this same total, expressive, semantic meaning in his own version. This means that an incorrect reading of a literary work might cause an entire readership unable to approach a text in its original language to receive a spurious version thereof.

The task of a literary translator is a difficult one – and more so when having to face such a slippery work like Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*: a novella that has elicited ongoing questions over its 'correct' interpretation for approximately a century and that remains to date an unsolved mystery. If in the past there were two main interpretations regarding Henry James's intent in this narrative piece, from the 80s onwards a new reading emerged suggesting the impossibility of making a 'correct' interpretation of the tale as both readings, one involving an unreliable narrator (a deranged governess) and another a reliable one (a woman haunted by ghosts), are equally viable. This goes to show that interpreting a literary work is a completely subjective process, which in turn poses a bigger problem for a translator – how to 'rewrite' a literary work portraying the same meaning as intended by the original author if each interpretation is inevitably subjective? How to avoid, on the other hand, a translation that by being too literal may 'kill' the spirit that makes the source text unique?

Following the comparison of various excerpts from two Spanish versions of *The Turn of the Screw*, one by José Bianco (1945) and another one by José Luis López Muñoz (2000), it can be claimed that what might seem like minor changes can lead to an entirely different interpretation of the translated work. If Henry James's tale is crowded with clues that create an unsolvable ambiguity, certain lexical choices in the translators' versions seem to alternately strengthen or weaken one or another interpretation. In the case of Bianco's version, the examples analyzed provide, especially in those of chapters XVI and

XXIV, support for the psychoanalytic interpretation. By getting rid of the ambiguity in Chapter XVI's statement "It came to that" (James 1986, 86), Bianco turns the governess into a liar, thus making her an unreliable narrator and giving the reader a feeling of dealing with a mentally unstable character. In the same manner, in chapter XXIV, his choice of vocabulary accentuates the description of the governess as a violent and demented person, who ends up killing innocent Miles in one of her neurotic episodes. Bianco, however, is able to maintain some degree of ambiguity in some of the examples discussed from Chapter XX, while the greater emphasis on the act of staring in Chapter III, as well as the verbal choice in translating the first occurrence of the phrasal verb "to turn away" in this same chapter, would favor the 'ghost' interpretation; however, the weight of these clues is lesser and therefore, the final impression the reader gets from this version would be one favoring the 'insanity' interpretation. On the contrary, López Muñoz's version, while being more literal, does favor the 'ghost' interpretation by softening the vocabulary used in Chapter XXIV and the shift in meaning involved by rendering the original term "disaffection" (James 1986, 103) in Chapter XX as "mala voluntad" (López Muñoz (transl.) 2000, 163), thus portraying a sense of devilishness linked directly to Beidler's interpretation of the work as an example of demonic possession.

However, one must take into account that the way these two translators really interpreted the work is actually unknown. Maybe Bianco did interpret *The Turn of the Screw* as a tale of madness and López Muñoz as a ghost story, but a further analysis of the rest of the chapters making up the whole story would be necessary to confirm such a hypothesis. And even so, it would be very hard to make a conclusive statement in this regard, since no matter how deeply anchored in the close reading of both translations our analysis may be, we cannot exclude an element of chance whereby their authors, while striving to preserve the text's rich ambiguity, inadvertently favored one interpretation over the other without necessarily being theirs. Nor can we discard the possibility that what for a sensitive critical reader supports one interpretation may back up the opposite for another one, since, in the end, interpreting a literary work is, inescapably, a subjective task.

7. Reference List

James, Henry. (1908) 1986. *The Turn of the Screw.* London: Penguin Books.

---. (1908) 1945. *Otra vuelta de tuerca.* Translated by José Bianco. Spain: Lunwerg Editores.

---. (1908) 2000. *Otra vuelta de tuerca.* Translated by José Luis López Muñoz. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Álvarez, José Antonio. 1991. "Possible-World Semantics, Frame Text, and Unreliable Narration: The Case of 'The Turn of the Screw.'" *Style* 25 (1): 42-70.

Ballesteros Larrea, Sara Elisa. 2015. "Análisis comparativo de las metáforas de contenedor en la novela de Henry James: *The Turn of the Screw* y en su traducción al español *Otra vuelta de tuerca*." (*Disertación previa a la obtención del título de licenciada en lingüística aplicada con mención en traducción.)*

Beidler, Peter G. 1989. *Ghosts, Demons, and Henry James: The Turn of the Screw at the Turn of the Century*. Columbia: University of Missouri.

Booth, Wayne C. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cortés Gabaudán, Helena. 2008. "La traducción de la forma literaria." In *Nuevas pautas de traducción literaria*, edited by Javier Gómez Montero, 87-116. Madrid: Visor libros.

De Miguel Crespo, Olivia. 1994. "Las traducciones de Henry James al español: De *El banco de la desolación* a *El rincón de la dicha.*" *Livius* 5: 119-132.

Dry, Helen Aristar, and Susan Kucinkas. 1991. "Ghostly Ambiguity: Presuppositional Constructions in 'The Turn of the Screw.'" *Style* 25 (1): 71-88.

Fagin, N. Bryllion. 1941. "Another Reading of The Turn of the Screw." *Modern Language Notes* 56 (3): 196-202.

Gamoneda, Amelia. 2008. "La lengua bífida de la traducción." In *Nuevas pautas de traducción literaria*, edited by Javier Gómez Montero, 37-73. Madrid: Visor libros.

Hansen, Per Krogh. 2007. “Reconsidering the Unreliable Narrator.” *Semiotica* 165 (1 / 4), 227-246.

Ives, C.B. 1963. “James’s Ghosts in The Turn of the Screw.” *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 18 (2): 183-189.

Jones, Alexander E. 1959. “Point of View in The Turn of the Screw.” *PMLA* 74 (1): 112-122.

Kussmaul, P. (1997). *Training the translator*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Lee, Susan Savage. 2007. “The Turn of the Screw’s Debated Phantasms: The Role of the Fantastic in the Creation of Peter Quint and Miss Jessel.” (*Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.)

Levy, Leo B. 1956. “*The Turn of the Screw* as Retaliation.” *College English* 17 (5): 286-288.

Makarenov, Victor, and Yael Segalovitz. 2020. “Sensing Ambiguity in Henry James’s ‘The Turn of the Screw.’”

Moss, Laura. 2009. “Hesitating Readers: When *The Turn of the Screw* Meets *Disgrace* in the Classroom.” *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 35 (2-3): 129-144.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Ranjan, Rajiva. 2017. “Point of View in the Novels of Henry James.” *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (IJELR)* 4 (3): 45-47.

Riffaterre, Michael. 1959. “Criteria for style analysis.” *Word* 15 (1): 154-174.

Rimmon-Kennan, Shlomith. 1982. “Ambiguity and Narrative Levels: Christine Brooke-Rose’s *Thru.*” *Poetics Today* 3 (1): 21-32.

Torre, Esteban. 2001. *Teoría de la traducción literaria.* Madrid: Síntesis.

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 1995. *Apuntes sobre traducción literaria y análisis contrastivo de textos literarios traducidos.* Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zerweck, Bruno. 2001. "Historicizing Unreliable Narration: Unreliability and Cultural Discourse in Narrative Fiction." *Style* 35 (1): 151-176.