

2002

The Text of the "Restored" Edition of All the King's Men

Noel Polk

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/rpwstudies>

 Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Polk, Noel (2002) "The Text of the "Restored" Edition of All the King's Men," *Robert Penn Warren Studies*: Vol. 2 , Article 5.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/rpwstudies/vol2/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Robert Penn Warren Studies by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

The Text of the “Restored” Edition of All the King’s Men

NOEL POLK

I want in these few pages to discuss the general principles governing the editorial decisions that went into making the newly “restored” edition of Robert Penn Warren’s best novel, and then to list, for reference, the most significant of the restorations with specific comment about the reasons for the decision made.¹ This is not exactly the full textual apparatus that a complete scholarly edition of *All the King’s Men* deserves and will eventually get, but it will, I hope, provide some sense of the significant differences between the 1946 and the 2001 texts and provide scholars and readers with my rationale for the decisions made.

First, though, a brief history of the novel’s writing. I exclude from this history Warren’s work on the precedent *Proud Flesh*, the texts and histories of which James A. Perkins and James A. Grimshaw, Jr., have skillfully provided.² The information here has been gleaned and mostly quoted from Warren’s correspondence with Lambert Davis, the editor of *All the King’s Men*, housed in the Harcourt offices in Orlando, and made available to me for work on the restored text; these letters form a fascinating account of the novel’s composition. In reproducing them here, I have silently corrected obvious typing errors.

Composition³

Warren wrote to Davis on January 28, 1943, about “the novel coming up (which will probably be called *All the King’s Men*).” He hoped

to get down to the final grind of writing next fall. I have begun tinkering with it, and have settled on an approach. It seems to me that my way in is through a single narrator who will carry the ball all the way—first-person treatment. I think I’ve got my man picked. The problem was to get a narrator who would have enough opportunity to know the story and would have enough intelligence to interpret and would have a style of his own. I believe that I have the boy, all right. He’s a first cousin of Duckfoot [Blake in *At Heaven’s Gate*], I should say. Coming back to the date. I should hope to have the thing ready for you in the early fall of next year. I don’t see it as a very long book—rather a shortish and strongly unified one.

By June 15, he was already “trying . . . to get at the new novel.” He had

intended to use the politician’s publicity man (ex-newspaper man) as the narrator of my story, and to use him as a refracting agent for the whole affair, but Dos Passos had very much the same idea, as you know, and now I’m frankly troubled by the similarity of method. Do you have any views in general on this point?

And I’ve been toying with another notion, which may be crazy as hell. But I’ll tell you about it anyway. As I had the novel planned, the sort of envelope story would be a conflict in purely “spiritual”

terms between the narrator and the hero. The narrator is both involved in the action and superior to the action—and critical of it. The crazy notion is something like this: The dead man, the politician, appears in little inserted sections as a kind of chorus to comment on the narrative given by the publicity man, and even to correct it and to define his own role in his terms. Does this sound too goofy?

On August 21, he wrote that he had been “going beautifully” on it until he “had to plunge into house-hunting—which is a hell of an arduous occupation in this town—and until I had to take a sudden and unexpected trip to California.” Even so, he expected “in a few days” to send a “wad of manuscript,” and asked what Davis thought about the “points of similarity in plan with Dos Passos.” Davis finally wrote on August 30, advising him not to be “in the least concerned about the Dos Passos treatment of your subject. You write in a way that can never be confused with the Dos Passos way.” Davis was a “little bit troubled about the device of the dead man speaking, as I think it would put a considerable strain on the reader. But if it has to be, it has to be. . . .”

On September 28, Davis’s secretary wrote Warren acknowledging the receipt of the first section of *All the King’s Men*. Apparently Davis could not get to it immediately, since on October 27, Warren wrote, “nudging” Davis to tell him his reaction to the first pages. “I am in the middle of another long chapter, having just finished one section of it,” he continued. “I’ll send that, too, when I get a copy made.” Less than a week later, on November 2, Davis responded:

Now, ALL THE KING’S MEN. I am tremendously excited by the first chapter. It’s superbly organized and moves with far more assurance than any section of AT HEAVEN’S GATE that I saw in the original draft. I have much more the feeling that you are saying exactly what you want to say. All that’s very much on the positive side. I am troubled a bit by the load you put on the narrator. I have the feeling from time to time that he could not be telling the story in the way he tells it, but that it is Red Warren taking the typewriter from him. This is particularly true of the first part of the chapter, where I feel you have labored too hard. I recall that that was true of the original opening of AT HEAVEN’S GATE, so I don’t take it too seriously. As you go along, I feel less of a dichotomy and that is to me a good augury for the story to come. I think you should keep right on with the writing, but I also feel that there will need to be some very careful attention to the finished draft from the point of view of the narrator’s language. The problem interests me a great deal, because it is exactly the problem presented in Jean Lowell’s manuscript which she is now revising. It too is a first person narrative, and also exhibits passages in which one feels that it is Jean Lowell rather than her narrator who is speaking. I don’t want to exaggerate the problem but it exists, but it can be taken care of. I hope you will carry on as rapidly as you can. . . .

Warren responded on November 12 that he was “encouraged greatly” by Davis’s enthusiasm, and agreed “that the flavor of the first few pages is wrong—pretty sophomoric, to be exact—but I was sparring my way in. I’ll tackle the beginning again when I’ve got a draft finished. Now I’m winding up another big hunk, and shall send it to you in a few days.” Those “sophomoric” “first few pages” were, apparently, the discarded opening reproduced in the Appendix to the new text.

On February 9, 1944, hoping that Davis would have “read over the stuff” before March 20, Warren wrote that he may have “another wad” before then, but was for the moment “stymied because my local lawyer friends lack the proper quality of imagination to work out some details for me.” On October 23, he wrote that “AKM” was

moving along. I now have about 100 pages more than you have seen. A long section—a story in itself—is to appear in the next issue of the Partisan. You may be interested to see it there, but the rest of the stuff is not in clean copy yet. It will probably be several weeks before I get it copied out and sent to you. With luck I ought to finish up in the early spring. But there are always interruptions and lags.

By February 19, 1945, he was working at good speed:

I shall send a batch of MS from the novel to you within the next few days. As soon, that is, as I get a new chapter typed. I finished it last night, and so since it is fifty pages long, it won't be ready immediately. The version I am sending you has certain minor lags and contradictions in it. For instance, Irwin at one time has been married only once, later it develops he has been married twice. But I can easily catch those up. Any such things you notice, however, would be a help to me. As for the unwritten part, I plan two more chapters, and with luck should finish in early April. The two last chapters are pretty well worked out. The only catch is that I have committed myself to a paper at New Haven in April, and the damned thing isn't ready yet.

On March 15, 1945, Warren wrote to Davis that he thought he would finish drafting the novel in "latish April," and hoped to get the finished draft ready by late May. He asked about the "absolute last date of delivery for fall publication." On April 1, he wrote that the novel would be "in your hands within another couple of weeks. In time, I hope, for you all to get some reading done . . . before I get to NY." On April 5 he wrote that he would give Albert Erskine a call to talk with him about the manuscript, and on April 19, he wrote that he had "this morning sent you all of the novel except the last chapter. My typist just fell down on the job and held me up on the thing. But maybe you will have time to read this before I get to NY. . . . I am anxious to get your considered views on the manuscript, for I am ready to push the thing through and want the benefit of your remarks."

After Warren's trip to New York for editorial advisement, Davis wrote on May 3, reflecting on their conversations about the new novel:

That doesn't mean that I have revised any of the ideas I expressed when we talked. I still feel that the most important thing is the proper establishment of the point of view of the narrator at the beginning of the book. But I have had one additional idea about structure. It seems to me that the book ought to begin with the plan to call on Judge Irwin, with the succeeding retrospect that we talked about, introducing the Stauntons [*sic*] and Jack Burden's background in a general way. The Irwin assignment is a crucial thing in terms of Jack Burden: it is the incident which begins the train of circumstances that transforms Burden from a spectator of the Talos saga to a deeply involved participant. Looking back on his career, Jack Burden would know that that was the beginning of the road to his own maturity. I think the structure of the book should carry this emphasis.

. . . there is one point that came up when the others read this copy that I think is important enough to pass on to you, though not for any immediate decision. This was the feeling, generally expressed, that Talos was not the right sort of name for the character. It presents an ambiguity in pronunciation, and in addition carries a foreign flavor that suggests a different background for the man than is actually the case. I recognize some metaphorical overtones in the word Talos that may be important to you, but I think this criticism of the name has some point on the practical level. The book might gain by a name of less ambiguous pronunciation, and one that suggested more definitely an American origin. As I have said, this is nothing for immediate decision, and I would suggest that you make no change whatever immediately. If, when the final draft is completed, another name is to be substituted, the change can be taken care of by the copy editing in this office. So there is no need for you to do anything but put the problem in the back of your mind for the present, and let it stew there for a while.

On September 5, Warren wrote to Davis that he had completed the novel, except for the need to rework chapter II and to transfer some revisions to the copy for the printer. He hoped to have everything to him by "the middle of October." On November 15 he sent Davis "two sets of revised pages . . . for Chapter II and Chapter VII," revisions he made because his "politician friends didn't like the tone of some of Willie's speech, and made me re-do it, and re-do some other odds and ends for him. And now," he concluded, "I have developed the operation section in Chapter VII."

Davis responded quickly in another long and important letter, on November 19:

You have certainly tied up the Stark career, as far as I'm concerned. His early days now seem thoroughly believable, thoroughly consistent with his character. The new pages, which arrived this morning and have been properly inserted, may be essential in the light of your political friend's advice, but they weren't needed as far as I was concerned. I can't see that anything else needs to be added to establish the fact of Stark's being where he is.

Similarly, it seems to me there are not enough early allusions to Ann and Adam to pre-figure their later development. Short of designing a new book, I don't see how anything more can be done along that line. I am a little troubled by the chronological shifts in the Burden's Landing chapter that provides three or four different time recapitulations on the early days. But I think that is essentially a matter of a sentence, a phrase, or perhaps even a word. Essentially, the job is done.

You have done a fine job in eliminating from the opening chapter the smart-aleck tone that we both recognized in the earlier version. There is still a touch here and there, in that chapter and in some of the following, but on this matter I think that well-chosen cuts can be agreed upon when we meet. I'm not worried on this point at all.

The Cass Mastern passage has troubled me in the way in which it was introduced. Jack Burden is quite dead-pan, introducing this episode, in calling Cass his Great Uncle, and yet Cass is not his Great Uncle. The reader, finishing the story, can legitimately say he has been tricked. I assume that you intend the irony of Jack's being engaged upon the biography of a man who is not his blood kin, and that this is the point you most want to make in the final chapter. Nevertheless, it disturbs me a little—perhaps because the Cass Mastern story is set into the third person. Is the point worthy, and is there anything that could be done about it? It does trouble me. Another point that has simmered in my mind a bit. Is Jack unnecessarily brutal in the language he uses with his mother? I can understand the revulsion of attitude, but wouldn't it be even more evident if it were expressed in fewer damns and goddamns? Again, it is a matter of a number of very minor operations.

As for the conclusion, it is absolutely right. Perhaps there is a small question in my mind regarding Jack's return to the Cass Mastern project. I can see the symbolic reason, but it might be too pat. That is not a matter I want to venture a real opinion on just now. By the time you get here, I will have had time enough to think about it.

That's all I can think of now, and it seems a meager enough offering. Dave is reading the manuscript now, and tomorrow it will go to Willard Trask for copy preparation. . . .

“Dave” is David Clay, to whom along with Mrs. Clay Warren dedicated *All the King's Men*, and who was the other principal editor. Clay wrote to Davis on November 23:

Lambert: Red's last chapter must be changed to indicate 1) the first delicate, then strengthened re-weaving of the fibre of bond between Jack and Anne (a) the nature of that bond (b) the emotional satisfaction of that bond; 2) Jack's present point of view toward: (a) society (b) human values, esp. his own. (3) Anne's ditto. (4) Jack's future—and livelihood—what is it. (Jack and Anne give up the Row, etc: the natural question is “give up for what?”^[1] One renounces something for something else that is more satisfying. What is that?)

Clay's memo prompted Davis to write Warren immediately, the same day:

A further thought on ALL THE KING'S MEN. I have been brooding about the conclusion, and I offer this as a considered suggestion. (It's worth noting that Dave Clay, whose understanding of the book is acute and sympathetic, has the same feeling.)

It seems to me that there is a partial evasion of the author's responsibility in omitting a scene between Jack and Anne. In the present draft, Jack's thirst for knowledge, a sense of guilty involvement, carries him to all the other surviving characters: Sadie Burke, Tiny Duffy, Lucy Stark, Sugar-Boy, and his mother. At the very end, of course, there is the revelation that Anne is now Jack's wife, but this isn't really enough. In all truth, Anne has been more deeply involved in the killing of Stark than anyone else, and more deeply affected, since it is her beloved brother who has killed her lover. It would seem to me that this matter couldn't be avoided as something between Jack and Anne. It would have to come in the open in some way or other before there could be any progress in their relationship.

I am not suggesting a scene ending with a conventional clinch. In fact, that would be just what one would want to avoid. But I am thinking of a scene that, by providing for the purgation of the Stark problem, would set the stage in such a way that the final bare mention of the fact that Anne is now Jack's wife would be quite sufficient. As the conclusion stands, you are open to the charge of having evaded a crucial scene. I am writing you now because I hope you'll be thinking about this before you come east, and may even, if you agree with this comment, have a draft of the scene for insertion. As I envisage it, it wouldn't necessarily be a very long scene, but it would need to be the kind of scene that would give the reader the feeling that the effect of Stark's death had been dramatized with respect to all the characters whom his death vitally affected.

I hope you agree, Red. I haven't any further ideas regarding sins of omission. I hope the copy editor will finish his work quickly enough to give me a chance to go over the first two chapters again. I have a feeling, which has not yet been confirmed by close study, that the book might gain an immediate popularity by some cutting in those chapters. Maybe it can't be done, but I would like to study the problem. Once the reader is thoroughly involved in the book, he won't be able to put it down.

That letter must have crossed in the mail with Warren's next letter, dated November 24:

. . . I am delighted by the view you take of the novel. I have been waiting with breathless anxiety to hear from you. As for the things you mention: Check on the matter of the deception about the relationship of Cass Mastern to Jack. This is easily remedied. I can simply state the relation of Cass to the Scholarly Attorney and then let the chips fall where they will. Check on removing bits of the smart alecky style. I'll try to do that. Check on the matter of language to mother. On the matter of going back to the story of Cass Mastern in the end, I may have to let the matter ride. Some verbal changes which may help make the thing more plausible may be possible. I'll give this my attention, but I don't believe I can see my way clear to drop the thing. But you may convince me when we meet face to face. Meanwhile, I have had Joseph Warren Beach, whose instinct for and knowledge of fiction is very great, to go over the manuscript. He has suggested a number of detailed changes, all very small, matters really for proof or on manuscript at the last minute. (I'll bring my notes on them with me and try to make them there in your office), and two or three bigger changes. Two of the larger changes had to do with tying in the Cass story and the Anne story (chapter vi) more closely at the time of the actual narration. So I have written some new stuff to be inserted in the manuscript you now have. Just pull out the pages with the same numbers and put these in, please sir. I have another notion of this which I want to talk over with you when I see you. It's not very big, nothing drastic.

On February 21, 1946, Davis sent the "last of the proofs" to Warren, along with this letter:

But the last of the proofs went to you yesterday. . . . I read them rather spottily—the last batches not at all—because time was of the essence. I know you will get through with them as quickly as possible, and I hope you'll feel satisfied enough not to want to see page proofs, and let me take care of page proof reading for you. Possibly I made this request before, but even so I hope you'll give me a confirmation on skipping the business of sending you page proofs.

I made a couple of queries that were specific, but the point I wanted you most to check again was the underlying chronology of Jack's life. I am sure that everything is neatly tied up, but knowing that the chronological structure was changed somewhat in the process of writing, I want to be absolutely certain. I believe that with the galley proof back, there will be nothing left to bother you with although our lawyer didn't read the manuscript, and he will be reading the galleys and may have a minor point or two to query you on. But I am sure we are in the clear on that score.

Warren was already hard at work on the proofs, as he wrote on February 25:

I have been working steadily on the proofs and should have them off to you by the end of the week. They are, on the whole, remarkably clean. But there is a hell of a big batch of them to handle. I am giving very close attention to the problem of chronology, and have discovered a couple of lapses, which remained from the time when I was working from a system different from the final one. Many thanks to

you for putting your finger on this question. And I have also inserted here and there, as you suggest, better guideposts.

On February 26, Davis wrote that the company's lawyer had suggested they make sure that the names of the business corporations Warren had invented for the Cass Mastern episode were invented, then was apparently satisfied that they had been, and Davis suggested just dropping the matter. On March 1, he wrote with the news that though they had set June 6 as the publication date, they might run in to some complications having to do with several other books that were scheduled to be published at the same time and that if that happened, he, Davis, would argue to hold publication until "late August or even early September," so as to ensure a "proper reserve of paper" for *All the King's Men*.

Davis wired Warren on March 3 that he had received the galleys and sent them back to the printer, but apparently he had only received part of them, since Warren wrote on March 5 that "tonight" he had "finished [his] last work on the proof":

I hope to God that I have caught everything. I feel pretty sure that I have put in enough pointers about chronology, and have corrected the two contradictions which were embedded in the work as detritus from an earlier scheme. I am attaching a chart here for you to look at in case you spot anything puzzling in your last glance at the proof. It might save you a question or enable you to straighten out something which I have overlooked. I want to thank you again for your attention to this point on the proof. I have also tried to handle your other questions. I have put in Jack's age for the time when the Scholarly Attorney left home. I have fixed up the apparent contradiction about his attitude toward his mother's money, etc.

Davis responded on March 16 that he approved all of Warren's galley changes:

I thought your changes in the galley, tying down the chronology of the book, were all excellent. You and I, of course, had grown familiar enough with the structure not to need these pointers, but they may make a big difference to the reader approaching the book for the first time.

As I had expected, the production schedule on the book has been shoved back. As now set, we expect to have finished books early in June, and are tentatively setting a publication date in late July or early August. That will allow for a much longer period between books and publication than is generally the case. That's all to the good, as it allows advance opinion to accumulate before book publication. In that connection I can say that our experience over the past five years does not show that there is anything to the old prejudice against summer publication. The rhythm of book sales has smoothed out considerably, and wars and rumors of war and other acts of God have more effect on reading habits than the course of nature.

Davis sent Warren one of the first "advance copies" of *All the King's Men* on May 13, 1946, though indeed publication was delayed until August 19, 1946.⁴

The Two Texts

As the correspondence between Warren and Lambert Davis indicates, *All the King's Men* was written over a period of about three years and under a variety of circumstances. The ragged texture and consistency of the typescript setting copy Warren sent to Davis over the years of composition may be seen as a sort of objective correlative to the actual labor of composition. Composed over a number of years, the novel as preserved on this typescript contains numerous internal inconsistencies—the color of The Boss's hair, for one example—which a good editor, and any author, would want straightened out before publication. Lambert Davis, Warren's editor at Harcourt Brace, and David Clay did a reasonably good job of finding such anomalies and correcting them. But they did considerable damage in other ways.

Warren was from the beginning grateful for Lambert Davis's guiding hand as he wrote *All the King's Men* and sent it to him, chapter by chapter, and upon Davis's retirement many years later, wrote a warm tribute to him, thanking him for his contributions to his career, especially to *All the King's Men*. In a real sense *All the King's Men* is a co-authored novel, since, as the evidence suggests, Warren sought and accepted Davis's advice and suggestions as he wrote and sent chapters for Davis's and Clay's comments; it does not appear that he ever argued with Davis's judgments about anything. So, to put it bluntly, one may well ask: how dare I "restore" those portions of his best novel which the author himself so willingly gave up to the editorial axe? It's a question very much worth some discussion. Several answers operate here. In the first place, to be sure, is my firm conviction that what Warren wrote is all but demonstrably superior in almost every instance than what Davis & Co. changed it to. But then the question becomes, Why did Warren yield so easily and readily to inferior judgments? In the first place, authors always exist in curious relationships to their editors; they write with various degrees of confidence in what they are doing and they want and expect and even need editorial intervention where they want it, but not where they don't. Typically an author reaches the end of a long novel completely exhausted by it, bored with it, and eager to get on to something else—a bottle of scotch or a new novel. By the time the work, or part of it, has reached the editorial eye, the author is nearly always interested in something else, even if only the next chapter. His or her attention turns to what is to come, while the editor turns to what has gone before; frequently the author simply doesn't remember what he or she has so recently written.

In the second place, the correspondence and the complicated typescript make it clear that editorial suggestion and revision were being made as Warren wrote. It does not appear that any of the three read the novel entire until galleys. Warren would send them a chapter and move on to battle with the next section of material; he might be two or three chunks away from that chapter when it came back to him from the editors, and he would perforce go to work on the line-for-line revisions that Davis had called for while his creative instincts still grappled with the current work and were divorced by light years, perhaps, from the context in which he had composed the material that the editors requested changes on, many such changes which in many cases overrode his own larger sense of the novel's direction. The effect of such a method of composition—that is, editing Chapter I without any knowledge of Chapter II, much less of Chapter IX—was to give the editors a limited sense of what *All the King's Men* was about, what its full scope was to be. In effect, then, editorial and revisionary eyes constantly worked in the trenches of the immediate, without much vision of the larger battlefield.

This limited vision of the novel meant that revisions and deletions suggested—and made, for the most part—in one part of the novel didn't necessarily take in to account how a particular revision would impact another part. Two examples will illustrate ways in which Lambert Davis was not the ideal reader of *All the King's Men*, much less editor.

First, he didn't like the Cass Mastern episode, which is central to the novel's meanings and which most readers and scholars today count among Warren's best sustained narratives. He not only didn't like it, he misunderstood it; doubtless he didn't like it because he misunderstood it and, editing from the point of view of his misunderstanding, in editing it he caused problems elsewhere in the novel. That is, throughout the text, Jack calls Cass and Gilbert Mastern his "great-uncles," allowing his reader to assume that they are his blood kin through his father, the Scholarly Attorney; the great revelation of the novel's climax, of course, is precisely that the Scholarly Attorney is *not* his biological father and that the Masterns are therefore not really his biological ancestors, although to be sure they are all his emotional—and thematic—ancestors.

Jack and Warren undertake a tricky business here because the Jack Burden who narrates *All the King's Men* after the fact knows things that the Jack Burden who acts throughout does not know; that is, the narrator has more complete knowledge than the character has during the time of the action. Davis saw this as Jack's lying to his reader, withholding crucial information, and making a sort of cheap trick out of the ending. He thus finessed Warren whenever he could. In a typical passage, for example, Warren typed: "Cass Mastern was one of Jack Burden's father's two maternal uncles. . . ." Davis altered the phrase to read: "Cass Mastern was one of the two maternal uncles of Ellis Burden, the Scholarly Attorney" (RE228), a reading which is, in my judgment, a bit more dishonest than what Warren wrote. As Warren wrote it, Jack's position as a first person narrator is one of the novel's thematic and structural glories; they deal directly with what Davis thought was a problem in a passage that Davis deleted:

But to return to that day: The fact of my ignorance during the course of the events of the day creates a peculiar problem in narrative. Things as they came to me that day were only, or almost only, appearances, for I lacked knowledge of their logic. But if I narrate them in terms of the logic later perceived, that is, in terms of the principle in which inheres their reality, something is wrong, too. For in art as in life there is a sin against Appearance as well as against Reality. And there are no descending circles and only one flame in Hell. But it is a beauty. ¶ I shall keep distinct what I knew that day, and what I came subsequently to know. (RE534)

Davis altered Jack's discussion of his family history because he didn't understand that problematic and complicated history's function in the novel: he deleted this passage because he didn't understand the relationship between this passage and Jack's family history and his position as narrator. Jack fully understands the difference between himself as narrator and himself as a character in the narrative; he even reminds us of this distinction at several points throughout when he narrates about a person named "Jack Burden" rather than about "I."

Second is a suggestion that Warren actually wisely resisted. As we have seen, in a memo to Davis of November 23, 1945, Clay argued for a change to the final chapter that would "indicate . . . the first delicate, then strengthened re-weaving of the fibre of bond between Jack and Anne" and then suggest something about their future: "Jack and Anne give up the Row, etc: the natural question is give up for what? One renounces something for something else that is more satisfying. What is that?" Although on November 19 Davis had written Warren that he thought the conclusion "absolutely right," he took Clay's memo to heart and wrote Warren that he and Clay agreed that the ending "is a partial evasion of the author's responsibility in omitting a scene between Jack and Anne. . . . At the very end, of course, there is the revelation that Anne is now Jack's wife, but this isn't really enough. In all truth, Anne has been more deeply involved in the killing of Stark than anyone else, and more deeply affected, since it is her beloved brother who has killed her lover. It would seem to me that this matter couldn't be avoided as something between Jack and Anne. It would have to come in the open in some way or other before there could be any progress in their relationship."

Davis and Clay missed the ambiguities in Warren's ending, at least partly because they overlooked the significance of an earlier passage that they simply deleted, apparently for reasons of taste. Soon after his abortive attempts to make love to Anne toward the end of their idyllic summer of young love at Burden's Landing, they meet again while she is on vacation from college. Jack meditates trying her virtue again, this time a good deal more cynically, since he now believes her to be a good deal more sexually experienced than she was that summer:

Then I assured myself that it wasn't Adam I was afraid of. To hell with Adam, I told myself, did he think he could put lead seals on his sister's drawers. Hell, somebody had probably hosed her already. (RE384)

Jack the narrator knows, as he gives us this information, that in fact *Willie* has “hosed” Anne. Readers can't understand the passage fully until we discover in the last chapter that Jack the narrator is married to Anne and that he knew he was married to her while he was narrating this passage. Thus this passage explodes with Jack's anger at Anne and at Willie for cuckolding and betraying him—Willie has in effect “hosed” them both—and with implications for a good deal of the rest of the novel. Once we sense his anger at the time of narrating, we cannot help seeing that anger, his sense of loss, throughout, even in that idyllic summer of first love. It underlies his several melancholy speculations about life in the homes of ordinary citizens, and nearly all of his comments about other women, especially about Lois, his first wife, and about Miss Dumonde, whose important appearance in the typescript was also drastically reduced in the typescript revision. Most of all, his anger impacts the ending of the novel, its carefully crafted, sober, and measured cadences that lead Jack and Anne out in to the “awful responsibility of Time.”

Davis and Clay's proposed alteration would have imposed a conventional love story on the novel. Apparently Jack and Anne would have talked things out, confessed to each other; there would have been “progress in their relationship” (a phrase and a concept Jack would have vilified and ridiculed as maliciously as he did Lois's claim that he and she were “perfectly adjusted sexually”!); presumably, Jack and Anne would then have lived happily ever after, even though the novel itself is evidence that not all, at any rate, is well in their household. Warren's ending makes their relationship, and their future, much more ambiguous and problematic, since “the awful responsibility of Time” that they step out in to now *includes* their past with Willie. Jack's anger as he narrates suggests that their future might not be so rosy as to include “progress in their relationship.” They “give up” the Row in exchange for the chance to escape at least that part of their mutual past. But can they ever escape Willie? The novel seems to suggest how hard it will be for Jack to forgive Anne.

Other instances of harmful editorial intervention suggest other ways in which the 1946 text is inferior to the novel Warren wrote. The editors changed Warren's original nine-chapter structure to ten chapters, by dividing the very long and complex Chapter IV into two chapters. Warren's Chapter IV put Jack Burden's two explorations of his family's past—his unsuccessful research into Cass Mastern's history and his rather more successful search into his father-Judge's past—into one chapter, thus making them more of a single thematic unit than the split allows. It was also Davis's idea to change Willie Talos to Willie Stark, as his letter to Warren of May 3, 1945 indicates, not for literary reasons, but for commercial, cultural, and political reasons. He wanted a name that was more “American” and more easily pronounced, even though he agreed that “Talos” probably had literary resonances that Warren wanted to exploit. Warren acquiesced in this change, but it hardly seems likely that he approved completely, even if he did come to accept it. But he had lived with the name Talos from the beginning of his work on the novel and such resonances informed the novel's composition from the beginning; their absence thus denies the 1946 text an important thematic register.

The Restored Edition

The scholarly editor's job is first of all to determine the differences between the typescript and the first edition, to determine the sources of those differences and then, upon the basis of that determination, to select the reading in each instance which, as far as one can judge,

more nearly represents what the author actually wrote and/or actually, consciously, wanted, and then to restore that reading. This is an important point: the goal is *not* to select the *better* of the two readings, but the one that the author wrote, let the aesthetic chips fall where they may. The editor who does otherwise is likely to impose his or her own aesthetic judgment over the author's, and it would seem obvious that no one would be really interested in an author whose aesthetic judgments were suspect. Certainly, Warren's are not and, since I gleaned most of my own aesthetic and critical principles from Brooks and Warren, I am reasonably confident that what Warren wrote is better than anything any lesser being is likely to have changed it to. To be sure, authors are human, and they make mistakes. But even an author's mistakes are often more interesting than an editor's corrections—else why study anachronisms in Shakespeare?—and so what we may perceive as an error or mistake may in fact be part of the author's purpose, especially for authors (I do not include Warren here) who experimented with language: How would an editor of e. e. cummings determine whether a close parenthesis inside the word “and,” say, is a mistake or deliberate? With an author like Faulkner or Joyce, for example, how could an editor determine whether a single violation of a pattern of usage is a mistake or a deliberate and therefore important variation? Think, for example, of the number of paragraphs in *The Sound and the Fury* which *do* end with a period, and of the one or two that don't: Are those one or two places to be corrected, or taken as deliberate, and therefore meaningful? Typescripts and manuscripts offer an editor no easy way out: Once the decision is taken to re-edit any text, the editor must inevitably impose one meaning or another on any particular reading. That absent period is either deliberate or it's a mistake; in a single text, it's impossible to have it both ways.

All the King's Men is no exception to these problems. Partly because of the lapping and overlapping nature of its composition and original editing, it is filled with several minor inconsistencies: Sugar-Boy's last name appears in two places in the text: in both typescript and first edition it is “O'Shean” first, and then, hundreds of pages later, “O'Shean.” Phrases like “friend of your youth” are capitalized allegorically in one place, but lower-cased in another; in another passage of about two paragraphs, Warren/Jack philosophizes about “Life,” partly with a capital letter, partly lower-case. Does Warren intend a difference between these two usages, or should an editor impose one meaning or another either by regularizing all occurrences to capital or lowercase or by letting the irregularity stand? This kind of problem is compounded in the novel's final word, “Time.” Though it appears capitalized only five times throughout the typescript, in its final appearance here at this crucial and highly dramatic point, it is “time,” lowercase. At some point in the proof stage, someone capitalized it, and it appears so, magisterially, in the first edition. The difference between the two forms of the word, especially in this position, has enormous implications for our understanding of the novel's final sentence and therefore of the novel. There *is* no reliable evidence one can call on to decide which of the two readings is the proper one. That is, that word is positioned so powerfully that it would seem incredible that anybody could miss it, yet somebody, author or editor, saw it in proof and changed it. Though the word appears in *All the King's Men* literally hundreds of times, and in a variety of combinations (sometimes, every time), it appears, as I say, only five times capitalized; but those capitalized appearances obviously take on powerful meanings because of the novel's ruminating obsession with history that their allegorical content seems to insist upon the capital letter at the end. I opted for the capital letter, too, but as unhappily and with misgivings as grave as if I had opted for the lower case word.

Editorial Principles/Guidelines

In general, in editing *All the King's Men*, I have assumed that what Warren wrote should be restored; that is, I assumed everything he wrote was innocent until proven guilty; that what editors wrote or insisted or suggested that Warren write be treated as suspect, or guilty until proven innocent. For example: Davis talked Warren into imposing a very precise time scheme upon the events of the novel. In the typescript a character will refer to something that happened ten years ago; Davis preferred the character to be more precise: that the event happened 12 years ago, or in March of 1934. Warren seemed happy with the suggestion and worked with Davis to create a time scheme Davis approved. But such precision altered the novel's idiom and made Jack Burden into a different kind of historian than the one Warren originally created. It also therefore shifts, even if slightly, the relationship between time and history as the novel develops it. I therefore restored Warren's less precise and more idiomatic usage in the typescript.

I have been suspicious of deletions which seem obviously made simply to reduce the novel's length, as in the episode involving Miss Dumonde, and of editorial changes which seem simply arbitrary. That is, in an early paragraph the typescript reads "Mrs. Talos, Tiny Duffy, and I were in the back seat, Lucy Talos in the middle." One editor, noting this simple and straightforward statement, nevertheless wrote on the verso of the page, "first guess is the middle seat," as if there were possible to understand it any other way; nevertheless, editors changed the sentence to: "Mrs. Stark—Lucy Stark, the wife of the Boss—Tiny Duffy, and I were in the back seat—Lucy Stark between Tiny and me" (RE6). Such alterations seem both arbitrary and patronizing to intelligent readers.

I have also been suspicious of changes which seem made to clarify or explain; such changes are more likely, in my judgment, to be editorially-inspired; changes, particularly additions, that heighten the drama or the language are by the same token more likely, I think it fair to assume, to be authorial. Thus the change in proof of the typescript's "dreary coquetry" to the first edition's "sad valentine lace" (RE4) seems clearly a poet's and not an editor's alteration, even if one for some reason believes "dreary coquetry" to be a better image.

The Variants

The table that follows is a fair and representative sampling of the kinds of variants between the typescript and the first edition and, for most of them, a brief explanation of my reasons for choosing one or the other. The entries are keyed to page and line numbers of the new restored edition (RE); immediately following the page and line number is the reading of the restored text, which begins on that line in RE, even if it runs for several lines. If I've retained the reading of the typescript (TS), a square bracket immediately follows; if I've accepted the TS or proof alteration, I've so indicated by putting FE (first edition) immediately following; if I've initiated a new reading, I so indicate with RE immediately following the reading. To the right of the bracket is the rejected reading, usually of the FE, and I've given the page numbers of TS and FE to help locate the reading in the other texts. The next line provides an explanation of the reasons for the choice of alternatives. The curled dash (~) to the right of the bracket indicates that the word in question has been repeated without change, and that punctuation is the variant; the caret indicates the absence of any punctuation at the point where the caret occurs. Warren pagged by chapter: III.27, for example, a numbering method that makes reference here a bit clumsy. So I have used the editorial or compositorial penciled numbers in the upper right corner of each page.

- TS3. RE accepts FE, since the change is a poetic one rather than an editorial “corrective” of a presumed authorial mistake.
- 4.16 City.] City, nearly three years ago, back in the summer of 1936. FE5
TS3 Added in proof. RE rejects chronological precision here and elsewhere.
- 6.1 sixteen or seventeen] eighteen or nineteen FE6
TS5 RE rejects chronological precision. Jack even says that he “forgets” how old Tom Talos is.
- 6.4 was] had been FE6
- 6.5 and he] and the fall before he had been the flashiest thing on the freshman team at State. He FE6
TS5 RE rejects chronological precision.
- 6.25 dark brown hair FE7] hair
- 10.9 his tail over the dashboard FE9] pitching
- 13.27 glitter was in FE12] glitter was on TS12
Glitter is “in” everywhere else.
- 17.24 more than ten years back,] about fourteen years before, back in 1922 FE15
TS16 RE rejects Davis’s chronological precision.
- 19.21 ten] eleven FE16
- 19.29 up to FE16] up
TS18 RE accepts FE, but notes that an early TS draft also reads “up.” The typescript makes no sense without the addition, not even as a colloquialism, and this omission must have been a typing error.
- 22.8 ten] twelve FE18
TS20 RE rejects Davis’s chronological precision.
- 23.22 hands[^] FE19] ~,
TS22 Typing error. Perhaps Warren intended: “shake hands, that morning,” but failed to type the comma after “morning.”
- 24.2 Christmas FE19] Xmas TS22
RE is tempted to leave “Xmas” as a sample of Jack’s irreverence, but follows FE here and elsewhere.
- 24.17 “Git him some beer,” Alex said, backing up the side with the biggest battalions.
] “Too strong for you?” Mr. Duffy demanded. ¶ “No,” Willie replied, “but no thank you.” ¶ “Maybe the school-teacher don’t let him drink nuthen,” Alex offered. ¶ “Lucy don’t favor drinking,” Willie said quietly. “For a fact.” ¶ “What she don’t know don’t hurt her,” Mr. Duffy said. ¶ “Git him some beer,” Alex said to Slade. ¶ “All around,” Mr. Duffy repeated, with the air of closing an issue. FE20
TS23 RE rejects proof revision. Davis insists that Warren add something about Lucy’s attitude toward drinking here to account for later (TS42). But the passage was added to account for the deletion of a longer passage of a couple of pages, beginning at the bottom of RE24. Since RE restores this deleted passage, there’s no need for this FE passage.
- 24.28 anyway, FE20] ~[^] TS23
Comma is needed here.
- 30.1 ten] a dozen FE22
TS23 RE rejects Davis’s chronological precision.
- 30.12 Morfee] Wynn FE23
TS26 Changed in proof. No way of knowing who made the change. In this case, perhaps “Morfee” was, for Davis, too close to McMurfee, just as he worried, later, that “Mortonville” was too close to “Martinville,” and changed it to “Duboisville.” But there’s no reason for such names not to be similar. RE accepts TS here and elsewhere for such changes.
- 30.26 five] six FE23
- 31.9 Mr. Duffy] Tiny Duffy FE23
“Mr.” inked out on TS27, but for Jack to call him by his last name is inconsistent with every other usage. RE restores TS.
- 31.15 Paul.” FE23] Paul.” And he did turn around.

- TS27 Ink deletion. The question is how much of the Boss's movements Jack records here. He's "getting ready to turn around" earlier in the sentence, but on the top of the next page Tiny Duffy goes right on "talking to the back of the Boss's head," and in the first sentence of the next paragraph, the Boss "whipped his head around" to look at Duffy. RE accepts the deletion.
- 44.18 Little Jackie was] I became FE33
TS41 Throughout the novel are passages in which Jack, for his own narrative and perhaps psychological reasons refers to himself, to his past self, in the third person. Davis resisted this practice in certain places, but RE restores them.
- 44.19 Idealist.] Idealist in those days. If you are an Idealist it does not matter what you do or what goes on around you because it isn't real anyway. FE33
RE rejects this TS41 ink addition, though uncertainly: it's in Davis's hand, but seems clearly authorial. It is suspect because it seems more explanatory than anything else, clarifying something that doesn't need clarifying. Probably Warren supplied a clarification at Davis's request.
- 52.4 get . . . lose] got . . . lost FE39
TS48 The typist typed *e* over *o*; FE compositor read it as "got" in view of the past tense "lost" 6 words later. But the sense of the passage insists upon the present tense.
- 52.9 aquarium. Anyway, that is what I would have said back then, that evening. FE39] aquarium.
TS49 This ink addition is in Davis's hand, but it is difficult to believe that he wrote it. RE accepts as Warren's. It is of course possible that Warren dictated a revision at Davis's suggestion or insistence, but there seems to be nothing problematic in the passage preceding that the addition works to correct or clarify.
- 54.10 in a car, headed back to Burden's FE41] Burden's
TS50 Davis's ink addition completes the sense of a sentence mangled when Warren pasted a revision on the page.
- 54.10 Burden's Landing FE41
TS50 This is the only place in the typescript where Warren typed "Burden's Landing." In each of the other places, Warren typed "Burton's Landing," and an editorial hand, the same that changed "Talos" to "Stark" throughout, has changed "Burton's" to "Burden's." RE, a bit unhappily, accepts the TS emendations as Warren's for the reason that in the passage at RE54.10 Jack says they are "headed back to Burden's Landing, which was named for the people from whom I got my name, and which was the place where I had been born and raised." Faulkner might indeed have liked a history in which names change from one generation to another, but there's no real sense in *All the King's Men* that Warren wants history to work in quite that way, that he wanted, even by implication, to reach further back into Jack's immediate family history than the single generation of his father. To have left it "Burton's Landing" would have implied a historical register that the novel doesn't in fact deal with.
- 68.5 sweet-smelling
TS51, FE51 Refusal to emend. This curious adjectival locution, used as a noun, remains constant through all versions of the text, so RE can only consider it deliberate.
- 70.14 still like your FE53] like your new
RE accepts this ink editorial revision of TS66 as a necessary correction. This episode occurs some time after Jack has gone to work for Willie; the revision reflects a recognition that Jack's job is no longer "new."
- 73.3 ago now.] ago—nearly three years, for it is now into 1939, but it seems like forever. FE55
Ink addition to TS69. RE rejects chronological precision.
- 73.4 ago,] ago, back in 1922 FE55
Ink addition to TS69 RE rejects chronological precision.
- 74.17 place] place a couple of months ago FE56
TS71 Proof addition. RE rejects chronological precision.
- 75.17 arterial sclerosis] arteriosclerosis FE56
Davis's ink change on TS71. But "arterial sclerosis" is classic Jack, and completely understandable.
- 77.17 in front FE58] in restaurants and in front TS73
This phrase deleted in ink on TS, obviously to accommodate the earlier deletion of the longer scene with Jack in the restaurant and drug store, a scene clearly an authorial deletion. RE accepts.

- 82.5 were. FE62] were, the man in the restaurant and the town fellow in the drug store and the old ones on the bench and the boys in the room behind me. TS78
This passage also deleted to accommodate the earlier deletion of the scene in restaurant. See previous note.
- 83.6 managed] managed to say hello, and that he remembered me from our meeting in Slade's place a few months back, and FE63
TS79 This proof addition seems more explanatory than otherwise. RE rejects as editorial clarification.
- 84.16 marcel FE64] marcelle
TS80 RE accepts TS ink change.
- 89.28 John Jones] real Willie FE68
RE restores the reading of TS85. The meaning of "John Jones"—a generic name like "John Doe"—is pretty clear from the context, but the earlier typescripts demonstrate that the generic name is a holdover from a passage deleted and preserved among the AKM papers at Yale. Here is the deleted passage:
- But the man is John Jones, and he cherishes the conviction that way down inside him there is the essential John Jones which is truly and precious himself like the pearl in the dark inside of the oyster, and that the potential of the act which will be the pure and identifying act for him is there, named John Jones, beyond accident and change and the soft gleam of eyes in the half-light. What the act will be, he does not know, but the conviction is there, and he clings to it even as, lying in the dark and looking up at the ceiling and listening for the somnolent and sweetly-sibilant breathing beside him, he is aware of the unpredicted change in the chemistry of his being which is proceeding as a result of that catalytic body beside him. ¶ Well, Lucy was a woman, and therefore she must have been wonderful in the way women are wonderful. She turned her face to me with that expression which seemed to say, "See, I told you, that's the way it is," and meanwhile Willie sat there. But his own face seemed to be pulling off again into the distance which was not distance but which was, shall I say, simply himself.
- 91.11 drooping around his ample] drooping, FE69
TS86 All preliminary typescripts are as the setting copy; FE finessed the problem by deleting the TS phrase. It's a curious usage, but not completely out of line with Jack's language at other points. See "a bait of fresh" at RE106.25 and "sweet-smelling" at RE68.5.
- 95.1 glorified FE72] gloried TS90
Though all typescript versions have "gloried," RE accepts this proof revision as closer to the novel's idiom.
- 97.7 the copy of his speech FE73] a couple of his speeches TS91
RE accepts FE singular here and over the next couple of pages. TS is not completely clear. Although a case could be made to follow the TS, it would leave the text pretty ugly to do so. At least part of the variation occurs because of revised typescript pp. following 91. To stay with the typescript, one would have to argue a distinction between the written speech and the delivered ones. But to argue thus would still be unnecessarily confusing, so RE goes with the singular here and elsewhere: that is, Willie has one speech, revised and polished and delivered lots of times.
- 103.22 friends.] friends, but I had known her from way back FE78
TS98 Davis's unnecessary ink addition.
- 103.30 jury] juries FE78
TS98 RE accepts "jury" as a collective noun, which requires the singular verb. Warren's stint as a Rhodes Scholar may have given him this British usage.
- 106.25 a bait of fresh. TS101, FE81
RE refuses to emend this odd locution, consistent in all typescript drafts, and consistent with "ample" at RE91.11 and "sweet-smelling" at RE68.5.
- 111.4 shortly. "And they'll deserve what they get." FE84] shortly. TS105
RE accepts as Warren's proof revision.
- 117.7 dark FE89] red TS112
RE accepts as a necessary proof revision, which makes Willie's hair color consistent through the text.

- 121.12 posture ^] ~, FE92
RE refuses to correct here, following both TS116 and a preliminary TS.
- 122.29 barbecue for FE93] barbecue TS118
RE accepts FE as a necessary proof correction.
- 133.23 ffRE rejects changes from “crucifying” to “nailing them up”: though revisions on TS127 are in Warren’s hand, there’s no reason to think this change is anything but an editorial suggestion. The crucifixion image is much more powerful, and makes sense to think Davis wanted to tone it down, for reasons of taste or sacrilege, if nothing else.
- 134.5 sudden movement FE102] movement TS128
RE accepts as Warren’s proof revision.
- 137.21 it? FE105] ~. TS131
RE emends to FE, following the previous paragraph.
- 141.8 before.] before. I had even given a name to it—The Great Sleep. FE107
TS135 RE rejects this inked TS addition, even though it is in Warren’s hand. Likely he made the revision at Davis’s suggestion for clarification.
- 141.17 time] other time the Great Sleep had come was the time FE108
TS135 Proof addition to complement revision at 141.8.
- 141.20 sleep] Great Sleep FE108
TS135 Proof change.
- 144.25 Stanton, who was their father, or Mr. Ellis Burden, who was my father] Stanton or Mr. Ellis Burden. FE110
TS139 Davis’s change denies some of the complications of Jack’s father problems.
- 146.1ff I would see. ¶ She sat there before me . . . could not define. FE111] I would see. TS140
RE accepts these proof revisions as authorial, as they add substance, not clarification.
- 155.16 afternoon] afternoon, on the borderline between winter and spring, back in 1933, FE118
TS147 RE rejects chronological precision.
- 155.19 We always sooner or later got into a row about something, and in the two and a half years that I had been working for Willie it usually in the end came round to Willie. And if his name wasn’t even mentioned, he stood there like a shadow behind us. Not that it mattered much what we rowed about. There was a shadow taller and darker than the shadow of Willie standing behind us. But I always came back, and I had come back this time. FE118] I hadn’t been working for him very long then, seven or eight months, and she thought she could make me quit it. It was a disgrace, she said. Well, I had walked out after some fairly spirited exchanges. But I had come back, for I always came back. TS147
This proof revision seems clearly authorial, for matters more important than chronology, and RE accepts.
- 156.11 pull, feeling too that it was something special. FE118] pull. TS148
RE accepts as Warren’s proof revision.
- 156.14 as if FE118] as TS148
RE accepts proof change. Jack quite possibly intended “so as,” but “as if” suggests that his mother is feigning delicacy; “so as” suggests that she is truly drinking delicately. Given her drinking throughout, “as if” seems more likely, or at least more likely what Jack would think.
- 156.14 likker FE118] liquor TS148
RE emends to the FE vernacular, accepting Davis’s note on verso of TS208 that “likker” is Warren’s preferred usage throughout.
- 156.29 And suddenly I felt old, and the thirty-five years I had been living suddenly seemed to stretch back forever. But I had to hand it to her. FE119] And you would have to hand it to her. TS148
RE accepts this proof change as authorial.
- 157.22 But it is hard to say that knowing is always against something. There is the something. And] But FE119
TS 149 Probably a compositorial eye-skip caused this deletion, and RE restores.
- 157.25 you. You could get the feeling that either she didn’t know anything at all, not a blessed thing, or that she knew something which was a hell of a lot more valuable than anything you’d ever been able to find out.] you. FE119
TS149. Deleted in proof for unfathomable reasons, and RE restores.
- 159.31 each in turn FE121] ~, ~ ~TS151
RE accepts FE as a necessary emendation.
- 160.7 ideal, for that is the stage in life when you are supposed to celebrate the ideal.] ideal. FE121

- TS152 Ink deletion.
- 160.10 been my father,] been FE121
TS152 Ink deletion. See note for 160.15.
- 160.15 father] Daddy FE121
RE restores TS152. Interesting variant, with some significance for how Warren is playing with the idea of fatherhood throughout. Davis seems to be less coy with readers than Warren wants to be about Jack's paternity. The problem is how coy Jack's mother is being. RE rejects the revision here, as editorial rather than authorial, and the revision is in line with the deletion earlier in the paragraph of "my father" at RE160.10.
- 160.25 gone.] gone. I was about six years old then. FE122
TS152 RE rejects chronological precision.
- 161.7 accurate black] black FE122
TS153 "accurate" interlined in ink on TS, probably in Davis's hand, but it's hard to believe that Davis could have made a revision like this. RE accepts the revision, even though FE doesn't have it.
- 161.21 Count. I had liked to watch him ride a horse. FE122] Count. TS153
RE accepts this inked addition to TS as authorial, though it is not clearly in Warren's hand.
- 161.26 blood, which would be the color of Lavoris,] blood, FE122
TS153 Davis almost certainly deleted this because of the name brand of mouthwash.
- 161.30 down^ FE123] ~, TS153
RE accepts TS deletion as a necessary correction for sense.
- 163.18 here,] here, years before when we were kids, FE124
TS155 RE rejects this ink addition; it is only for chronology.
- 163.29 catboat FE124] white yawl TS155
RE accepts Davis's inked alteration to the TS, to accommodate what is apparently a single-sailed boat at RE165.6: a catboat has only one sail, a yawl has two.
- 167.23 my father's] his FE127
TS159 Inked editorial change.
- 168.28 Most of the time while I was in college my mother was in Europe, for the war was over. But I didn't go. In vacation I would go back to Burden's Landing and stay with the Stantons, for Governor Stanton was still alive then, or one summer I stayed with Judge Irwin. He was just back from the war, and] When he got back from the war, he was FE128
TS160 Apparently this passage was altered because of perceived problems in chronology. If Jack leaves for college in the fall of 1915, and if by "college career" Jack means just his undergraduate years, it would not be true that the war was over for "most" of his college career. If he includes his years as a graduate student, his statement is more nearly accurate: he would have graduated in the spring of 1919, then entered graduate school and could easily have been at the dissertation-writing stage before 1922, when he first met Willie and subsequently went to work for him. RE restores TS.
- 169.12 I spent at his place he damned well] after he got back he FE128
See note for 168.28. RE restores TS160 reading to re-insert the fact that Jack spent a summer with the Judge, which seems to have been inadvertently left out in the revision. Such a summer makes the bond between them more significant.
- 169.18 I take] for a long time I took FE128
TS161 ink change. But "take" is proper here, and very much in line with "take" later in the same sentence.
- 176ff TS166ff. RE restores the long scene involving Miss Dumonde, though hesitantly. It seems clearly a late deletion, since the pages cut, III-21, 22, and 23, are serial with III-20 and 24. But the scene may well have been cut for no more reason than the novel's already great length: Davis was constantly at Warren about the novel's length, so Warren may have just decided that the scene could go. But it seems integral to the novel's themes, especially those having to do with Jack's relationships with women. Miss Dumonde ("of the world") has no stake in or relationship with Jack, as the other women do, and her reaction to Jack may tell us a good deal about him that we need to know. In any case, it's a powerful piece of writing. FE133
- 180.1 And all at once I had the satisfactory vision of Miss Dumonde's face being pushed back below the surface of the bath, her eyelids fluttering over the dark eyes with fascinating alacrity and her mouth making a

- perfect, soundless “O” before the water poured into it. Under the clear water the eyelids would keep on fluttering fascinatingly, and beautiful, perfect bubbles would ascend from the O-shaped mouth, which was set round with pearly teeth, and explode on the surface. TS167, FE134
RE restores this passage, as part of the passage about Miss Dumonde. It’s a powerful and important passage.
- 181.16-26 “I don’t like her,” my mother said. ¶ “I don’t either, and she doesn’t like me, and so we three make a fair picture of human society,” I said. “She definitely does not like me. To be exact, she called me a son-of-a-bitch.” ¶ “She—what?” ¶ “Called me a son-of-a-bitch.” ¶ “Whatever made her, son?” ¶ “Because she said I thought she was a fool, and thought everybody else there last night was a fool, and was high and mighty.” ¶ “She is a fool,” my mother burst out viciously. “There’s something wrong with that girl.” Then she] She FE135
TS169 ink deletion, probably by Davis, regarding the previous deletion: RE restores.
- 182.24 eyes. ¶ “Not that I want your money,” I said. FE135] eyes. TS170
RE accepts this proof revision as authorial, though with some hesitation. The addition allows Jack to retract his assumption, two paragraphs earlier, that he would inherit his mother’s money, and so complicates his problematic relationship with all of his heritage. The entire passage does not seem problematic enough to require any sort of editorial intervention, so RE’s assumption has to be that this is Warren’s self-generated revision, and allows it to stand.
- 184.24 ago] before, about 1896, FE137
TS172 Proof change, for chronological precision.
- 190.12 God-a-Mighty] the good Lord FE141
TS177 No reason to suspect Warren of changing this here and nowhere else.
- 190.18 one-nut FE141] one-out TS178
This is clearly a typing error, given the joke. RE accepts FE.
- 192.10 Masten’s] Martten’s FE143
Either a Warren typing error or a revision after writing the Cass Mastern interlude. RE restores TS179, accepting the possibility that Warren made the connection deliberately aslant, as he perhaps had done with Martinville/Mortonville and Morfee/MacMurfee.
- 194.8 Boy, it FE144] It TS181
Warren’s ink revision.
- 195.2 shank-bones open RE] shank-bones TS182, FE145
RE emends. A flag is “to the breeze,” not a shank-bone.
- 198.10 calmly, FE147] ~^ TS185
- 202.19 was FE151] is just TS189
RE accepts this TS ink change as adjusting the tense to past tense later in the sentence.
- 210.10 April] April, 1933, FE137
- 215.12 say:] had said, FE160
TS202 ink change. RE restores TS reading, though he has used the past perfect earlier in the paragraph; Jack here imagines himself, and us, into the present tense of the scene.
- 215.21 saying:] had said, FE160
TS202 ink change. See note for 215.12.
- 217.20 new, unchecked roar FE162] roar TS204
RE accepts this TS ink addition. Hard to imagine Davis making such a good change.
- 219.31 six-year old kids RE] six-year kids TS204, FE164
RE emendation. Surely this is what Willie says.
- 221.20 term] term in 1934 FE165
TS208 Proof change for chronological precision.
- 221.23 In fact, it was quite a while after the little midnight trip down the State to call on Judge Irwin before she did leave him. There] When she did leave him, there FE166
TS208 ink deletion.
- 222.1 The Boss himself used to go out to the poultry farm now and then, to keep up appearances. Two or three times the papers ran photographs of him standing with his wife and kid in front of a hen-yard or incubator house. The hens didn’t do any harm, either. They gave a nice, homey atmosphere. They inspired confidence.] Lucy probably figured that she could do something to hold Tom down, and so there wasn’t any absolute break with Willie. Now and then, but not often, she would appear in public with him. For instance, on that trip up to Mason City—the time the Boss and I made the midnight visit on Judge Irwin—

- Lucy came along. That was in 1936, and by that time Lucy had been staying out at her sister's poultry farm for going on a year. FE166
 TS208 Proof revision. Lucy did go with them to Mason City, but not to see the Judge. RE restores the TS.
- 222.2 now and then] occasionally FE166
 TS208 Proof change.
- 222.3 papers] papers—the administration paper, that is— FE166
 TS 208 Proof change.
- 226.6 at. And back then, fifteen years ago, it was still something to look at, too. Sometimes Jack Burden (who was *Me* or what *Me* was fifteen years ago) would be proud to go into a place with her, and have people look the way they would, and just for a minute he would be happy. But there is a lot more to everything than just walking into a hotel lobby or restaurant.] at. FE169
 Davis deletes this passage from TS211-12, with the question in the margin, “Is this correct in terms of last chapter?” It’s the wrong question to ask, because Davis assumes that the young Jack’s attitude toward his mother would/should have been consistent from one day to the next. But Jack clearly says “*Sometimes*” he would be proud to be seen with her, and would be happy “just for a minute.” This passage complicates Jack’s attitude toward his mother, and RE restores.
- 228.7 one of Jack Burden’s father’s two maternal uncles] one of the two maternal uncles of Ellis Burden, the Scholarly Attorney, FE170
 RE restores TS214. Jack deliberately conceals the identity of his real father and, therefore of necessity he must misrepresent his blood relation to Cass Mastern. Davis is obviously trying to protect Jack here, as elsewhere, by finessing his invocation of “father,” eliding it into a name, here Ellis Burden. But in fact Davis actually created this problem by deleting a passage on TS560 (see note for 534.1) in which Jack faces up to the problem as a problem in all historical narrative by announcing that he is deliberately trying to keep separate those things—i.e., his family relationships—he knew before and those he knew after the revelation; that is, he wants to recreate in his narrative how what he learns in his research affects him at the time. His need to separate what he knows as a narrator from what he knew as an actor in this drama may help account for the several extended passages in which he narrates in the third person, relating the experiences of “Jack Burden” instead of “I.”
- 228.8 Mastern, a great-uncle to Jack Burden.] Mastern. FE170
 RE restores TS214, deleted by Davis, for reasons discussed in the previous entry.
- 228.9 great uncle] uncle FE170
 TS214 See explanation for previous entries.
- 228.14 his cousin Jack] Jack FE170
 TS214 See explanation for previous entries.
- 228.27 Mastern, his great-uncle,] Mastern, FE171
 TS214 See explanation for previous entries.
- 229.27 Mastern, Jack Burden’s grandmother,] Mastern, FE172
 TS215 See explanation for previous entries.
- 230.19 twenty-seven or eight] in his thirties FE172
 TS216 RE rejects such chronological precision.
- 233.29 I . . .] Jack Burden . . . FE175
 RE restores TS220 for this paragraph, though with some uncertainty. Jack frames the Mastern story as a narrative about “Jack Burden,” as he does in other places throughout where he wants to distance his present self from that former self (see notes at 44.18 and 228.7). This paragraph, however, roughly one-fourth the way through the Mastern episode, is the only place in the Mastern narrative in which Jack refers to himself at all, so that, in effect, it’s a narrative island of first person. FE editors quite reasonably, perhaps with authorial assurance, assumed this was an authorial oversight. But the typescript pages for the Cass Mastern episode are the cleanest, clearest, most carefully-typed pages in the entire document, and there seems no reason to doubt that Warren at some point wanted Jack to refer to himself here in the first person, or that Davis was more interested in consistency than in practically anything else. RE restores TS, then, for whatever subtlety or shades of self-identity the first-person Jack may be striving for here.
- 236.14 as if I was sitting on the couch yesterday.] as if it were only yesterday when I sat on that couch. FE177
 RE favors TS223 over this editorial tidying-up in proof.

- 240.6 opening the] the first FE180
RE accepts TS227, awkward though it be, if only because the FE reading is not noticeably superior. In the previous typescript, Warren added “opening” in pencil to the passage, so it seems clearly what he wanted.
- 249.115 “Her] ¶ “~ FE187
TS237 marks a paragraph here for no apparent reason.
- 262.2 Isaiah FE197] Isacah TS250
RE accepts proof emendation; in an earlier typescript version of this passage Warren added the sentence naming the slave in pencil. His curved “i” looks very much like a “c” and the typist seems to have taken it for that letter.
- 264.26 his Holy] His Holy FE199
RE restores TS253, reproducing what may be intentional orthographical inconsistencies in Cass’s journal.
- 265.14 history and the grand-nephew of Cass and Gilbert Mastern.] history. FE200
TS254 Ink deletion, more editorial finicking about Jack’s ancestry. RE restores.
- 267.5 did] could FE201
TS256 Ink change.
- 267.5 could understand and what he understood] was afraid to understand for what might be understood FE201
RE accepts TS256 for this and the preceding entry. The proof corrections seem little more than tidying up. The difference seems to be the editor’s awareness that Cass is no relation to Jack.
- 267.29 me . . .] him . . . FE201
RE restores TS256 first person here and in the next paragraph, using the final sentence of the paragraph, “*Mr. Jack Burden* fading slowly” as reason to think of this paragraph as a transition back to the first person. The first sentence of the next paragraph reverts to third person, but quickly adjusts itself to the first person.
- 268.7 success. FE203] success. It got into all the newspapers. It rocked a State. TS257
RE accepts this TS ink deletion. Davis corrects Warren’s slip and marks it with a note: “The ‘case’ never becomes public, isn’t this overstatement?” If it had gotten into the papers, Jack’s mother would not have to ask him, at novel’s end, why the Judge had committed suicide.
- 270.7 you still like your FE204] how you like your new TS259
RE accepts editor’s ink TS change, to agree with what Irwin says earlier, at RE70.14
- 271.11 that is one thing that sure gets around in a small town.] if anybody in a small town has anything on anybody it isn’t long before everybody knows it. FE205
TS260 Proof change, probably editorial; it clarifies something that doesn’t really need clarifying.
- 272.28 nigger women like great sacks of bloated black blubber] nigger women FE206
TS262 RE restores this image, which was true to its time.
- 277.32 “A long time ago, I understand, he made different things from angels. Before *it* happened.” ¶ “Before what happened?”] “He makes angels. Because of what happened.” ¶ “What happened?” FE210
RE reluctantly restores TS267, perhaps at the expense of a Warren revision. But there’s no particular reason for the changes here, and the TS is arguably much better.
- 278.5 know.” How the hell could I know?] know?” FE210
TS268. Ink deletion.
- 278.16 He—” ¶ “It probably affected the angel some, too,” I suggested. ¶ “It affected George very deeply,” he reiterated with sternness.] ¶ “How about the way it affected her?” ¶ The old man ignored my wit and said, “He FE210
RE again restores TS268, for reasons stated above. Plus, with this addition, Jack repeats his joke about the Scholarly Attorney’s “ignoring my wit” on the next page.
- 283.16 said] burst out without meaning to FE214
RE restores TS274. Davis makes this TS change, apparently trying to make Jack appear less in control of this interview than he is. At the top of TS274, he wrote a note to Warren: “Why is Jack such a fool? Doesn’t he know this is no way to get information?” Davis thus misses the possibility that Jack in this scene is afraid of what he might find out, that he may well be conducting the interview with the Scholarly Attorney precisely *not* to get information. He may also be making this consistent with Jack’s statement on TS275 (RE285.5) that he had “burst out” about the governor.

- 287.20 *to puke.* ¶ But why should I have puked if he had? Because my father had not laid his arm across my shoulder? Well, I hadn't run sixty-five yards for a touchdown, had I? To the last three minutes to leave the score six to three for dear old State?] *to puke.* FE218
RE restores this important paragraph deleted from TS278. Incredible that anybody could have deleted it.
- 296.20 trap and the mouth looked like that well-healed surgical wound.] trap. FE224
TS288 On a preliminary typescript, somebody pencilled square brackets around this phrase, apparently to call Warren's attention to it; the typist typed the brackets around the phrase, but editors and/or compositors simply removed the brackets and phrase within.
- 297.26 flash flood streaming down the gorge and snatching] levee break streaming out to snatch FE225
TS289 Warren first typed "spring freshet", then drew an ink line through it and typed above it "flash flood." Clearly he wanted Adam's "exuberant gaiety" to have more force than a "spring freshet." Davis's change to "levee break" creates a more ponderous image, alien to the idea of "exuberant gaiety": "flash flood" retains the startling immediacy of the image.
- 301.9 woman] grown woman FE228
TS293 Proof change, but explanation is unnecessary.
- 303.9 1914 FE229] 1916 TS296
RE accepts this date as adjusted to agree with the date a few paragraphs later.
- 304.15 whisky FE230] whiskey TS297
RE accepts FE emendation. Perhaps Jack/Warren is drawing a distinction between the American bourbon (whisky) Jack and the Boss have been drinking throughout and the rye he drinks in Savannah, but it really doesn't seem likely; the difference *this one time* creates an oddity at worst, a tiny island, perhaps, of meaning that is too tiny to be worth parsing out.
- 306.32 West.] West. Or rather what in Savannah they called "the West." FE232
RE restores TS300 denying an unnecessary, obviously editorial, attempt to make sure readers get Jack's joke.
- 320.1 March] March in 1937 FE243
TS315 RE rejects this chronological precision.
- 320.3 researches into enchantments of the past] researches FE243
TS315 Probably an editorial deletion of a cliché, but the cliché is in perfect keeping with Jack's smart-aleck use of this sort of cliché throughout.
- 322.24 six years] even seven years or so FE
TS317 Proof change for chronological precision.
- 322.24 later. It was the time when everybody was his own orphan.] later. FE244
TS317. No reason whatever for anybody to delete this splendid line.
- 324.21 Martinville] Duboisville FE246
Davis circled this on TS319, and wrote a note to Warren: "change name? (too close to 'Mortonville' cf p. 295)". RE rejects this as sufficient reason to change. Warren typed "Duboisville" on TS477, but there's no reason to think of these two names as naming the same town.
- 330.11 (But, look here, gentle reader, mon semblable, mon frère, you needn't get upstage with me about it, for you were happy to read that Philip Sidney had pimples, that Jesus Christ may have been sweating from T.B., that Plato was merely defending the interest of his economic class, and that George Washington had false teeth. And Robert E. Lee has never been your favorite hero.)
Editors deleted this splendid paragraph from TS326, FE250.
- 331.7 did] could FE251
RE restores TS219. "Did" here is perfectly understandable and more in keeping with Jack's frequent parody of such formal, perhaps archaic, diction.
- 334.22 Life . . .] life . . . FE253
TS331 Here and in the following paragraph, RE accepts FE regularization to Life. It is possible that Jack/Warren is making a subtle distinction here, but the distinction, as I read it, is not consistently made; and the capitalization complies with his practice throughout the novel of abstracting such terms with capital letters.
- 336.18 stop. FE255] stop. Or the image hung there in the glass like a bright fly perfectly embalmed in amber which was clear as crystal.
TS333 RE accepts this ink deletion as Warren's general revision of the passage.

- 336.19 recollection, FE255] recollection of a leaf or a fly, TS333
TS333 RE accepts this as Warren's TS deletion.
- 336.19 Stanton herself, FE] Stanton, TS333
RE accepts this TS ink alteration as Warren's.
- 336.29 within. There is nothing like what the older generation used to term a coat suit to mysteriously call attention to arrangements within if the arrangements are worthy of having attention called to them.] within. FE255
TS334 ink editorial deletion.
- 337.14 hit FE255] bit TS334
RE is tempted to leave the TS "bit" but on a previous typescript, Warren added in pencil "& the blood hit her cheek." The typist obviously misread the *h* for a *b*. But comparison with the other *h*'s in the added passage persuades that Warren wrote an *h*.
- 343.25 into] onto FE260
TS342 Curious usage, perhaps, but no reason to alter it.
- 349.5 shock, a death,] shock, FE264
TS348 Ink deletion. Hard to tell who deleted this, but RE restores.
- 355.3 said. And spoke the truth.] said. FE269
TS356 Ink deletion. RE restores.
- 356.29 O'Sheean RE] O'Shean TS358, FE270
RE corrects the spelling to the first chapter.
- 357.11 And we gentlemen did.] We did. FE271
TS358 No reason for this inked revision. It's perfectly in keeping with Jack's temperament and diction, and RE restores
- 360.8 tree. Then he got himself some frontal lobes in his brain—hell, you've seen that stuff, Doc, just some squishy gray stuff, and they tell me you cut out that front stuff and a fellow is right back up in the tree far as caring about good and bad is concerned.] tree. FE273
TS361 Proof revision. RE restores the typescript.
- 360.13 it] Good FE273
Proof change. RE restores TS362 as more ambiguous and better in context, especially with the restoration of the previous deletion.
- 361.12 you] if you FE274
Proof change, but TS363 is perfectly proper in Willie's idiom.
- 364.10 contract?] contract? Why did he get so heated up just because Tiny's brand of Bad might get mixed in the raw materials from which he was going to make some Good? FE276
TS366 Proof addition. Unnecessary editorial clarification. Warren probably wrote it, but almost certainly at Davis's suggestion.
- 368.11 friend of your youth FE279] Friend of Your Youth TS371
RE emends here, instead of earlier, where the phrase is lower case several times.
- 368.21 O.K. [...] O.K. FE279] Okay [...] Okay TS371
RE accepts FE here, the only place where "Okay" is used instead of O.K.
- 371.28 slammed the Boss's door off the hinges, too,] exploded out of the Boss's door, FE282
RE restores TS375. The revision is in Warren's hand, but made in response to an editorial query in the margin, and for no good reason.
- 373.30 the question] her question FE283
TS377 ink change. RE restores, as sufficiently clear.
- 377.7 callous-assed] callous-rumped FE286
TS380 ink change. RE restores the TS.
- 378.5 bath,] bath and put on my pajamas, TS381
On TS382 (RE379) Jack is naked in bed; hard to believe that he is making distinctions between one time and another, since he's only in Long Beach 36 hours. RE accepts the alteration, for consistency with TS382. TS453 (RE440) corroborates his habit of sleeping naked.
- 381.1 twenty-one FE289] nineteen TS385
RE accepts this TS ink change in chronology. Jack is on two earlier occasions identified as being four years older than Anne. Jack is twenty-one on TS400 (RE393).
- 381.6 gallery FE289] veranda TS385

- This is the only occurrence of the word “veranda” in this novel, and clearly the editor changed it for consistency. But Warren also changed “veranda” to “gallery” several times in the preliminary typescripts, so RE allows the proof correction to stand.
- 384.2 piano. Then I assured myself that it wasn’t Adam I was afraid of. To hell with Adam, I told myself, did he think he could put lead seals on his sister’s drawers. Hell, somebody had probably hosed her already.] piano. FE292
RE restores this passage, deleted by ink from TS388.
- 384.25 night, an express headed for Florida that didn’t stop at the Landing, for there weren’t any Yankees there, for nobody at the Landing ever had any good reason to go to Florida.] night. FE292
RE restores this passage, deleted by ink from TS389.
- 387.12 everything, who had read all the books, who had been to three warehouses and had diddled two co-eds (one likkered up, neither particularly attractive, and both with the reputation, it developed, of being easy marks) and one waitress (in the locker room of the restaurant where he hashed) and one forty-year old married woman (who loved the works of Walter Pater and who took it away from me),] everything, FE294
RE restores this passage, deleted by ink from TS392, obviously for reasons of taste.
- 388.10 boat FE295] yawl TS393
Ink change on TS probably authorial, to make consistent with earlier change from yawl to catboat.
- 388.24 poised FE295] posed TS394
RE accepts FE emendation, as “poised” appears in the preliminary typescripts and is clearly the sense of the passage.
- 392.18 require] later require FE298
RE restores TS398. Unnecessary editorial clarification.
- 393.26 But that is all for the lesson today. So pax vobiscum, my pets, and don’t forget to put on your galoshes in the vestibule.
RE restores this paragraph, deleted in ink from TS399 (FE299).
- 394.32 Even when I was dancing with another girl, it didn’t matter much, and you might as well have driven a hay-wagon between us. Even when it was the Colfax girl, who, I remember, had fine breasts, and who marched right up to you like a little soldier and took her punishment and hung like the paper on the wall, and didn’t distract you, or herself, with useless conversation. Whatever Colfax did was perfectly anonymous, and just made me more anxious for the next dance when it would be Anne and we could really count them out.
RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS401 (FE299).
- 394.22 Stanton (though the word *decently* is not used advisedly in this context),] Stanton FE299
RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS401.
- 397.20 She was right. It was an example of that clairvoyance which makes a love affair so harrowing and makes marriage damned near a nightmare, for the woman is right in her clairvoyance about half the time and thinks she is right all the time. But Anne was right. I] I FE301
RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS404.
- 402.16 twenty FE305] thirty TS410
RE accepts the TS ink change, even though it’s Davis’s. In the next paragraph, Warren writes “twenty-” in ink above a blank space he had left in the typing. His figure identifies the “twenty-foot” board as the board Anne “had been using,” and that she now climbed past to get to a higher one. A necessary change for logic.
- 414.24 crapless] into a cold sweat FE315
Even though it appears that Warren made this change in ink on TS424, it seems clearly to have been initiated by editorial considerations of taste. Since “crapless” is much stronger, better, than the cliché “into a cold sweat” RE restores TS.
- 415.30 ride. I had been to a drug store, too, and came equipped for all contingencies. (At this stage the wisdom had not yet been converted into nobility, or if I had been noble, well, I had been noble and proved that I could be noble, and having proved it, it was proved and there it was, and had nothing in the world to do with the fact that I had gone to the drug store, while Anne was doing some shopping, and walked to the back, and had asked the pasty-faced leering youth for the classic commodity.)] ride. FE315
RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS425, clearly on grounds of taste.
- 427.8 might FE324] would be ready to TS438
RE accepts this TS change as Warren’s.

- 427.20 Even these devices, however, began to pall. They were a phase. Then came the final phase, the phase of the Great Sleep. I had once before experienced this—back when I was working on a dissertation on Cass Mastern for the Ph.D.—and so I knew the symptoms of its coming on.] Then came the final phase, the phase of the Great Sleep. FE324
 TS439 ink deletion. RE restores.
- 427.30 adventures, if I had had any adventures] occupation FE324
 RE restores TS439. Warren’s ink change seems to have been dictated by Davis’s question in the margin.
- 429.1 reaches] she reaches FE325
 TS440 ink addition. RE restores typescript. Grammar might require a subject, “she,” but the sense and idiom of the entire passage don’t.
- 429.8 Well, after I walked out from Lois’s apartment I was just a newspaper man until that day I walked out from the *Chronicle* office after the row with Jim Madison, the editor, over my piece on Willie Talos. That was the way I went.
 NE restores this paragraph, deleted in ink from TS440 (FE326).
- 429.26 him, and after he had been put into a hole in the moss-garlanded churchyard, and after the eulogies had been pronounced and the newspapers had dug pictures and biographical data out of the morgue (“Wasn’t that old buzzard Governor one time? Did he ever get mixed up in anything?”),] him, FE326
 RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS441.
- 430.6 work. He opened his office in the city, and as his fame and practice grew, retired more and more from the world until he lived in the crummy apartment house.] work. FE326
 RE restores this passage, deleted in ink from TS442.
- 433.30 History, the Last Man on that Last Coast, FE329] History, TS446
 RE accepts this as a Warren proof revision. Hard to imagine Davis inserting something like this.
- 440.13 buck] buck-naked FE335
 RE rejects the editorial change in favor of both TS453 and previous typescript’s “buck.”
- 451.23 draw bridge FE343] cantilever bridge TS465
 RE accepts this change made by Warren in ink on TS465, though suggested by Davis in the margin, who noted that cantilever bridges are not draw bridges, and that the passage calls for a draw bridge. Warren also made the change on TS466 (RE452). Warren wrote “draw bridge” as two words, and an editor marked them to be printed as one word.
- 452.13 open bridge FE344] cantilever TS466
 RE accepts the inked TS revision. An editor added “draw” between “open” and “bridge.” See previous note.
- 453.14 known.] known. And I love him. I love him, I guess. I guess that is the reason. FE345
 TS467 Added in proof, this sentence seems a sentimentalization of Anne’s relationship with Willie, and is a little hard to believe, though clearly it intends to make Anne’s relationship with Willie morally acceptable, somehow. It doesn’t. It is unnecessary; it unduly oversimplifies Anne, and RE rejects.
- 459.6 It was a fascinating spectacle. They would perform it quite shamelessly before me. Until finally I began to wonder if the fact of the eyes upon them was not, perhaps, something necessary for their own satisfaction in the performance. Otherwise the whole business might have been like playing by rote an old role to a completely empty theater. For it was played by rote, almost. Whatever fine content of fresh emotion might be in it, I could predict each turn and stage of development, as though I were watching the stars in a ballet I knew by heart. I knew it so well that sometimes I would just get up and walk out, for the suspense was gone.
 RE restores this paragraph, deleted in ink from TS474 (FE349), perhaps by Warren, after Davis’s suggestion that the scene repeats an earlier version of the scene. It doesn’t however, even if only because of Jack’s sense that Sadie and Willie are “performing” “quite shamelessly” for him as an audience.
- 459.18 talked. She would stand quiet, but with the engine still running, as you could tell by the minute vibration of the chassis even if the expensive power was throttled down so low it didn’t make more than a whisper.] talked. FE349
 RE restores this passage, inked out on TS474.
- 462.4 insinuation] insinuation FE351
 TS477 Ink change. RE restores TS.
- 464.5 You] If you have ever been down toward the Gulf, you FE353

- Davis's ink emendation on TS480. This emendation carries the editor's need for clarity to ridiculous, patronizing extremes.
- 464.33 run or as though I were a sneak thief in a dark house and a board might creak or as though I were the ravishing Tarquin Superbus tiptoeing down the back hall toward the room where Lucrece lay with a bosom gleaming silver in the dark. But it wasn't dark, it was broad, sun-dazzled daylight, and if any eye was spying on me I had no cover. And I wasn't either a thief or a Tarquin. And there wasn't any Lucrece in the house, either. Just Lucy Talos. Who opened the door when I knocked. ¶ She] run. ¶ Lucy FE353
TS481 Ink deletion. RE restores. This is precisely the kind of historical reference that Jack loves to play with.
- 471.5 I got to the Landing in the early evening, found that my mother and the Young Executive had gone down the Row for a while after dinner, and got the cook to give me a sandwich and a glass of milk. Then I went out on the side gallery, which was screened, and ate my sandwich and drank my milk and watched the night deepen over the bay. After a while, my mother and the Young Executive came home, and brought out the makings and sat with me on the gallery. We had a very decorous conversation, in which we all pretended to be total strangers just met. That arrangement worked very well.
TS488 RE restores this significant paragraph, deleted in proof. At home, Jack, as always, becomes a child again. Also, he doesn't want to rush things, for he knows that what he is about to do is momentous. FE358
- 471.28 shoes. I wasn't too old for that. FE358] shoes. TS489
RE accepts this proof change as Warren's, as it attests to more of Jack's resumed childishness upon returning home.
- 474.13 room FE360] room, on the iron bed, TS492
RE accepts this TS ink deletion. In Chapter 6, during his abortive sexual encounter with Anne in his old room, they stand "in the middle of a bare, shadowy room (iron bed, old dresser, pine table, trunks and books and male gear—for I hadn't let my mother turn that room into a museum)" (RE409). But in Chapter 3, in a scene that takes place earlier in the text but later in Jack's life, after he has gone to work for the Boss, he occasions to note that the "white iron bed" in his room had been replaced by a "big fine old family bed, which had come from somebody else's family" (RE162).
- 484.30 you—] you—I could just tell you something— FE369
TS504 Proof change. More editorial explaining, which RE rejects.
- 485.1 say] tell me FE369
TS504 Proof change. More unnecessary editorial explanation, as in the previous entry.
- 486.8 my bed FE370] the iron bed
Ink change on TS506, but necessary for consistency with entry for 474.13.
- 486.8 sleep. It was a troubled sleep, but it was a sleep, and when you are asleep you may be troubled but you are, after all, asleep. Something whispers all the time to tell you that you are asleep and that the troubles are only a dream.] sleep. FE370
TS506 Proof deletion. RE restores.
- 486.30 "You FE370] "You made him do it. You
TS506 Ink deletion. RE accepts as authorial, if only because this is not the kind of change Davis has usually made.
- 487.24 putting that out] carrying on FE371
TS507 Ink change made at Davis's request, but Warren's original is clear enough.
- 490.16 made?] made? At least that was the way I argued the case back then. FE372
Warren revised this paragraph on TS510, at Davis's suggestion: "Then & Now," Davis writes in the margin, to ask for more chronological clarity. But the paragraph is sufficiently clear without the additions.
- 490.29 Randall] Daniell FE373
TS511 Proof change here and at 490.31. No reason to accept.
- 501.26 chamber-pots] urinals FE382
TS522 Proof change. "Urinals" may be a little more precise a term historically, but it's a bit too sanitary and doesn't carry the full dimension of meaning of "chamber-pots," which fits Jack's sense of humor perfectly, not to say the material conditions under which doubtless most of Willie's constituents live: cf. the opening chapter in which Willie discusses having taken some

- pains to hide his pappy's new indoor toilet from the neighbors so he can't be accused of putting on airs.
- 502.29 once FE382] once, as you may recall, TS524
TS reading is a residue from an earlier draft, apparently. But there's no earlier mention of Larson as a gambling-house operator in the setting copy, so RE accepts the FE correction.
- 508.30 bothers FE387] bother TS530
RE accepts this proof correction. No evidence that Sugar-Boy, for all his stuttering, makes this kind of error.
- 509.20 They love him because he is a challenge and a profession. They love him, too,] They love him FE388
RE restores this TS531 ink deletion.
- 511.30 Hardwick RE] Hardwick TS530, FE389
A typing error. RE emends to preliminary TS.
- 519.6 minutes. She sat there, staring down at her desk, as though she were just discovering me.] minutes.
FE395
TS542 Proof deletion. RE restores.
- 524.10 a negative skull, but in the lateral view a fracture and dislocation of the fifth and sixth RE] and sixth
TS548
RE emends from a preliminary typescript. Obviously the typist's eyes inadvertently skipped a line of the typescript. Davis queried Warren about the passage as it stands in TS; Warren didn't go back to the previous typescript, but simply grabbed a phrase from the Adam's later description of the injury.
- 531.24 I do not have the tidy passion of the housewife, but] But FE405
No reason for this inked deletion from TS556. Davis's note in margin: "?/out"
- 533.15 Talos with her baby boy.] Stark. FE406
TS558 Ink deletion. RE restores. Davis wanted Warren to alter here and on the next page references to changing the baby's diapers. But the passages bear important resonances with other parts of the novel.
- 534.1 baby's bottle and change him] the baby FE406
This is a nonsensical alteration in ink on TS559, assuredly editorial.
- 534.30 togetherness as direction] direction FE407
NE restores this TS560 ink deletion.
- 535.1 But to return to that day: The fact of my ignorance during the course of the events of the day creates a peculiar problem in narrative. Things as they came to me that day were only, or almost only, appearances, for I lacked knowledge of their logic. But if I narrate them in terms of the logic later perceived, that is, in terms of the principle in which inheres their reality, something is wrong, too. For in art as in life there is a sin against Appearance as well as against Reality. And there are no descending circles and only one flame in Hell. But it is a beauty. ¶ I shall keep distinct what I knew that day, and what I came subsequently to know.
RE restores these two important paragraphs. One editor queries on TS560: "LAMBERT: should this be cut out?" and Davis responds "Yes." On a preliminary TS, somebody inks the passage out with a note: "avoid this [indecipherable word]'s aside." Did Warren then delete this on carbon typescript and TS? RE opts to restore the passage, however, since it seems so completely integral to the novel's themes, and to place Warren a bit in advance of current narrative theory: here he deals with the problem of the position of the narrator vis-à-vis his or her relationship to the materials being narrated—and therefore integral to the novel's treatment of history and the writing of history.
- 543.20 that day] today FE413
TS569 Davis suggests the change to "today" in the margin, and somebody, perhaps the compositor, makes the change. But Anne is distinguishing between what has just happened "today" from the something that happened to *her* on "that day," an earlier time. Warren leaves the reference ambiguous, but clearly he meant a distinction which Davis's revision removes.
- 543.29 somebody] somebody—a man—that was all he said— FE414
Warren ink alteration TS569. Apparently Warren "fixed" this, here and on TS590, to respond to Davis's question on the verso of this page: "Don't think these 'they's' can stand now, after 'a man.' But to substitute 'we' would make confusion. Can you fix?" That is, Davis for some reason wants to clarify the gender of the caller, though clarification here doesn't seem at all necessary. In

fact, clarification seems to violate the drama of the scene; it seems perfectly natural—and certainly within the idiom—for Anne to say “they” rather than “a man,” even if only to keep alive the possibility that the mysterious caller was a woman—perhaps Sadie? So that even though this is a Warren revision, RE restores TS reading, because Warren revised in response to a problem that Davis created. The other possibility is that Warren initiated the revision here, to clarify, and Davis then revised in the subsequent passages, changing “they” to “that man;” if we accept the revision here as Warren’s, is it necessary to accept Davis’s changes subsequently? Wouldn’t it be acceptable for Anne to continue to say “they”? and no less natural for Jack to say “A man” on TS594?. RE restores TS in all instances.

- 544.30 isn’t like that. It isn’t] wasn’t like that. It wasn’t FE415
 TS570 Davis apparently changed the tense here to match Anne’s tense in the first sentence of this paragraph, but there’s no need to.
- 545.15 went down the elevator] stepped out the door of the apartment house into the rain, FE415
 TS570 Ink change. Warren made this unnecessary correction in response to Davis’s query in the next paragraph about “letting the seat get wet.” But readers can infer that it’s raining from the context.
- 557.19 again. “You got to believe that.” FE425] again. TS583
 This seems to be a Warren ink addition to TS not prompted by Davis and RE accepts.
- 557.23 whispered.] whispered. “If it hadn’t happened, it might—have been different—even yet.” ¶ He barely got the last words out, he was so weak. FE425.
 TS583 This proof addition does not add much to the scene. The nurse’s signal says it all.
- 562.13 up,] down, FE428
 TS587 Warren typed “down” in the previous sentence, “up” in this one. An editor, apparently, changed to “down” for consistency here. The typescript here reads exactly as the preliminary typescript, so it seems to be deliberate on Warren’s part.
- 562.19 I put up at the hotel, and as I signed the register I thought it was sort of extravagant for me to be paying room rent anywhere when it looked like I spent all my time hanging around hospitals and cemeteries. But that was over now, I amended. They had shoveled it in over the Boss, and he was the last.] My mother and her Theodore were off on a trip and I had the house to myself. It was as empty and still as a morgue. But even so, it was a bit more cheerful than the hospitals and cemeteries I had been hanging around. What was dead in this house had been dead a long time, and I was accustomed to the fact. I was even becoming accustomed to the fact of the other deaths. They had shoveled it over Judge Irwin, and Adam Stanton, and the Boss. FE428
 RE restores the TS588 reading, despite the clear evidence in the writing that Warren did the revising. However, he seems to be responding to precisely the kind of clarification that Davis asks for throughout the novel. Here the revision clarifies the issue, raised two paragraphs down, of which gallery he and Anne sit on—the Stantons’ or the Burdens’. This is not really an issue, however, since they could just as easily be sitting on one as on the other. What is at issue in the original passage is Jack’s hatred of his boyhood home. On TS619 (RE594), for example, when his mother asks him to return to Burden’s Landing, he says that he asked her to tell him what she wanted over the phone, “for I still did not want to go back.” And on TS623 (RE597) he is even more specific, telling his mother: “Damn it . . . it is your house and you can do whatever the hell you want to with it. I wouldn’t have it. As soon as I get my bag out of there this afternoon I’ll never set foot in it again, and that is a fact. I don’t want it and I don’t care what you do with it or with your money. I don’t want that either. I’ve always told you that.”
- 564.1 somebody] some man FE429
 RE restores TS589. See entry at 543.29 on the gender of the mysterious caller.
- 565.10 say.”] say—” she hesitated—“except that it was a man. I’m sure he said man.” FE430
 Warren’s TS590 addition here seems clearly prompted by Davis’s wish to make clear the gender of the caller, and not by any particular dramatic need in the scene. RE restores the typescript reading. See entry at 543.29.
- 567.17 lounge] longue FE432
 TS592 Chaise lounge is an acceptable alternate spelling for this in some dictionaries, and it surely suggests an American pronunciation rather than a French. RE accepts the TS.
- 569.32 knew] ought to have known FE434

Warren's TS595 ink revision is in response to Davis's query. But the revision doesn't noticeably improve the passage; there's nothing in the revision that's not in the original. In fact, in a way, the revision seems to contradict the first part of the exclamation.

593.23 came back to FE452] am back at TS618

TS Ink changes. RE accepts the tense changes in this paragraph as probably Warren's.

596.19 at the knock FE454] when they knocked. TS621

Authorial lapse. It's clear that only Jo-Belle takes the tray up to his mother's room. RE accepts FE correction.

605.18 father.] father, or of having delivered his two friends into each other's hands and death. FE461

TS630 This proof addition seems clearly Warren's, but probably was suggested by Davis for some kind of completion of Jack's burdens. But here he speaks directly and powerfully about having killed his father, and the power is diluted somewhat by the addition. He deals with his delivery of his two friends into each other's hands two paragraphs later. Thus RE rejects the revision and restores the TS reading.

609.4 next summer] summer of this year, 1939, FE464

TS634 RE rejects this change in chronology.

609.13 Time FE464] time TS634

Proof change. RE accepts, though hesitantly. Warren has capitalized "Time" (except when it is the first word in a sentence) only 5 times, each time to give to the word some abstract quality. Its privileged position here, as the final word in the novel and hardly to be overlooked by even a casual proofreader, is clearly a claim on such importance and RE accepts the proof change.

[Place endnotes as footnotes on appropriate pages. –eds.]

¹I want to thank John Burt, William Bedford Clark, James Justus, James A. Grimshaw, Jr., and James A. Perkins for their generosity in commenting on the textual variants from among which I had to choose; and Joseph Blotner, who patiently worked through the typescript with me, helping me distinguish Warren's handwriting from Lambert Davis's. They were invariably helpful and kind to a Warren neophyte. I also am indebted to André Bernard and David Hough of Harcourt Brace, who encouraged and supported this project at every stage. Finally, I want to thank my editorial assistants at the University of Southern Mississippi, Autumn Pennington and Stacie McCormick, for their efficient hard work and their unfailing good humor.

²*Robert Penn Warren's All the King's Men: Three Stage Versions*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

³For permission to quote from Warren's letters here I am indebted to John Burt, Literary Executor of Warren's estate; for permission to quote from Davis's letters, I am grateful to André Bernard of Harcourt Brace.

⁴David Hough, Houghton Mifflin San Diego, email communication 15 October 2000.