Editor's Notes

If you have published on Pater recently, please send us a reprint or bibliographic note to ensure prompt notice in the PN bibliography.

NEWS

Samuel Wright is in the course of preparing an Index to Pater's work of about 800-1000 pages. The works covered will be:

- Ten Volumes (Marius= two)
- Uncollected Essays by Walter Pater (1903) ed. Thomas Mosher.
- Sketches and Reviews (1919) ed. Mordell: two items:
  - "Aesthetic Poetry"
  - "Coleridge as a Theologian"
  - "Children in Italian and English Design" (1872)
  - "Imaginary Portraits. 2 An English Poet" (1931)
  - "Love in Idleness" (1883)
  - "The English School of Painting" (1885)
  - "English at the Universities" (1886)
  - "Vernon Lee's 'Juvenalia'

The primary purpose is to enable one to find, whether the one word, or mentions of a word or idea throughout the entire opus. While every item will be annotated, the length of notes varies greatly from two or three lines to eight pages. The work includes many grouped entries such as "temples", "flowers", and "formula".

* Francis C. McGrath has completed the MS of a book entitled Pater's Modernism which treats Modernist elements in Pater's philosophy and aesthetics.

* Billie Inman spoke to members of the Marlowe Society at the King's School, Canterbury in September on Pater as a boy at the King's School, his achievement, and the enduring appeal of his writings. The meeting was arranged by Mr. Duesbury, Head of English, Mr. Pollak, and Mr. Brodie.

Ian Fletcher is Visiting Professor at Arizona State University at Tempe for the session 1983/4.
The house in Harbledown Court where Pater lived while attending the King's School is now for sale at £49,500.

Notes

'Shie la Grant Duff says in the preface of The Parting of Ways: A Personal Account of the Thirties, just published in England by Peter Owen, that while writing she was "often conscious of the words of Walter Pater, so dear to my grandfather: 'Not to discriminate every moment some passionate attitude in those about us and in the brilliance of their gifts some tragic dividing of forces on their ways is, on this short day of frost and sun, to sleep before evening'." Curiously, she fails to say which of her two famous grandfathers she is referring to: her paternal grandfather, Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff, whom she identifies as a leading Liberal MP and Governor of Madras, but whom Victorian scholars know as the author of the many volumes of diaries, or her maternal grandfather, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, whom we know as the father of Bank Holiday and also a prominent Liberal M.P., as well as the author of books on many subjects, including archeology, biology, entomology, and literature. Since she says she never knew him, as he died the month she was born, her reference is probably to Grant Duff. In any case, it apparently suggested her title, which is interesting since the book concerns her desperate and eventually unsuccessful attempt to warn the British about Hitler's designs on Czechoslovakia—an unpateresque endeavor. She did, of course, make many of the friends who influenced her career in political journalism when she was a student at Oxford, among them Isaiah Berlin.' (Martha S. Vogeler.)

Ellis R. Hall, author of an M.A. dissertation submitted to Manchester in June this year, offers the following description of his research on 'Kant, Schiller, and Walter Pater: A Comparative Reading.'

This thesis tries to go some way towards resolving the conflict which has arisen in recent critical interpretation of Pater's philosophical standpoint. For while there has been general agreement that eighteenth and early nineteenth century German thought contributed much towards its shaping, opinions have been divided on the question of its precise location and have ranged from viewing Pater as a Hegelian idealist to regarding him as a champion of contemporary positivist/empiricist attitudes. The solution advanced suggests that even a quite an early stage in the development of his outlook Pater was contemplating a synthesis of positivism and idealism through a cosmology similar to T.H. Green's, constructed around ideas derived from Kant and Schiller.

Divided into three basic sections, the thesis begins with a detailed examination of texts, and establishes the centrality of Kantian epistemology — or rather Pater's concept of it — to his own world-view. The Conclusion's evocation of the isolation of the individual consciousness within the flux, from which Pater's aesthetic may be seen to proceed, is shown to parallel his description of Kant's "Copernican Revolution" in "Coleridge's Writings". The connection is confirmed by a paragraph in MS bMS 1150 (3) which, effectively providing a gloss on the "Conclusion", accredits Kant with having laid the theoretical foundations for the slippage experienced by the modern sensibility — a point reiterated in the lecture on Prosper Merimée. A close reading of "Style" reveals that the active process of cognition with which Pater imprisons us inside our own senses also that which he views the artist employing in the formulation of a "personal sense of fact" — the all-important subjective apprehension of reality that makes possible the truly beautiful work of art. His argument that only such an account of experience can attain its artistic goal of 'objectivity', coupled with a characteristic emphasis on form as principle aesthetic carrier, elicits the conclusion that he equates the form of the art-object with that of Kant's "Transcendental Aesthetic", and that he therefore regards aesthetic formal to be a reflection of a posteriori of a priori informing mechanisms, which allows the percpient an intuition of the "supersensible substrate" underlying the fabric of the phenomenal world. In this way Pater's notion of the transcendency of the art-object is seen as arising in the first instance not from the straightforward Hegelian view of art as the sensuous semblance of the Idea, but rather from the realisation that it has the ability to cast shadows of the categories onto the world of sense.
As a corollary to this, a comparison of Pater's essays with the Kritik der Urtheilskraft reveals points of correspondence, notably on the subject of the "judgement of taste", which Pater views as arising from the free interaction of cognitive faculties in the "imaginative reason"; like Kant, he considers beauty to be universally subjective, springing from immediate perception of sensory data rather than from conscious exercise of the rational faculty.

The second section of the thesis examines the possible influence that Schiller's adaptation of Kant may have exercised over Pater, and in particular attempts to puzzle out the reasoning behind Pater's equation of the experience of aesthetic form with that of a moral state. Again proceeding from a comparison of texts, it is suggested that Pater, rejecting Kant's definition of form as too abstract, opted instead for Schiller's concept of lebende Gestalt - the balanced synthesis of matter and form - as a workable hypothesis of the Beautiful. The process that Pater terms "the removal of surplusage", by which the artist achieves this aesthetic ideal, is found to correspond exactly to the Schillerian procedure of die Wegwerfung des Zufalligen (the "removal of the accidental"). Further instances of borrowings from Schiller occur in the "Conclusion" and in the essays on Giorgione and Winckelmann, where Pater employs ideas advanced in the Briefe über die Aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen concerning the inter-relationship of matter and form in the work of art, and the aesthetic object as a "freedom in appearance". The metaphysical properties with which aesthetic formality is endowed in this account of the mechanism of the Beautiful are shown to have a direct bearing on the conception of the ideal human type outlined in "Diaphaneité" and "Winckelmann", which closely resembles Schiller's schone Seele; it is found that for Pater, as for Schiller, contemplation of the union of matter and form in the work of art leads to the establishment of an ethical condition, since it causes a like synthesis of opposites to come into being within the percipient, uniting the sensuous and formative impulses in an "instinctive morality".

The third and final section attempts to show how the Kantian and Schillerian concepts previously identified interlock to form the central 'core' of Pater's aesthetic theory, and re-examines the epistemological basis of that theory in terms of its ability to accommodate both an empiricist and an idealist world-view. Pater's relativistic interpretation of Kant is traced to his reading of Hume, Berkeley, Heine, Carlyle, and most importantly, Fichte, whose work Die Bestimmung des Menschen appears to have provided the model for the Conclusion's 'Kantian' solipsism. Pater's grounding of aesthetic activity in an a priori process of cognition is further found to have its roots in Coleridge's primary and secondary imagination, and also in Schelling's "poetic intuition", and this suggests that he was thinking in terms of a dualistic cosmology bridged by the individual consciousness.

The thesis concludes with an assessment of the available evidence relating to Pater's Old Mortality Society paper of 20 February 1864. Based partly on Fichte's Uber das Wesen des Gelehrten, this early work seems to have been a common ancestor to both the 'positivist/empiricist' essays of the 1860's and '70's, and the 'idealist' writings of the 1880's and '90's, containing not only the relativistic account of experience promulgated by The Renaissance, but also the idea of the phenomenal manifestation of the Absolute in the collective body of humanity - a subject later explored in the Houghton MS, Marius and Plato and Platonism. The final conclusion drawn is that Pater, like Green, regarded the Kantian cognitive process to lie at the basis of phenomena as the organ of a supra-personal, metphenomenal principle, on the one hand limiting individual consciousness to the cell of subjective experience while on the other collectively manifesting that principle in a teleology expressed in and through the history of human thought.

REVIEWS (edited by Hayden Ward, West Virginia University)

"The Future of Pater Criticism"


In the first essay in Walter Pater: An Imaginative Sense of Fact, the papers of the first international conference on Pater (held at Brasenose College, Oxford in July, 1980) and subsequently reprinted in a special issue of Prose Studies, Gerald Monsman argues that
"at least on the Continent and in a certain few American and British institutions, new critical methodologies better able to make sense of Pater were forged and applied (first the phenomenological method; then, later, modified and somewhat humanized versions of post-structuralism)" and he suggests that "the future of Pater criticism may well lie" in this direction. According to the jacket of Walter Pater, Monsman's introduction does indeed point in this direction, demonstrating "how well Pater's writing responds to the critical approach which has been developed by such writers as Harold Bloom and J. Hillis Miller."

The essays that follow, however, suggest that the future of Pater criticism lies in other directions. According to the jacket, "these essays acknowledge the overriding need in Pater studies to establish fundamental matters of fact, to provide accurate and critically illuminating scholarship, and to recover the many contexts within which Pater worked." Monsman himself emphasizes the fact that "biographical and textual gaps leave readers ignorant in too many critical areas of just what Pater actually did and wrote, and a clear grasp of the personal and intellectual influences on his life and art is hampered."

Hence there is clearly a need, first of all, for a new edition of Pater's work. Sharon Bassett argues that it should be an edition of the original periodical essays. No doubt such an edition would be more popular with readers who prefer Pater's more aggressive "modernist" attacks on his contemporaries to the revised versions which Pater preferred to pass on to posterity. On the other hand, Robert Seiler argues for an edition more in accordance with Pater's wishes. In any case, there remains a need to do for Pater what R.H. Super did for Arnold: print the works in the order of first appearance to reveal how the author's ideas and techniques evolved. Hayden Ward reveals how much work will be required to establish a credible chronology of Pater's composition, in both the initial and revision stages. Nevertheless, it would seem that both the initial and the revised versions need to be included in any new edition of Pater's works, not only for what they would reveal about Pater's development, but also for what they could tell us about the nature of human creativity. Pater's revisions seem to be excellent evidence for the theories of those who suggest that decisions made during revision most clearly reveal the influences of forces other than "individual inspiration" in the creative process.

In addition to work on Pater's revisions of his own texts, accounts of his revisions of the ideas of his precursors and his contemporaries are cited in Seiler's bibliographical essay, "Walter Pater Studies; 1970-1980." Certain kinds of criticism are conspicuously absent from his survey, however, including Sharon Bassett's recent VN article on Pater as a modernist, most of Monsman's essays as well as his latest book, Pater's Art of Autobiography, J. Hillis Miller's article on Pater (Daedalus, 1976), and Harold Bloom's 1974 essay on Pater. These omissions are justified on the grounds of limitations of space and the fact that "Many commentators have been -- to paraphrase T.S. Eliot -- interested, but not exactly in the subject before them; and are learned, but in something quite beside the point; many have extracted 'something from their subject which is not fairly in it'." Seiler's complaint is, apparently, that these commentators have so imaginative a sense of fact that concern for fact itself is displaced altogether. In short, not only is the nature of a new Pater edition in dispute, even the meaning of the title, Walter Pater: An Imaginative Sense of Fact, is debated.

Clearly, if Pater's subjectivist tendencies are carried to their logical conclusion, we verge on solipsism. Indeed, according to J. Hillis Miller, all of Pater's criticism is based on "solipsistic premises" while Harold Bloom defines Pater's "aesthetic Man" as one who "accepts the truths of solipsism and isolation," one who understands that the Romantics "were not nature-poets, but rather exemplars of the power of the mind, a power exerted against the object-world, or mere universe of death." Monsman takes this approach to his paper: "Taking his stance in radical relativity (one lesson he did learn from modern science), Pater denied any form of absolute or wholly objective knowledge. ... Pater's relativistic, anti-mimetic stance grounded itself in a subjective poetics of prose which insists that all literary uses of language will be self-expressive." Monsman argues that Pater's "Hippolytus," for instance, "really veils a portrait of himself" and he proceeds in Bloom's psychoanalytic style to construct a "psychic profile for the elusive Walter Pater."

In the very next essay, however, Billie Inman argues that even in the "Conclusion" to The Renaissance Pater rejected the solipsistic tendencies he discovered in science and philosophy. She admits that "in the first half of the 'Conclusion' Pater shows that
philosophy . . . can only consign the human mind to a solipsistic isolation. These are the 'truths' that 'the modern world is in possession of,' to which Pater had referred contemptuously in the paragraph preceding the conclusion to 'William Morris' -- truths that do not make the spirit free but overwhelm it with the sense of death." However, Inman points out that in the second half of the "Conclusion" Pater rejects solipsism and the philosophical cast of mind associated with it for a life of sensations and impressions. She points out the parallels with Hume, who ended Part I of A Treatise on Human Nature "by vowing not to be ruled by philosophy," and with Fichte who felt solipsism was so absurd that it demanded "a new approach to the whole question of truth."

Nor is the praise of solipsism the only feature of Bloom's approach implicitly criticized in this collection of essays. Bloom's emphasis on the weight of the past, on the castrating influence of long-dead Precursors, does not seem very relevant to most of these authors, with the exception of Monsman. Most of the contributors to this volume focus on the interaction between a creative genius and his contemporaries, all those influential figures whose lives extended into his own. Pater's textual revisions reveal, as Sharon Bassett puts it, "a growing wish to be accepted by his contemporaries," and Inman, apparently influenced by David DeLaura's study of Pater, Newman, and Arnold, reveals Pater's creative revision of the ideas of such contemporaries as Spencer, Renan, Baudelaire, Morris, and Swinburne. Jowett was another important contemporary, Monsman, Laurel Brake, and Seiler remind us, but the dominant contemporary for Pater was clearly Ruskin. Seiler points out that Michael Levey's The Case of Walter Pater focuses on Pater's response to Ruskin, but the best discussion of Ruskin's influence in this collection is J.B. Bullen's comparison of the responses of Ruskin and Pater to Michelangelo. On the whole, though Bullen avoids Bloom's terminology and his psychoanalytic context, it is significant that Bullen's approach appears akin to Bloom's, applied now to a contemporary rather than a deceased Precursor.

A comparison of these two essays reveals that the "new critical methodologies" and the traditional ones have far more in common than we suspect. Bloom argues that ultimately Pater stands in "no need of psychoanalytic reduction," and that, in Pater's case Ruskin, a contemporary, can be a more important influence than a distant precursor. Bloom focuses on how Pater "subverted Ruskin's influence by going back to their common ancestor, Wordsworth" and by emphasizing the value of the Renaissance rather than the Middle Ages. Bullen concentrates on Ruskin's representation of Michelangelo's decadent betrayal of medievalism for the sake of the "partly scientific and completely lascivious enthusiasm of literature and painting, renewed under classical influence." Pater responded with a reversal of Ruskin's argument which, ironically, appealed to the same audience: that is, Pater emphasized Michelangelo's medieval heritage: "'He comes,' says Pater, 'with a genius spiritualized by the reveries of the Middle Age, penetrated by its spirit of inwardness and introspection'." This approach to Michelangelo was, as Bullen points out, "a highly original one," but the creativity resulted not from psychic combat with a deceased Precursor, but rivalry with a contemporary. This rivalry actually resulted in a leaping over the Ruskin of the Michelangelo lecture to identify with the Ruskin of Modern Painters, who had praised Michelangelo.

Bullen also points out various aspects of influence usually ignored by Bloom, such as the way contemporaries often choose not to confront, but to adapt to each other. He rates Pater's decision, for instance, not to write about the painting and sculpture of Michelangelo, which Ruskin had already discussed, but on the poetry. Another aspect of influence neglected by Bloom but evident in Bullen's essay is the issue of masculinity and femininity. Michelangelo's "ostentatious display of strength and science," said Ruskin, "has a natural attraction for comparatively weak and pedantic persons." Pater responded by stressing the feminine quality of "sweetness" in Michelangelo, anticipating our post-Freudian emphasis on a balance of masculine and feminine qualities, an ideal that might help a biographer avoid the extremes of biographer "as widow" and biographer "as Judas" which Laurel Brake illustrates in her fascinating essay.

Unlike much Continental literary criticism, there is no attempt to this volume to work out the implications of a single dominant theoretical paradigm. Rather, as if in recognition that the most successful species in the history of evolution are those that are most flexible, most of the essays in this collection reflect the more Anglo-American habit of adopting any approach that enhances our appreciation and understanding of the
literature, a habit that attempts to keep the focus on the literature rather than on literary theory per se. This is not to say that an approach like Bloom's is to be ignored, but rather that, as Pater put it, we should not become the slaves of any "theory or idea or system which requires of us the sacrifice of any part" of our experience. Billie Inman traces this idea of Pater's to Renan: "Eclecticism is ... the obligatory method of our age .... Schools are in science what parties are in politics: each one is right by turns; it is impossible for an enlightened man to shut himself up in one of them so exclusively as to shut his eyes to what the others hold to be reasonable." Eclecticism is often best represented not by works of single authors but by collections of essays such as this one, a collection which thus does indeed suggest "the future of Pater criticism."

Jerome Bump
University of Texas

RECENT PUBLICATIONS
(Compiled and annotated by Bernard Richards, Billie Inman, and Laurel Brake)

Books
J.A. Gere and J. Sparrow, eds., Geoffrey Madan's Notebooks. OUP. 1981. Although Geoffrey Madan was born the year after Pater died, he moved in circles of interest to Paterians. His father was a Brasenose Fellow and Bodley's librarian, and Madan himself was an intimate friend of A.C. Benson. Pater appears once in the section devoted to Benson (p. 44 ff) but the notebooks as a whole and the introduction provide considerable insight into a world that touched on Pater's.


Essays
Paul Barolsky. 'Walter Pater's Renaissance', Virginia Quarterly Review (Spring, 1982), 208-20. This evocative article has at its heart a spirited defense of the historical sense in The Renaissance. Barolsky gives multiple examples of Pater's pioneering and vivid historical analogies, and notes the 'veritable thesaurus of interrelated words' expressing these interconnections which Pater uses. He shows how Pater's focus on the extensive role of Neoplatonism in Renaissance theology, philosophy, poetry, architecture, and visual art is a new and historical perception to which twentieth-century historians of the Renaissance are indebted. Pater's evaluations of Renaissance artists such as Luca della Robbia and Giorgione are echoed by our contemporaries. Barolsky points to a variety of cultural traditions which Pater delineates in The Renaissance -- histories of 'visionariness' and of French, English, and German literature, for example. Barolsky suggests that though 'the poetical structure of Pater's intellectual history is ... so overwhelming that its historical value has to be excavated', 'in their analyses of the continuities of Western culture, the great scholarly books of our own time, 'Curtius' European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, Seznec's The Survival of the Pagan Gods, Bolgar's The Classical Heritage, and Panofsky's Renaissance and Renascences all follow the path that Pater first struck'.

Charles S. Blinderman. 'Huxley, Pater and Protoplasm', Journal of the History of Ideas, 43 (Summer, 1982), 477-86. Studies the way in which Huxley's view of transience coincides with Pater's, and decides that Paterian aesthetics is joined to Darwinian materialism by a shared belief in protoplasm. Ferdinand Cohn and Robert Koch discovered in 1850 that the constituents of plants and animals were identical. Huxley's 'On the Physical Basis of Life' is printed (Feb. 1869) at a time when Pater's views were being made public.
Hugh Brigstocke. 'Lord Lindsay as a Collector', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 64 (Spring, 1982), 287-333. This article provides insight into attitudes of an active collector toward early Christian art and 17c pictures between 1840 and the mid 1870s. In BJR, 64 (Autumn, 1981), 27-60, the same author discusses Lindsay and his Sketches of the History of Christian Art (1847) which was inspired by and critical of Rio's De la Poésie Chretienne (1836). Lindsay saw his principal challenge in the need to reinterpret Rio's concept of the école mystique in terms which 'would be acceptable to moderate members of the Church of England but which could not be construed as lending support to the Puseyites'.

Robert F. Fleissner. 'Prufrock's Ricardian Posture', Research Studies, 47 (1979), 27-36. In a comparison of Eliot's Prufrock with Richard II, rather than Hamlet as the poem suggests, Fleissner shows that Pater's portrayal of an effeminate Richard and stress on the 'irony of kingship' in 'Shakespeare's English Kings' influenced Eliot in creating Prufrock's character and religious difficulties. (See this author's earlier "Prufrock," Pater, and Richard II: Retracing a Denial of Princesship', American Literature, 38 (1966), 120-23). Prufrock's and Pater's views of Richard are both characterised by 'lyrical incompetence'. 'The main irony...in Prufrock's situation is that in taking pains to deny being a Hamlet, he allies himself with a pre-Hamlet type—just as Eliot likewise in disdaining Romantic subjectivity ... allowed himself ... to follow the Romantic tradition in his early poetry.'

David Hilliard, 'Unenglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism and Homosexuality', Victorian Studies, 25 (Winter, 1982), 180-210. As part of 'the historical evidence' for the ways in which a homosexual sensibility has expressed itself within Anglo-Catholicism, the author cites Pater's friendship with Richard C. Jackson and their mutual involvement with the Anglo-Catholic religious community of the Order of St. Augustine, St. Austin's Priory in Walworth. Although Hilliard's treatment of Pater is cursory and uncritical, the cumulative information and bibliography enshrined in the piece may be useful to Paterians.


'Pater in The Portrait of a Lady and The Golden Bowl, Including Some Unpublished Henry James Letters', The Henry James Review, 3 (Winter, 1982), 80-95. Prints six letters in which James expresses his private opinion of Pater -- four not previously printed: i) to Arthur Symons (7 Sept. 1894) excusing himself from contributing to a memorial volume; ii) to Gosse (8 Nov. 1896) on his reaction to Gaston de Latour; iii) to A.C. Benson (31 May 1906) on his critical biography; iv) to Grace Norton (1 May 1878) on the portrayal of Pater in The New Republic. Tintner compares James' gracious words of praise in them with the 'artful uses' of Pater which James makes in the two novels of her title as well as in two short stories, 'The Sweetheart of M. Briseux' (1873) and 'Glasses' (1896), and two other novels, Confidence (1880) and The Princess Casamassima (1896). Tintner suggests that James drew on 'Imaginary Portraits: The Child in the House' (1878) for the title of A Portrait of a Lady, and on Pater himself and Mr. Rose for Gilbert Osmond who embodies James' 'severe criticism of the passive appreciation of art as the end of civilized existence as propounded by Pater'. Debts to the 'Conclusion' and 'The School of Gioragione' are revealed in James' conception of Adam Verver's notion of success and Charlotte's role as a 'recent acquisition' in The Golden Bowl. Where Pater in the Giorgione essay calls for the 'same measure of value' to all sensations, James implies that human property 'requires a different kind of handling'. 'James was attracted by Pater's point of view that fitted into his own
predispositions, but he held out against the egotism and antihumanism that is essentially in the center of single-minded aestheticism'. Tintner regards James as fighting his way beyond Pater's passive philosophy. James seems to have written a review of The Renaissance in 1873, which was sent to T.S. Perry, but neither printed version (if there was one) nor manuscript has ever been found.

Reviews

Barrie Bullen. The Renaissance, ed. Donald Hill (U. of Calif. P., 1980), JEGP (Jan. 1982), 141-44. Hill's Renaissance is a source book for Pater scholars as well as a good edition, but Bullen would have preferred the 1873 rather than 1893 text and more attention to visual material in the annotations.

Jerome Bump. Literary Architecture: Essays Toward a Tradition. Walter Pater, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Marcel Proust, Henry James, by Ellen Eve Frank (U. of Calif. P., 1979), Comparative Literature, 34 (Winter, 1982), 88-9. Bump thinks that Frank's 'daring hypotheses' seem 'scattered, haphazard, often highly speculative, sometimes virtually unsupported or even irresponsible', and that the illustrations could have been better chosen. Her 'wide-ranging' inquiry is commended, but Bump suggests that more scholarly work remains to be done on analogy in Pater and other Victorian writers.

Bernard Richards. Literary Architecture, by Ellen Eve Frank, Essays in Criticism, 32 (July, 1982), 283-86. The reviewer suggests two new critical fallacies to add to the Verbal Icon: 'the imitative fallacy' (that it is somehow effective to criticize a work of art by adopting a style similar to the work's), and the 'etymological fallacy' (that the critic can add to the richness of a poem by invoking the whole legacy of the Indo-European languages). Frank's work is said to be suggestive but not sufficiently rigorous.

John J. Conlon. 'The Invention of Walter Pater' (rev. of M. Levey, The Case of Walter Pater and G.C. Monsman, Walter Pater's Art of Autobiography), The Arnoldian, 9 (Spring, 1982), 73-80. The strength of Levey's biography lies in the first seven chapters which contain new material concerning Pater's family, early environments, and Pater's responses to the visual arts. Its flaws include unsubstantiated speculations including a roman à clef reading of Pater's fiction. Levey's book, however, is 'fine reading, though it does aim at a popular audience'. Conlon has very high praise for Monsman who 'has done an inestimably admirable job both of presenting the case for deconstructing Pater's work and of bringing that task to one possible perfection'. Concerning Pater's formation as a critic, Monsman usefully stresses the influences of Sainte Beuve and Baudelaire. Conlon admires the finish of Monsman's chapters, and suggests that Monsman's reading of Pater's work is an important 'new invention' of Pater which will disturb the universe of more traditionally minded Paterians.

Billie Andrew Inman. Walter Pater: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings About Him, compiled and edited by Franklin E. Court (De Kalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois U.P., 198C Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography, 5 (1981), 256-58. While this accurate and detailed bibliography provides 'the first comprehensive base that scholars have had for generalizing about the course of Pater criticism', it has notable omissions and covers material only to 1973. Its brief introduction does not 'reap the full fruit of the Bibliography'. But it is an 'important and satisfying book'.

Dissertations (U.S.A.)

Helen Elizabeth Watson. 'The Art Criticism of Hazlitt and Pater as a Prose Genre'. Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, 1981. (DAI, 42, 3170-A. Order No. 8123236). 'The fine arts criticism of William Hazlitt and Walter Pater is within a prose tradition specifically expressive and imaginative...Because Hazlitt and Pater do more than interpret art, but present a process of perception, their art criticism is of interest as literature. Pater goes beyond Hazlitt in that he more fully develops and refines this new tradition.'