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ANY PEOPLE HAVE assisted at the birth of this present issue of the *Pater Newsletter*. Indeed, my new function as Editor of the journal has been helped, stimulated, and encouraged immensely by the very efficient and collaborative spirit in which Lesley Higgins, Ken Daley, Catherine Maxwell, Elicia Clements, Megan Becker-Leckrone, and Bill Livolsi have made things happen — on time even! Lesley Higgins has been an invaluable Deputy Editor and highly efficient proof-reader, catching many an error in the last minute. Ken Daley has again produced a fine set of annotations. As a reader of the journal I have always found the bibliographical part of the *Newsletter* particularly useful, and I hope that in the future we can even strengthen this section, given the current increase in Pater scholarship. Catherine Maxwell replaces Carolyn Williams as Book Review Editor. I wish to thank Carolyn warmly for her good work over the years, and to welcome Catherine equally warmly. The present issue contains no fewer than four book reviews, and four more have already been scheduled for the spring issue of the journal as clear testimony to the general growth of interest in Pater.

Elicia Clements is newly appointed Web Editor, and it is our hope that the website — http://www.paternewsletter.org/ — will expand and make much more material available to the general public. Thus a new folder on conferences and conference reports has been added, and we plan to make back issues of the *Pater Newsletter* available in full text on the website in the course of 2012. The website will also be the only place to renew subscriptions in the future. Given the exorbitant rates which banks charge for issuing and cashing cheques these days, it makes little sense to continue using cheques as a method of payment. My first unpleasant public duty as new Editor is, however, to increase subscription rates. The future existence of the *Pater Newsletter* as a biannual journal is important, and subscriptions have been very irregular and remarkably cheap these past years. Neither harmonizes very well with the costs of printing, formatting, and postage,
and I have therefore decided to raise the subscription rate accordingly. Thus only two-year subscriptions will be available at the rate of $30 (U.S.), and I hope this minor increase will not decrease the number of subscribers. Could I, in fact, kindly ask you to renew your subscription on the website within the not too distant future, unless you have paid your subscription within the past six months? The Newsletter bank account needs boosting and muscling up for future issues, and your support will be greatly appreciated.

In her role as Editor of the Newsletter Megan Becker-Leckrone has done excellent work to modernize the journal these past five years. A new design, the website, electronic payment, and a good balance between essays, notices, and bibliographic material are all due to Megan’s efforts. Together with Bill Livolsi, she has formatted the present issue. I am delighted to take over the editorship of the journal after Megan and will do my best to develop the Newsletter even further. The Editorial Board has seen a couple of alterations as part of the change of editors. Thus I would like to thank Franco Marucci, Paul Tucker, and Hayden Ward for their work on the Board these past years and welcome Elisa Bizzotto, Bénédicte Coste, Stefano Evangelista, and Jonah Siegel as new members. The new Editorial Board thus continues the tradition of reflecting the international scope of Pater scholarship with representatives from Northern America, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Japan.

The present issue is unusually packed with material, reflecting the wide range of activities relating to matters Paterian which have taken place these past six months. Whether we can keep up this level of activity in the future remains yet to be seen. Four panels on Pater at a major conference on “Decadent Poetics” at the University of Exeter, preceded by a one-day workshop “Towards a New Edition of the Collected Works of Walter Pater,” constitute the core event this past summer. Sara Lyons – a name new to readers of the Newsletter, but undoubtedly one we will see more of – has, together with Kate Hext, Elicia Clements, and Megan Becker-Leckrone – produced a conference report, abstracts, and minutes from the workshop to give Paterians unable to participate some idea of what went on during those three packed midsummer days. A proposal for a new Collected Works of Walter Pater was
the material outcome of the workshop, largely thanks to the efforts of Lesley Higgins. The proposal is now with Oxford University Press and is currently out with readers; while we eagerly await their response, we thought we would share the proposal with the readers of the Newsletter and invite comments and suggestions from you, the users of a future edition. A section of the next issue of the Newsletter will be set aside to publish any such comments and suggestions, which should be sent directly to the Editor: oesterm@hum.ku.dk. With your efforts, the Newsletter might become a vibrant forum for discussion about that new edition which we all so urgently need to replace the 1910 Library Edition.

The book review section contains four substantial reviews of recent monographs in which Pater is either the pivotal point or a major figure. Catherine Maxwell is doing a fine job to keep us up to date with the major publications in the field, and we look forward to many more book reviews in the future. And finally, two academic essays also contribute towards increasing the volume of the present issue. Elicia Clements explores the subtle dialogue between Pater and Wilde on the interrelationship between words and music, an essay which had its origin as a paper given in one of the four panels at the “Decadent Poetics” conference in Exeter. My own contribution is the publication and contextualization of seven unpublished letters from Pater to Oscar Browning from the late 1870s. The essay forms a part of the larger argument of our need for new textual editions of all of Pater’s writings; I am convinced there are many more letters in trunks and private collections, awaiting publication.
HE INFLUENCE OF Walter Pater on Oscar Wilde has long been established, not just by the literary criticism that circumnavigates the two writers, but also by the authors themselves. Some critics attempt to determine whether or not Wilde was writing in support of Pater or, more characteristically, against him in the novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, and biographical readings (particularly reliant on the reviews they wrote of each other's work) often provide the backdrop against which claims are made for either side. ¹ I would like to shift the focus away from influence, and its embedded hierarchical relation of mentor-to-student, father-to-son, or primary text-to-secondary one, to explore the connection in intertextual terms. By examining the interart thinking that emerges in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and Pater's *The Renaissance*, I hope to create, even in a Wildean sense, more of a dialogue between these two writers that can allow for some of their ambiguities and potentially to open up new possibilities in terms of their mutual concern to articulate aesthetic principles. I am interested in why both writers attempt to reach across the arts for possible answers to their aesthetic queries, and, when comparing this tendency, how the differing art forms are represented in their texts.

To clarify, when I use the word intertextual, I am not merely invoking a dialogue between Wilde and Pater as associated with Wilde's preferred Socratic format for his essays. More precisely, I understand the relationship
between *Dorian Gray* and *The Renaissance* in dialogic terms, to invoke Mikhail Bakhtin's definition of the word. I am doing so for two reasons: to indicate that language is a social phenomenon (it does not exist in isolation, is never neutral nor free from the effects of other discourses); and, by extension, that texts do not merely answer each other, they are always in a state of dialogic relation. Any construction of language "permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of links and interrelationships" (Bahktin 263). Thus, I hope that by reading *Dorian Gray* and *The Renaissance* dialogically, rather than as one text influencing the other, I can avoid slipping into the faulty pattern of binaries that inevitably privileges one author over another in a sort of duel over territory. I am much more interested in marking the subtle shifts that occur to see how they illuminate the texts in new ways.

For many literary historians Pater has been understood as ushering in the Decadent 1890s with his theories about subjectivity in relation to art – as encapsulated in his question from the "Preface" to *The Renaissance*, "What is this song or picture, this engaging personality presented in life or in a book, to me?" (TR xix). Present-day critics, unlike Pater's contemporaries, also note that an important difference between Decadence and Aestheticism is the relationship between art and ethics. Pater's concept of the appreciation of art still maintains an ethical component, which for him is integral to the appreciation of beauty because of his debt to Hellenism, as Linda Dowling has shown. Moreover, as Alex Murray summarizes more recently, "this association of aesthetics with morality and ethics perhaps marks the great divide between Aestheticism and Decadence, a divide that Wilde was to make explicit in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*" (327). Indeed, Wilde probably contributed to the coding of Pater's theories as "immoral." Lord Henry, a caricatured version of Pater, espouses a simplified version of hedonism that provoked strong and outraged responses from contemporaries. Pater, of course, even went so far as to correct Wilde's version of Epicureanism in his review of the novel (no doubt to clarify the theory as much as attempt to clear his own name).

Yet, to suggest that Wilde's aesthetic advocates a sort of depraved indifference is also unfair, and, ultimately, a misreading of the novel. His bold pronouncements against the moralizing of the nineteenth century, a didacticism found so often in what he pejoratively called "journalism" (in other words, reviews of his novel), often elicited heated responses and rejections
that had as much to do with tacit homophobia as with the radical audacity of art for its own sake. And as readers of Wilde’s biography know, the incensed Victorian mindset did come with very real dangers, as evidenced by Wilde’s incarceration and utter isolation at the end of his life. A more subtle reading of *Dorian Gray*, therefore, one that understands Wilde’s aesthetics in dialogue with Pater’s, can detect a shift not just from an ethical aesthetics to one that seems to play fast and loose with morality, but a shift in valuation in the relationships among the arts.

For Pater, as is well known, “*All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music*” (*TR* 106). The dictum, as I understand it, is not about privileging music over and above the other arts as an unattainable ideal, but, as he discusses in “The School of Giorgione,” about how the arts strive after each other, the “great *Andersstreben*” of all art. Music is a high point only because it combines form and substance, “the mere matter of a poem” (106), with “its mode of handling,” as Pater describes it. According to him music has the ability to “penetrate every part of the matter.” It follows that “all art constantly strives after” this objective and “achieves [it] in different degrees” (106). As I have argued elsewhere, Pater’s interest and exploration of what constitutes music, realized in this essay and in *Marius the Epicurean*, suggests a transitory, performative, and efficacious understanding of the sonorous art. It is, for Pater, in addition to enabling a contemplative stance, also an active art form – it does things, to put it simply, it makes them happen and, by and large, this is a desirable aesthetic experience.

Nevertheless, it does so at a distance from representational meaning; it is the facilitator of interconnections among the arts and between form and content because of its distance from propositional content. Yet, this does not make music less meaningful to its perceivers. On the contrary, it brings one closer to “one’s own impression as it really is” (*TR* xix). This other-striving encapsulated by aurality instantiates art in the everyday practices of human beings, precisely because of the ineffable nature of music. Meaning is less fixed; music enables a variety of interpretations or impressions in ways that words do not. It only makes sense to me that a critic who values temperament, “the power of being deeply moved by the presence of beautiful objects” rather than “a correct abstract definition of beauty for the intellect” (*TR* xxi), would find in music a demonstrative art form.
In “The Decay of Lying” Wilde explicitly distinguishes himself from Pater’s aestheticism, and he uses a musical dictum to do so. They converge in their interpretations on several aspects of music’s condition, but they diverge on some important elements as well. Responding to Cyril’s suggestion that, “Art expresses the temper of its age, the spirit of its time, the moral and social conditions that surround it, and under whose influence it is produced” (“Decay” 313), Vivian rejoins with his quintessential art for art’s sake fervor:

‘Certainly not! Art never expresses anything but itself. This is the principle of my new aesthetics; and it is this, more than that vital connection between form and substance, on which Mr. Pater dwells, that makes music the type of all arts.... The highest art rejects the burden of the human spirit, and gains more from a new medium or a fresh material than she does from any enthusiasm for art, or from any lofty passion, or from any great awakening of the human consciousness. She develops purely on her own lines. She is not symbolic of any age. It is the ages that are her symbols.’ (“Decay” 313-14)

Wilde understands music as exemplar because it is the most difficult art to pin down in terms of propositional content; music (or any art for that matter) does not express anything but itself. But unlike Pater, this theory of art leads Wilde to uncouple the balancing act of form and substance encapsulated in Pater’s concept of music. Indeed, in the contentious “Preface” to Dorian Gray, published in the same year, 1891, as the twenty-chapter, single-volume version of the novel, Wilde goes so far as to claim that music is only form (not the combination of matter and its mode of handling): “From the point of view of form, the type of all the arts is the art of the musician” (3). In many ways, then, Wilde empties music of its efficacious capacity. But, importantly, this does not mean it is empty or hollow as an art form. Instead, the sonorous art figures into Wilde’s aesthetic differently from Pater’s because of his shift further away from “the human spirit,” to put it in his terms.

Wilde clarifies his interpretation of music’s import further in “The Critic as Artist: With Some Remarks upon the Importance of Doing Nothing,” first published in 1890.7 Wilde admires music for what he deems to be its lack of
content, I am arguing, but this is because it can enable and instigate multiple impressions. After referring to Pater’s interpretation of La Gioconda, Gilbert employs the overture to Richard Wagner’s Tannhäuser as a musical example that elucidates the myriad impressions art evokes in the perceiver:

‘Sometimes, when I listen to the overture to Tannhäuser, I seem indeed to see that comely knight treading delicately on the flower-strewn grass, and to hear the voice of Venus calling to him from the caverned hill. But at other times it speaks to me of a thousand different things, of myself, it may be, and my own life, or of the lives of others whom one has loved and grown weary of loving, or of the passions that man has known, or of the passions that man has not known, and so has sought for.... To-morrow, like the music of which Aristotle and Plato tell us, the noble Dorian music of the Greek, it may perform the office of a physician, and give us an anodyne against pain, and heal the spirit that is wounded, and “bring the soul into harmony with all right things.” And what is true about music is true about all the arts. Beauty has as many meanings as man has moods. Beauty is the symbol of symbols. Beauty reveals everything, because it expresses nothing. When it shows us itself, it shows us the whole fiery-coloured world.’ ("Critic" 368)

I will return to the mention of the Dorian mode in a moment, but first I want to point out that Wilde draws upon music more directly than Pater for its perceived lack of propositional content. Actually, he rewrites Pater in this segment with all of the quintessentially Paterian words – “fiery-coloured world” is just one example throughout the larger section of the dialogue. Indeed, as Gilbert suggests later in the essay,

‘Music can never reveal its ultimate secret. This, also, is the explanation of the value of limitations in art. The sculptor gladly surrenders imitative colour, and the painter the actual dimensions of form, because by such renunciations they are able to avoid too definite a presentation of the Real, which would be mere imitation, and too definite a realisation of
the Ideal, which would be too purely intellectual.' ("Critic" 370)

To distinguish his concept of art, his blatant rejection of nineteenth-century "realism" or "mere imitation," music comes into his discourse hiding or concealing its meaning. Moreover, both literature and music have indefiniteness and invisibility in common, according to Wilde. In the triumvirate of the three arts foregrounded in Dorian Gray – painting, literature, and music – interestingly enough, painting comes out on the bottom in "The Critic as Artist." As Gilbert declares:

‘Most of our elderly English painters spend their wicked and wasted lives in poaching upon the domain of the poets, marring their motives by clumsy treatment, and striving to render, by visible form or colour, the marvel of what is invisible, the splendour of what is not seen. Their pictures are, as a natural consequence, insufferably tedious. They have degraded the invisible arts into the obvious arts, and the one thing not worth looking at is the obvious. I do not say that poet and painter may not treat of the same subject. They have always done so and will always do so. But while the poet can be pictorial or not, as he chooses, the painter must be pictorial always. For a painter is limited, not to what he sees in nature, but to what upon canvas may be seen.’ ("Critic" 369-70)

And indeed, Wilde, at times – like music, you can never completely pin him down – privileges the aural domain rather than the visual. At another point in the dialogue Gilbert goes so far as to insult Pater by calling him a mosaic rather than a piece of music:

‘Even the work of Mr. Pater, who is, on the whole, the most perfect master of English prose now creating amongst us, is often far more like a piece of mosaic than a passage in music, and seems, here and there, to lack the true rhythmical life of words and the fine freedom and richness of effect that such rhythmical life produces.’ ("Critic" 351)
Yet, because Wilde inverts the usual privileging of action, it is an essay about the art of doing nothing after all; music is no longer the art form to which other arts aspire in Wilde's rendering. Gilbert clarifies and establishes that literature, not music, has the (perhaps coveted) role to combine form and content, movement and stasis in the most aesthetically pleasing manner. Gilbert responds adamantly to Ernest's rhetorical question, "even you must admit that it is much more difficult to do a thing than to talk about it" (359):

'More difficult to do a thing than to talk about it? Not at all. That is a gross popular error. It is very much more difficult to talk about a thing than to do it. In the sphere of actual life that is of course obvious. Anybody can make history. Only a great man can write it. There is no mode of action, no form of emotion, that we do not share with the lower animals. It is only by language that we rise above them, or above each other – by language, which is the parent, and not the child, of thought.' ("Critic" 359)

Later, Gilbert summarizes, "Movement, that problem of the visible arts, can be truly realized by Literature alone. It is Literature that shows us the body in its swiftness and the soul in its unrest" (363).

So I will end by listening for the consequences of these subtle shifts among the relations of the arts for Wilde's novel, and indeed, for his protagonist. How does this game among the arts play itself out in Dorian Gray, a novel that is typically read for its ekphrastic experiment between literature and the visual arts? The novel is, rightly so, often explored for its intricate penchant for doubling, especially as the doppelgänger motif is a favorite of the Gothic novel at the end of the nineteenth century. But when I reread the novel, I am struck by the inclusion, even employment, of music as part of the aesthetic conversation Wilde maintains throughout the text.

At the scene of enchantment in Chapter 2, when Dorian is sitting for his portrait (or, more accurately, standing for it), music's effect as an art form is gestured toward, but also incorporated into the dialogue, much as it is in "The Critic as Artist." Recall that in the essay, in addition to all of the references I have mentioned (and many more I have not), the essay opens with Gilbert "at
"the piano" and the conversation ensues in part because, according to Gilbert, "[Music] creates for one a past of which one has been ignorant, and fills one with a sense of sorrows that have been hidden from one's tears" (91). The scene in Wilde's novel opens with Dorian sitting at the piano leafing through Schumann's "Forest Scenes." Moreover, as Dorian stands for the painting and Lord Henry "bewilder[s]" him as he pours words into his ears, the narrator recounts that the experience "touched some secret chord that had never been touched before, but that he felt was now vibrating and throbbing to curious pulses" (Dorian 19). Echoing Wilde's concepts about sonority in "The Critic as Artist" (not to mention Pater's Gaston de Latour) the narrator continues,

Music had stirred him like that. Music had troubled him many times. But music was not articulate. It was not a new world, but rather another chaos, that it created in us. Words! Mere words! How terrible they were! How clear, and vivid, and cruel! One could not escape from them. And yet what a subtle magic there was in them! They seemed to be able to give a plastic form to formless things, and to have a music of their own as sweet as that of viol or of lute. Mere words! Was there anything so real as words? (Dorian 19-20).

The sonorous art seems to enable a secret undercurrent that in Virginia Woolf's words in reference to music, "twitch[es] the invisible strings" (137) of the unconscious. The topic is alive in the scene and part of the conversation about the arts, at the very moment Dorian is modeling for the infamous painting.

These echoes of music that underscore such important moments in his texts lead me to wonder if the novel's protagonist actually is music. Since, according to Wilde, art mirrors the spectator and not life, is it possible that Dorian has been solidified into the wrong medium and that this is part of the reason why he seeps out of the painting in such deteriorated, even debauched, form? His name is Dorian, a Greek modal scale, after all. Might the name refer to the musical mode as well as male same-sex desire, as rightly pointed out by critics such as Gerald Monsman, Richard Dellamora, and Linda Dowling? Although I do not want to quibble over the primacy of the different arts or fix Dorian to one art or another, I do think it might be important to add music as an integral part of the aesthetic conversation
Wilde is having with Pater in the novel.

In the chapter in which Alan Campbell, another friend of Dorian's, enters the text to help him, however reluctantly, to dispose of Basil Hallward's body, Dorian is indeed described as music. The narrator details how these two were initially friends but they have an inexplicable falling out. Importantly, Alan is a scientist, but he is also a musician – until he has his rift with Dorian:

He was an extremely clever young man, though he had no real appreciation of the visible arts, and whatever little sense of beauty of poetry he possessed he had gained entirely from Dorian. His dominant intellectual passion was for science.... He was an excellent musician, however, as well, and played both the violin and the piano better than most amateurs. In fact, it was music that had first brought him and Dorian Gray together – music and that indefinable attraction that Dorian seemed to be able to exercise whenever he wished – and, indeed, exercised often without being conscious of it. They had met at Lady Berkshire's the night that Rubinstein played there, and after that used to be always seen together at the opera and wherever good music was going on. (Dorian 140)

With the indefinable attraction that he exercises unconsciously, the description suggests that Dorian behaves as if he is music. And when they have a falling out, it is music to which Alan can no longer listen: “He had changed, too – was strangely melancholy at times, appeared almost to dislike hearing music, and would never himself play, giving as his excuse, when he was called upon, that he was so absorbed in science that he had no time left in which to practise” (Dorian 140).

Lastly, the penultimate chapter in which Dorian has his final conversation with the Paterian Lord Henry also brings forth some interesting details. While Lord Henry's rose-infused words linger in the air, Dorian plays Chopin at Henry's request. The performance of the music is the trigger for much of Henry's ensuing peroration. In fact, the chapter is littered with suppositions about all the arts, but music figures quite prominently. I will list a few of the meaningful observations, spoken no less, by the Paterian mouthpiece in the
text. Lord Henry asks him to play the piano and divulge the truth of how he has stayed so young: “Play me a nocturne, Dorian, and, as you play, tell me, in a low voice, how you have kept your youth. You must have some secret” (Dorian 181). But of course, music does not give up its secrets as we know from “The Critic as Artist.” After commenting on Dorian’s performance of the nocturne, Lord Henry exclaims, “What a blessing it is that there is one art left to us that is not imitative! Don’t stop. I want music tonight” (Dorian 182). Henry continues winding his way toward the subject of secrets: “You have crushed the grapes against your palate. Nothing has been hidden from you. And it has all been to you no more than the sound of music. It has not marred you. You are still the same” (Dorian 182). He continues, “I am so glad that you have never done anything, never carved a statue, or painted a picture, or produced anything outside of yourself! Life has been your art. You have set yourself to music. Your days are your sonnets” (Dorian 182). A performer of music in Wilde’s understanding, then, is simply the automaton that regurgitates the composer’s bidding, but this would be something at which Dorian would excel.

As Henry continues he entreats Dorian to carry on playing, asking, “Why have you stopped playing, Dorian? Go back and give me the nocturne over again.” And a little further on, “You have never played so well as to-night. There was something in your touch that was wonderful. It had more expression than I had ever heard from it before” (Dorian 183). Shortly after this, Dorian mentions the infamous, poisonous book that “does harm,” which Lord Henry gave him at their first meeting. Henry’s response: “You and I are what we are, and will be what we will be. As for being poisoned by a book, there is no such thing as that. Art has no influence upon action. It annihilates the desire to act” (Dorian 183). But my query is this: what if the art in question is action? I think this is ultimately Dorian’s problem. If he is music – indefinite, ambiguous, secretive, non-imitative, but unthinking action, nonetheless – he is vulnerable to the stasis of the visual. Indeed, this is the problem of the text. The art of movement (music) is not simply tempered by the visible, static nature of painting, it is immobilized by it. But it is as though music cannot be contained by painting in Wilde’s understanding. Each action, after all, is what oozes, impossibly, through the canvas; Dorian’s actions
are what change the painting.

What does modifying our understanding of the arts from a binary relation to a tertiary one do to the complex dialogue about aesthetics in the novel? How does this shift inform the exceptionally intricate yet often confusing relation between Wilde's version of aestheticism and Pater's? If Dorian is the art form to which all others aspire, then the narrative itself is a demonstration of Wilde's critical stance on Pater's dictum. It is a severe critique of it, almost a reprimand not to be enticed by music as the “typical, or ideally consummate art” (TR 106), a cautionary tale against what Wilde might have seen as too extreme a notion on Pater's part. I am not suggesting that Wilde simply dislikes music, although he seems to distrust it. I would suggest, however, that his response to Pater's aestheticism, which hinges on a move away from stultifying versions of morality that he will associate with mindless doing, ultimately, also necessitates his shift away from music as the art to which all others aspire. For Wilde, of course, the art form that strikes the balance is literature, and importantly, criticism, which he defines as the supreme art, and not by chance, one he practiced exceptionally well himself.

*York University, Toronto*
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NOTES

1 Richard Ellmann’s critical biography, Oscar Wilde, documents the links between the two writers in this way. In March 1890, Wilde published his review of Pater’s Appreciations in Speaker 1.12 (22 March 1890): 319-20. Pater reviewed “A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (‘The Picture of Dorian Gray.’)” in The Bookman (November 1891), i, 59-60; reprinted in Pater’s Sketches and Reviews (1919).

2 Dowling’s Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford traces the presentation of Greek love at the university in its “coded” yet palpable forms.

3 Stuart Mason’s Oscar Wilde: Art and Morality: A Record of the Discussion which Followed the Publication of “Dorian Gray” (London: F. Palmer, 1907) details the controversy that arose after the publication of Dorian Gray in Lippincott’s Monthly Magazine (June 1890).

4 Near the end of his review, Pater clarifies: “In contrast with Hallward, the artist, whose sensibilities idealise the world around him, the personality of Dorian Gray, above all, into something magnificent and strange, we might say that Lord Henry, and even more the, from the first, suicidal hero, loses too much in life to be a true Epicurean” (Bloom ed. 265).

5 The phrase is italicized by Pater in “The School of Giorgione.”


7 In January 1889, “The Decay of Lying: A Dialogue” appeared in The Nineteenth Century. The following year “The Critic as Artist” was published in the July and September issues of the same journal. Subsequently, in 1891, both essays were revised for inclusion in Intentions, along with “Pen Pencil and Poison” and “The Truth of Masks.”

8 Even Pater mentions this motif in his early but perceptive review of the novel (cf. 266), linking it to the work of Edgar Allan Poe (presumably, as Harold Bloom notes, the short story “William
Wilson”).

9 As Joseph Bristow notes in the Oxford paperback edition of the novel, this passage is an echo of a segment from *Gaston de Latour*, in which the narrator comments on the effect of Ronsard’s poetry on Gaston (Bristow 197).

10 Miss La Trobe in Woolf’s *Between the Acts* mentions this effect of music after Lucy Swithin gushes about a village pageant she has just watched. La Trobe also summarizes Swithin’s comments by stating, “You’ve stirred in me my unacted part;’ she meant” (Woolf 137). The similarity to Wilde’s characterization of music in this section, as well as Dorian himself, is quite remarkable.
Lene Østermark-Johansen

"Don't forget your promise to come here soon": Seven Unpublished Letters from Walter Pater to Oscar Browning

In his introductory list of Pater's correspondents, Lawrence Evans gives a small vignette drawn from the diary of Mark Pattison (1813-84), Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. The entry for 5 May 1878 chronicles a visit to the Pater household one afternoon, when Oscar Browning (1837-1923), the writer and future educational reformer, was there for tea. It is a colorful description, suggestive of an atmosphere of considerable frivolousness, in which Pattison clearly felt fairly alienated:

To Pater's to tea, where Oscar Browning, who was more like Socrates than ever. He conversed in one corner with 4 feminine looking youths 'paw dandling' there in one fivesome [?], while the Miss Paters & I sate looking on in another corner - Presently Walter Pater, who, I had been told, was 'upstairs' appeared, attended by 2 more youths of similar appearance.¹

The identities of the youths are not disclosed. To Pattison they appear as a species rather than as individuals, although it is quite likely that one distinctive individual may have been in the company. Browning's nephew and biographer, H. E. Wortham, mentions that Browning "had first met Oscar Wilde at Oxford when staying with Walter Pater," and that Wilde stayed with Browning in 1879 (Wortham, Oscar Browning 185-6). The letters printed in Evans reflect how – after Wilde had sent Pater his review of the
opening exhibition of the Grosvenor Gallery in the summer of 1877 - Pater was frequently exchanging books and notes and socializing with him. Wilde may well have been part of the entertainment Pater put on for Browning’s spring visit. The copious Browning archives at King’s College, Cambridge contain seven hitherto unpublished letters from Pater to Browning, four or five of which probably date from the spring of 1878 and contextualize the brief entry in Pattison’s diary. They contain nothing which significantly alters one’s perception of Pater, but they throw a little more light on his involvement with classical archaeology, with college matters, and they add a few more pieces to the great puzzle of his social life. Moreover, they fill in a couple of gaps in the late 1870s, years which are very sparsely represented in Evans’s edition of Pater’s letters. As usual, the letters are undated with respect to year, but I have tried to date them from the internal evidence they offer.

According to Browning, he and Pater had known each other since the late 1860s (Memories 106-7). Browning’s admiration of the “Winckelmann” essay, read in its periodical form in the reading rooms of Gagliani’s in the Rue de Rivoli, Paris, had provoked his desire to meet the author. Pater was identified and introduced to Browning by John Burnell Payne (1838-69), a mutual friend of his and Simeon Solomon’s. Indeed, according to one of Browning’s autobiographical sketches, “To know Pater was to know Simeon Soloman [sic]. They were close friends and companions, Solomon being as diligent in his visits to Oxford, as he was in those to Eton” (Recollections 4-5). Solomon drew intimate pencil portraits of Browning in 1868 and of Pater in 1869, the year when all three became members (with Sidney Colvin) of the New, later the Savile, Club in London.

Browning’s assessment of his friendship with Pater varies from one autobiographical sketch to the other. In 1906 he refers to Pater as “the most benevolent of men” whose chief characteristics were “sweetness and kindliness.” He is described as an “intimate friend for many years,” yet, with the exception of the “Winckelmann” essay, Browning never admired Pater’s writings. They became, he observed, “gradually spoilt by elaboration and self-consciousness” (Memories 106). By 1910 he assessed the friendship in the following terms: “My affection for him outweighed all other feelings; love is a more powerful passion than admiration” (Memories 106). When, again in 1910, Browning sold his book collection at auction, not a single volume by Pater was on the
auctioneer's list, which comprised volumes by many other contemporaries like E. B. and Robert Browning, Henry James, Tennyson, Wilde, and Ruskin. Browning's collection of Arundel prints, sold at the same auction, testifies to a very Paterian aesthetic sense: Botticelli's *Primavera* and *Nascita di Venere* were among them, as was the Giorgione Castelfranco altarpiece.⁶

Autograph correspondence between Pater and Browning is conspicuously absent from Pater's published letters, despite Evans's inclusion of Browning as one of Pater's most important friends. The two letters from Pater to Browning printed in Evans derive from Worthing's not-always reliable biography and date from 1875, the year when Oscar Browning was dismissed from Eton, where he had served as a history teacher and housemaster since 1860. Browning's "Socratic" behaviour and allegations of intimacies with young Etonians eventually led to his dismissal. Indeed, Browning's own teacher, the far less popular William Johnson Cory, had been dismissed on similar grounds only a few years previously, in 1872. The local climate at Eton in the early 1870s was one of extreme homophobic hysteria on the one hand, and a surprising openness about close friendships between teachers and pupils on the other. Browning repeatedly took favorite pupils as companions along on his vacation trips to the Continent.

Browning mentions Pater as a frequent visitor to Eton, one who "delighted in the society of the school" (*Memories* 26). One of the two letters in Evans relates to such a visit, resulting in a minor scandal, which reached the higher echelons of London society with lightning speed. According to Leslie Stephen's brother Fitzjames, whose son was at Eton, Browning had recommended that a young boy read Théophile Gautier's controversial *Mlle de Maupin*, a recommendation approved of by Pater during one of his Eton visits.⁷ The rumour added further fuel to Browning (and Pater's) reputation as corrupters of youth, but was eventually dismissed as pure fiction. When Stephens wrote to Browning to ask his permission to deny the rumor, Browning forwarded this correspondence to Pater, who was clearly distressed by the matter:

My dear Browning,
I was not at all amused but much pained at the letters you enclose. You heard all I said to Graham. I think it is not possible that I mentioned the book in question. I should greatly disapprove of its being lent to any boy or young man, or even allowed in his way, and it would be quite impossible for me to recommend it to anybody. I read it years ago but do not possess it. Please given an unqualified denial to the statement that I approved anything of the kind. Such statements misrepresent and pain me profoundly. . . . I remember that, the subject arising in the natural course of conversation, I mentioned an innocent sort of ghost story by Gautier as a very good specimen of its kind. I am sorry now that I did so, as I can only suppose that the report in question arose in this way. (Evans ed. 16)

The other letter, presumably from the autumn of 1875, appears to be an extract of a longer missive, but now takes the form of a short, sympathetic note:

All is can say is, that you know how much I admired your work at Eton when I was with you in the summer, and I was very glad to hear, not for your own sake only but on public grounds, that you had decided not to leave Eton without a struggle. (Evans ed. 17)

The Browning archives at King’s College do not contain any of the letters printed from Wortham, and we must assume that many more letters passed between Pater and Browning. Although Browning meticulously kept his extensive correspondence, his papers were divided, and some of them disappeared. More letters from Pater may well be lurking somewhere, waiting to be found. The former Archivist at King’s College, Rosalind Moad, sums up the custodial history of the Browning papers in the following way:

When Browning decided to settle in Italy, all his papers remained at his house in Bexhill. In February 1916 his old pupil and friend Francis Money-Coutts, 5th Baron Latymer, removed such parts as he thought would be of use
for a projected biography and placed them in Coutts’ Bank in London. These papers, which according to the bank’s records occupied three wooden trunks, six japanned trunks and a package, apparently included all Browning’s letters to his mother, diaries that covered the whole of his career after his arrival at Eton in 1851, much of his correspondence as an Eton master, and no doubt also a number of his subject files[...]. When Latymer died in 1923, the task of writing the biography devolved on Hugo Wortham, Browning’s nephew and sole executor and legatee, and in 1925 he removed the papers from Coutts’ Bank for this purpose. Their history after the publication of the biography, ‘Oscar Browning’, in 1927 remains unknown.

At about the same time as Latymer deposited this part of the papers in Coutts’ Bank, Browning gave the remainder to the public library in the Brassey Institute at Hastings, together with the manuscripts of several of his published works, some 3,000 of his books, and a large collection of music (see his obituary in the Hastings and St. Leonards Observer, 20 October 1923). It is these papers that form the subject to the present list. They comprise some 40,000 letters and other items relating to Browning’s career. (Moad, “A List”)

Browning left Eton after Christmas 1875 and spent the first half of 1876 in limbo, before taking up a fellowship at King’s College from September 1876 until 1909. He was left in dire financial straits, with no tutorial functions and a mere £300 fellowship to live on. According to Wortham, Pater provided some consolation for Browning in the spring of 1876. If Wortham can be trusted, Pater acted with great courage, given such recent events as the Simeon Solomon scandal of 1873 and his own scandal with the “Balliol Bugger,” William Money Hardinge, which had cost him the Junior Proctorship:9

When O.B. went shortly afterwards [after his dismissal from
Eton] to stay with Walter Pater at Brasenose, he found indeed that nothing could exceed the kindness of his reception by everybody, dons and undergraduates alike. 'I really think,' he wrote, 'that the tide is turning and that people are beginning to find out the real nature of my dismissal from Eton and are taking sides accordingly. I am constantly meeting with proofs of it.' (Wortham, *Victorian* 150)

Oxford appears to have been the site of Browning and Pater's meetings in the late 1870s. Several of Browning's old pupils had gone up to Oxford, among them William Roger Paton (1857-1921), who became a close friend of Wilde's, loyal to him also after the 1895 trials and his imprisonment. Paton matriculated at University College to read Classics on 13 October 1876 (Wortham, *Victorian* 150), and may well have been another of the six feminine-looking youths having tea at the Pater household in 1878. Pater mentions him explicitly in one of the letters to Browning. The *ODNB* entry paints a portrait of an ardent young classical archaeologist and epigraphist who joined the Hellenic Society in 1881 and pursued an active life of fieldwork and translation in the Greek Isles and Turkey. The mid-1870s also mark the period when Pater turned to classical studies and archaeology as one of his new subjects for publications and lectures, with the essays on Demeter and Persephone and Dionysus of 1875 and 1876, and with his lectures on Greek sculpture in the Michaelmas term of 1878.

The letters in the Browning collection cover a period from the spring of 1878 until the spring of 1880. Three of the letters give Pater's address as "22 Bradmore Road"; according to Evans, this numbering of the Paters’ house was instituted in 1878, only to be abandoned the following year and replaced by a new system of numeration in 1882, according to which the house became number 2 Bradmore Road (Evans 27). Dennis Donoghue declares, without reference to any authority whatsoever, that the friendship between Browning and Pater “lasted till the summer of 1880 and ended for no known reason” (38). Yet, there is no evidence in the correspondence of any kind of disagreement. In their tone and mode of address they reflect a close friendship, based on mutual academic interests, on college and university involvement and responsibilities, and on a shared sexual orientation and fondness for young men. Pater's mode of address and concluding words are consistent and constant: "My dear Browning" and "Very sincerely yours W.H. Pater."
In published letters from the period we find him using the same modes of address and conclusions to good friends and colleagues like Violet Paget (Vernon Lee), William Sharp, Thomas and Mary Ward, Falconer Madan, and to his publisher Alexander Macmillan.

The earliest letter is a “thank you” note, after Pater had paid his first visit to Cambridge in the spring of 1878.12 What the “papers of general questions” refer to is hard to know. They may refer to the subject of new college buildings, around which Pater’s next letter to Browning revolves:

22 Bradmore Rd.
Mar. 13. [1878]

My dear Browning,

I enclose all the papers of general questions wh. I can just now find.

I enjoyed my visit to Cambridge, very much, through your kindness, and look back to it with great pleasure; and returned to Oxford much better than when I left as I had really been ill.13

Don’t forget your promise to come here soon. It will give me great pleasure to receive you almost whenever you like.

Very sincerely yours

W. H. Pater.

King’s College Congregation Book 1875-85 contains minutes from a committee meeting held on 5 March 1878, during which plans for extensions of buildings by Mr. Street, Mr. Burges, and Gilbert Scott were discussed. Oscar Browning was on the building committee, which considered the future site for an extension.14 As the meeting coincided with Pater’s Cambridge visit, it seems natural that they discussed new college buildings in both universities, and that Pater went back to do some research on the matter, looking for suitable Oxford parallels:

[On the stationery of the Oxford Union Society, with crest]

22 Bradmore Rd.
Mar. 30. [1878]

My dear Browning,

So many people are away just now that it would be hardly
possible to get you full statistics of the new buildings here. I don't think those at Ch. Ch. [Christ Church College] would be so much of a parallel to those you contemplate, as the new buildings at New College. The buildings now in progress at Ch. Ch. aim only at decoration, though, I believe, costly. The New College buildings which have been opened within the last two or three years contain, besides undergraduates' rooms, homes for married fellows.\textsuperscript{15} Alfred Robinson\textsuperscript{16} would be the best man to consult for exact details about them. The Bursar under whom they were commenced is no longer resident. The new buildings at Balliol, though I fancy they add something to the accommodation there, only replaced old ones. I think New College would be almost precisely a parallel case to yours at King's College.

Ever Very sincerely yours

W. H. Pater

Pater here proves some of the "sweetness and kindliness" for which Browning praised him, by carefully considering which of the Oxford college extensions might prove a useful model for King's. Whether Browning decided to come and see for himself, or whether purely social activities were on the agenda for his visit in May, remains unknown. The next couple of notes from Pater relate to that visit and show him from his practical side, planning a variety of dinner companions and revealing an interest in train time tables and dinner times:

22 Bradmore Road

Apr. 23 [1878]

My dear Browning,

It will give me much pleasure to see you, and receive you in my small quarters, at the time you propose. I shall expect you on Sat. May 4th, or earlier, if you like.

Yours very truly

W. H. Pater.

[On paper with the Brasenose College crest]

22 Bradmore Road.
May 3. [1878]

My dear Browning,

I am looking forward to see [sic] you tomorrow. There is a good train from Cambridge at 2.0 but come earlier if you can. You had best come straight to my house. I have some men dining with me to meet you on Monday, so that I hope, as I concluded from your letter, that you will be able to stay till Tuesday. We dine at 7 on Saturday.

Yours ever
W. H. Pater

The next brief note to Browning, probably also from the spring of 1878, is interesting for the light it throws on Pater’s involvement with the field of classical archaeology, in London, Cambridge, and Oxford. The letter mentions several prominent archaeologists and connoisseurs and testifies to Pater’s familiarity with them all. It also proves that he was fully informed about the current developments in Oxford towards establishing an archaeological museum. In the recent history of the University of Oxford, A. G. Macgregor describes how a plan had been “presented in 1878 to the Hebdomadal Council in the form of a memorial signed by 132 senior members of the University, calling for the formal establishment in Oxford of a museum of archaeology and art. Particular emphasis in this institution should, it was suggested, be given to casts of Greek and Roman sculpture and to models of antique architecture; the University’s collections of sculpture should be centralized there, and libraries dedicated to classical epigraphy and to numismatics (the latter including casts of antique coins) should form prominent components” (605). The letter refers to Sidney Colvin,17 a friend of both Pater and Browning, and to Charles Thomas Newton.18 As Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, the former was much involved in the compilation of a cast collection in Cambridge, and the latter, Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum, had expanded the London collection of antiquities considerably during the 1860s and 1870s. Pater had recently relied heavily on Newton’s Travels and Discoveries in the Levant, 2 vols. (1865) for his essays on Demeter and Persephone,19 but it would appear that Newton was more than a distant archaeologist for him by 1878. John Richard Magrath,20 familiar to
Pater since his days at Queen’s College, was clearly an important power factor in negotiations about an archaeological museum. Magrath became a member of the Hebdomadal Council in 1878, and held university positions as Senior Proctor (1876), would later become Curator of the university chest (1885-1908), Vice Chancellor 1894-98, delegate of both the University Museum (1903-12) and the University Press (1894-1920). Clearly he was already a man to be reckoned with by 1878, and Pater seems to have had some sense of that. I have been unable to detect the nature of the scholarships mentioned in the opening line by Pater, but since classics and archaeology are the major subjects of the note, it seems likely that the awards were within those fields too. Clearly another visit from Browning was coming up:

B.N.C.
May 20. [1878]

My dear Browning,

I hear from Sayce\(^{21}\) that the meeting about the Scholarships will take place in London at a time and place not yet settled. There will be no meeting at Queen’s; only, Colvin and Newton are, I believe, coming to give evidence before a committee, of which Magrath is a member, about an Archaeological Museum.

Please let me know a day or two before you come. I can give you a bed if you like.

Very sincerely yours
W. H. Pater.

I am slightly uncertain about the dating of the next letter. Sidney Colvin and archaeology are again matters for discussion. In 1879 he made archaeology a subject in its own right at the University of Cambridge,\(^{22}\) and proposals for a chair in archaeology at Oxford had been made in 1877/78. Such a chair was not introduced until 1884. Given that Newton had been turned down for the Slade Chair in 1869, and that the history of art had taken precedence over archaeology as the field for the Slade Professorship, there was renewed pressure for a chair in archaeology at Oxford. It would appear that Colvin was involved, simultaneously, in setting up archaeological schools in both universities. Pater’s letter raises the question of his own involvement in the establishment of an archaeological school in Oxford. Is he referring to Colvin merely as a friend, or as a colleague with whom he
is working to institute archaeology as an academic discipline?

Pater mentions the Principal of Brasenose as having suffered from a severe illness in the first line of his letter. Edward Hartopp Craddock served as Principal from 7 December 1853 until his death on 27 January 1886. He was followed for a brief spell by the historian Albert Watson, who only held the position from 26 February 1886 till October 1889, when he resigned, possibly from stress (Brock and Curthoys VII: 130). Pater would appear to be responding to some rumor circulated by Browning about his good friend John Percival. Percival had been Headmaster of the newly founded Clifton College from 1862 until January 1879, when he became President of Trinity College, Oxford. He held this position until May 1887, when he was installed as Headmaster of Rugby School. Given the various dates and events at play, I think it most likely that one can date the letter to February 1879:

My dear Browning,

The Principal had a severe illness last term, but seems now, I am glad to say, almost recovered, and I hope it may be long before we think about his successor. The special rumour you speak of was absolutely new to me, and arose, I imagine, out of xxxxxx mere speculation following on Dr Percival's appointment to a headship. We expect Colvin here today à propos of the proposed archaeological school.

In haste,

Very sincerely yours

W. H. Pater.

B.N.C.
Feb. 17 [1879?]

In the last letter to Browning Pater explicitly declares that he is living in college. He is organizing another visit from his Cambridge friend and promising young men for both breakfast and dinner. The identity of William Roger Paton I have already established, but the identity of "Barnes" is unknown. It would seem from Browning's notes to his mother, spring of 1880, that he had a good time in Oxford: "I reported to my mother on May 23: 'I think I wrote to you just as I was starting for Oxford. I stayed there with Pater, a very good friend of mine, saw Paton and Burrows who had not been sent down from University, and also Curzon, who was very
Browning's intimate friendship with G. N. Curzon, when the latter had been a pupil at Eton, had been one of the factors which eventually provoked his dismissal, but in the late 1870s and early 1880s Oxford clearly provided a welcome platform for him from which he could maintain some of the relationships with his former pupils, with Pater as a helpful go-between and events organizer:

Brasenose.
May 13. [1880]

My dear Browning,

I am living in college,25 and shall be very pleased to give you a bed here on Saturday and Sunday. I shall xxxx ask some young people to meet you at breakfast on Sunday morning. Could you stay over Monday; I should much like to ask Paton and Barnes; to meet you at dinner on that day; if so, send me a line by return of post.

Very sincerely yours
W. H. Pater.

In the introduction to his edition of the letters, Lawrence Evans estimates that, even if one takes into account that Pater was not a particularity prolific correspondent, his adult life from the age of 19 onwards would have yielded at least some 1800 letters, if one imagined him writing at least one personal letter a week. To this total should be added business notes and "thank you" notes, several of which appear in Evans's slim blue volume. With such a figure in mind, there may well be several unpublished letters out there in the archives,26 waiting to be found and published, and possibly easier to track through archival digitization than some forty years ago, when Evans made his first collection of the letters. Billie Andrew Inman published six such letters in 1991,27 Christie's sold a handful of such letters in 1992,28 and I am convinced there are plenty more, even if a large number of letters were destroyed after Pater's death.
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I am grateful to Lesley Higgins and Laurel Brake for reading this piece in draft form and for giving several useful comments and suggestions.


3 King’s College Archives Centre, Cambridge, The Papers of Oscar Browning, OB/1/1248/A. I am deeply grateful to Archivist Dr. Patricia McGrath for her efficient help and advice; for deciphering the odd illegible name; for directing me to the College Congregation Book; and for allowing me to publish the letters.

4 Browning on the whole maintained this view as late as 1919, in his letters to the Jewish writer Joseph Leftwich which have recently been purchased by the Clark Library in Los Angeles. I am grateful to Bénédicte Coste for pointing this out to me and for her transcription of the letters. See http://clarklibrary.wordpress.com/category/acquisitions/page/2/. Retrieved on 13 October 2011.

5 For Pater and Solomon, see Colin Cruise, “Critical Connections and Quotational Strategies: Allegory and Aestheticism in Pater and Simeon Solomon,” in Elicia Clements and Lesley Higgins, eds., *Victorian


7 Wortham traced the rumor to Pater’s comment to a woman after an Eton water-party. They had been in the same boat as the young Graham, who had impressed them with his knowledge of contemporary French novelists. Pater had praised such sophistication in one so young. In re-telling the story, the woman had herself introduced the names of Gautier and Mérimée, which in other retellings became attributed to Pater (whose name must have been already associated with those more risqué French writers). See H. E. Wortham, Oscar Browning. London: Constable & Co., 1927, 58-60.


10 Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886: Their Parentage, Birthplace, and Year of Birth, with a Record of their Degrees. London: Joseph Foster, 1888, vol. III. See also Wortham, Victorian 151, where he records one such visit from Browning to Paton in Oxford.

11 See my chapter on “Pater and Greek Sculpture” in Østermark-Johansen 213-276.

12 “On March 5 [1878], I report that I have been appointed Secretary for the Training of Teachers, an office which I held more than thirty-one years; also that Walter Pater had paid me a visit – his first introduction to Cambridge” (Browning, Memories 272).

13 Pater mentions having been ill in a letter to Wilde from Hilary term 1878. See Evans, ed., 28.

14 Subsequent meetings were held on 3 and 11 June 1878, when new buildings for accommodation (the Bodley building) on the Backs were discussed. Cf. King’s College Congregation Book 1875-85. Pevsner notes that the Bodley Building was completed in 1893; G. G. Scott’s Chetwynd Building had been completed in 1873. Pevsner also mentions the plans afoot in 1877 to demolish the screen towards King’s Parade and replace it by a building, with plans by Burges, Street, and Scott. Nothing came of this latter plan (97).

15 Gilbert Scott’s new building for New College was completed in 1873. In 1875-77, two more staircases plus a house for a married tutor were added. See Brock and Curthoys 414-15.

16 Alfred Robinson had been a Fellow of New College since 1865. He was Tutor, 1865-75, and Senior Bursar from 1875.

17 Sir Sidney Colvin (1845-1927; ODNB), art critic, connoisseur, and literary scholar. Like Pater, Colvin also contributed to The Fortnightly Review; Pater reviewed his Children in Italian and English Design in The Academy no. 52, vol. III in July 1872, 267-68. Colvin was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge and a friend of Browning’s (according to the ODNB his letters to Browning are at King’s College, London). He became Slade Professor of Art at Cambridge in 1873 as an interesting “aesthetic” counterpart to Ruskin’s post in Oxford, and Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1876. In 1884 he left for London to become one of the most influential Keepers of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum.

18 Sir Charles Thomas Newton (1816 (baptized) - 94; ODNB) was educated at Oxford at Christ Church College and a close friend of Ruskin’s. He competed against Ruskin for the Slade Professorship in 1869. Already in the 1840s Newton was working in the collections of the British Museum. In the 1850s he combined diplomatic work with archaeological excavations on the Greek islands and in Turkey. From 1861 onwards he became Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum, a position
to which he added the Yates Chair of Classical Archaeology at University College, London from 1880 onwards.


20 John Richard Magrath (1839-1930; ODNB) became a Fellow of Queen's College in 1860 (Pater studied at Queen's 1858-62). In addition to his impressive range of university posts, Magrath performed a long line of college functions: tutor, as of 1864: chaplain, 1867-78; bursar, 1874; pro-provost, 1877.

21 The prominent Assyrologist A. H. Sayce (1845-1933) was a relatively close friend of Pater's. He matriculated at Brasenose in 1865, and received his B.A. in 1869. The same year he became a Fellow of Queen's College. He resigned as Tutor in the summer term of 1879 to take up an exotic life abroad. Pater's letter must consequently predate that event. In 1891 Sayce was back in Oxford again as extraordinary professor of Assyrology. Sayce writes briefly about his friendship with Pater in his Reminiscences (London: Macmillan & Co., 1923).


24 John Percival (1834-1918; ODNB). There are five letters from Percival to Oscar Browning in the archives at King's.

25 Why Pater would be living in college at this point is hard to know. After he moved to London in the autumn of 1885 he would, of course, have to live in college when coming to Oxford. Paton went down from Oxford in 1880, having completed his degree, and spent the mid-1880s touring the Greek islands and Turkey, so there is little possibility, I think, that the letter can be dated after 1880, in spite of Pater's living in college.


27 See Evans, Introduction xvii.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Sara Lyons

Pater and Decadent Poetics

It was tempting to think of the Decadent Poetics conference held at Exeter University July 1-2, 2011 as a de facto Pater conference. Certainly it was possible to spend the majority of the two days attending sessions devoted to Pater (there was a Pater panel running during four of the six parallel sessions across the two days), and the large contingent of Pater specialists in attendance prompted quips about “the Pater sect,” “the Paterian cult,” and “Pater camp”. Yet if the conference’s topic could be taken as an invitation to irony, none of the twelve speakers who appeared on the Pater panels betrayed a trace of the kind of defensive archness that might once have burdened a discussion of Pater and decadent poetics. It is a measure of how high Pater’s critical fortunes have risen that scholars now feel free to engage with Pater’s “decadence” – a term once often used to banish writers to the margins of the canon, or as a nebulous form of moral censure – with unapologetic seriousness. Similarly, the critical commonplaces that the topic of Paterian decadence seemed bound to evoke – the purple prose of the description of La Gioconda in The Renaissance (1873); the scandalousness of the “Conclusion”; the fetishization of death, malaise, and decay; the Francophilia; the Epicureanism; the penchant for Christian ritual – were conspicuous by their absence from the twelve papers I heard. Instead, speakers seemed to take their cues from what James Eli Adams has called Pater’s “poetics of obliquity” (3), and approached the question of Pater’s decadence in subtle and indirect ways. It was pleasing to discover that even the “decadent” Pater is not anyone’s easy caricature but a portrait that has to be rendered in fine brushstrokes. Many of the papers were avowedly speculative
or experimental in nature, and drew attention to submerged, fragmentary or apparently peripheral aspects of Pater's works. The fact that there were many Pater specialists in the rooms, who are well-acquainted with one another, gave the sessions a sense of intimacy but also meant that questions from the floor tended to be incisive.

The sense that Pater's decadence is best assayed by uncovering latent themes or by pursuing seemingly counter-intuitive lines of interpretation was apparent from the first of the sessions, entitled "Anticipations of Decadence: The Renaissance and Marius the Epicurean (1885)." Matthew Bradley (Mansfield College, University of Oxford) argued that Christian eschatology has a repressed, but nonetheless potent, life in Pater's work, conditioning his apparently materialistic figurations of death in the "Conclusion" and troubling his desire to imagine early Christianity in sympathetic and pacific terms in Marius. Michael Davis (Le Moyne College) sought to illustrate the proleptic sophistication of Pater's work, especially his anticipation of many of the insights of contemporary queer theory. Davis suggested that Pater's commitment to formulating a theory and a poetics of queer desire is legible not only in his "Winckelmann" essay, where many critics have found a homoerotic subtext, but also in his early essay on the poetry of William Morris. Focusing on Marius, Jayne Thomas (University of Cardiff) argued that Pater's aesthetic epiphanies should be understood not simply as hedonistic celebrations of the moment but as indices of his investment in philosophical idealism. There ensued a rapid-fire debate about the degree of Pater's indebtedness to Hegel and his stance toward philosophical idealism more broadly.

The second panel, entitled "Pater's Dialectics with Decadence," began with a paper by Laurel Brake (Birkbeck College, University of London) that addressed the question of Pater's relationship with decadence, perhaps more directly and concretely than any other in the Pater panels. Brake called attention to the extent to which fin-de-siècle decadence was an affair of the periodical press, and demonstrated how Pater's choices of publication venue encoded his ambivalence toward the contemporary vogue for "decadence." Andrew Eastham suggested that Pater's appropriation of Hegelian Hellenism in his "Winckelmann" essay embeds a contradiction at the centre of his ideal of the aesthetic personality, a contradiction that Wilde inherits in his own account of aesthetic Hellenism in The Picture of Dorian Gray, and which is crucial to
understanding the relationships between philosophical idealism and fin-de-siècle decadence. Megan Becker-Leckrone (University of Nevada, Las Vegas) ventured a definition of Paterian decadence by tracing the etymological and imaginative slippages between the idea of “cosmos” (the universe conceived as a harmonious, divinely ordered whole) and the idea of “cosmesis” (the process of adornment or ornamentation).

The third session was named “The Paterian Fragment.” Drawing attention to the suggestive ubiquity of blank spaces between words, sentences, and paragraphs in Pater’s manuscripts, Lene Østermark-Johansen (University of Copenhagen) reflected on Pater’s composition techniques, particularly his tendency to proceed by tessellating fragments of prose into unified wholes. Anne-Florence Gillard-Estrada (Rouen University) charted the permutations of the word “consummate” in Pater’s work and within both reverential and parodic appropriations of Paterian aestheticism. Yuri Cowan (University of Ghent) provided an interesting counterpoint to Gillard-Estrada’s focus on Pater’s concern with the “consummate” or perfect. Using Gaston de Latour (1896) as his key example, Cowan argued that Pater’s aestheticism is also deeply engaged by notions of the incomplete, the failed, and the blemished. The Q&A session focused mainly on Pater’s note-taking habits and manuscripts, and the extent to which these bear witness to the peculiarities of his creative process.

The final panel was organized around the imaginative traffic between Pater and Wilde. Elisa Bizzotto (University of Venice) emphasized Pater’s role as a progenitor of British “decadence,” with complex ramifications in the works not only of Wilde but also of figures such as Arthur Symons and Aubrey Beardsley. Elicia Clements (York University, Toronto) explored the “inter-art thinking” that pervades both Pater’s The Renaissance and Wilde’s Dorian Gray, arguing that both works strive to locate points of convergence between the major artistic media. Bénédicte Coste (Paul Valéry University, Montpellier) sought to complicate the conventional framing of Pater as Wilde’s precursor by reading Pater’s Gaston de Latour as a coded response to the decadence of Wilde’s Dorian Gray. Finally, special mention should be made of Lesley Higgins (York University, Toronto). Although Higgins did not appear on any of the Pater panels, she delivered a paper on the first day of the conference that explored the influence of Pater’s sensuous poetics upon
KATE HEXT

Abstracts from “Pater and Decadent Poetics”

Last July the University of Exeter’s Decadent Poetics conference was overtaken by Paterians. I had originally intended to convene just one panel entitled “Pater’s Decadent Poetics.” However, due to the number and quality of the proposals I received, I was able to twist the arms of the conference organizers so that we could have four panels exclusively on Pater. As you will see from the abstracts included here, these panels traversed the intellectual issues and relationships that characterize Pater’s tense and complicated relationship with the Decadent Movement. They also ranged across Pater’s ouevre: Matthew Bradley discussed the Decadent foreshadowing and roots in Pater’s Studies in the History of the Renaissance, while Lene Østermark-Johansen explored the elusive spaces in Pater’s unpublished manuscripts, Laurel Brake put “Apollo in Picardy” in the context of its publication in Harper’s Magazine and Yuri Cowan looked at materiality in Gaston de Latour.

Our explorations of Pater and Decadence were greatly enhanced by the inclusion of the panels within the Decadent Poetics conference. Not only were our panel discussions enriched by scholars bringing broad Decadent contexts to bear on Pater, but as Pater scholars the intellectual context of the conference encouraged us to think dynamically about Pater’s relationship with Decadence and Decadents. Following the conference, I am editing a special issue on Pater’s Decadent Poetics for the Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies next year, which will feature articles based on the conference presentations.
Gerard Manley Hopkins.

The fact that Kate Hext’s call for papers elicited such a remarkable response – as she commented in these pages last year, she had originally envisioned a single panel on Pater at the Decadent Poetics conference, and was surprised to find herself convening four (18) – obviously attests to the vitality of scholarly interest in Pater, but perhaps also suggests that the notoriously problematic and elusive idea of “decadence” touches the core of Pater’s fascination for modern scholars, however much he labored to dissociate himself from its stigma in his lifetime.
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I. Anticipations of Decadence: 
*The Renaissance and Marius the Epicurean*

Mastery and Millennium: Pater’s Decadent Sense of an Ending
Matthew Bradley (Mansfield College, University of Oxford)

The basis for Bishop Wordsworth’s famous objection to Pater’s “Conclusion” to *The Renaissance* is not always as well-remembered as it might be. The immorality of the book’s sentiments, argued the Bishop, were the inevitable result of Pater’s belief that “probably or certainly the soul dissolves at death into elements which are destined never to reunite.” In other words, it is the afterlife (or the lack of it) that provides the key to Pater’s aestheticism. In this paper, however, I shall be arguing that the afterlife, and the revelatory apocalypse - that both ends it and is part of it - is by no means such an absent presence in Pater’s work as the Bishop suggests. Rather than seeing Pater’s deployment of Christian discourse as a combination of High Church ritual and Comtean teleology, this paper argues that Pater anticipates decadent discourse in playing out a debate between what would now be called “end of history” models of man’s progress on the Hegelian pattern, and traditional Christian apocalyptic with its attendant notions of the afterlife; and that this internal debate on matters of the “endings,” in religion and in general, is one of the chief ways in which Pater anticipates the decadence of the 1890s. This, I stress, does not result in a harmonious Hegelian (or even Paterian) dynamic of synthesis within Pater’s own work, but represents a clash of worldviews, a “haunting” that Pater often deliberately seeks to evade. Pater’s aesthetic of religious receptivity is formed, I argue, through a structure of absences (as in the essay on “Style,” most notably), but I contend that various systems asserting the presence of the afterlife, and of a “final judgment” on humanity that might come with it, persistently threaten to overwhelm his ostensible position of studied neutrality.

Shards of eschatology run their way through Pater’s work, as has been noted in specific instances before, by critics as eminent as J. Hillis Miller; but I will concentrate chiefly on Pater’s fictions, particularly *Marius the Epicurean*: a novel which casts itself as depicting a time when religion was
turning away from ideas of a speedy judgment and the end of the world, but which nevertheless itself persistently returns to apocalyptic texts such as the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which makes its attitude to the afterlife the defining feature of Marius's understanding of Christianity, and which persistently broods on Rome as a decadent culture doomed both by plague and time.

**Walter Pater and the Poetics of Desire**  
*Micahel Davis (Le Moyne College)*

Following the publication of the radical and indeed scandalous essay “Winckelmann,” in 1867, through which he worked towards a conceptualization of a critical theory (and practice) of same-sex desire, Pater turned his attention next to the seemingly more moderate and more modest task of reviewing the poetry of William Morris who had just published *The Life and Death of Jason* (1867) and *The Earthly Paradise* (1868). Pater does not, however, abandon his primary desire to develop and fully articulate a theory of same-sex desire so much as he “sublimates” it here, such that his analysis of the poetics of William Morris is actually an ongoing, even more highly refined analysis of the poetics of same-sex desire, where “poetics” is construed not only narrowly, as the images, tropes, and conceits, but also and moreover, more broadly, as it is perhaps in Aristotle, as an “analytics” - of same-sex desire. Above all, Pater's analysis of Morris's poetry produces at once a sexual reading of history (a queer historiography) in which the plot of the body becomes the plot of history (the immanence of the body in ancient Greek culture yielding to the absence of the body in medieval Christian culture), and a history of sexuality, well in advance of Foucault, that in some particular instances actually approximates to Foucault, as when Pater turns his analysis upon the cultural apparatuses that both regulate and articulate desire including the apparatus of feudalism itself. But in addition to producing both a sexuality of history and a history of sexuality, Pater also produces a set of concepts through which to understand the operations of desire that approximates even more closely to his nearer contemporary Freud, formulating the psychoanalytic concepts of repression, neurosis, affect, libidinal flow, and even sublimation, which is not only a *process* in operation
in Pater’s text but also a major topic of inquiry.

But in the end it is the process of sublimation at work in the text that produces Pater’s famous “Conclusion” to the essay, at once the chemical process of sublimation (still the primary sense of the word in the late nineteenth century) that produces the solid “precipitate” of the conclusion (“to burn like a hard, gem-like flame”), the solid transposable object (transposable to the end of *The Renaissance*) and the psychoanalytic process of sublimation that issues in the uncontrollable, premature ejaculation of the premature conclusion, which itself signifies doubly: both as the product of a sublimated sexuality and, inextricably in a culture of repression, as the fear of an early death, the fear of castration/decapitation, which is registered by Pater’s text in the increased rhetoric (poetics) of French Revolutionary violence.

**BURNING WITH A “GEM-LIKE FLAME”: WALTER PATER’S EPIPHANIES AND THE DECADENT INHERITANCE**
**JAYNE THOMAS (UNIVERSITY OF CARDIFF)**

In the first edition of the “Conclusion” to *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, which appeared in 1873, Pater outlined his sensation-fuelled epiphanies, those moments of intense sensation that were the result of burning with a “gem-like flame.” Based on aesthetic experience, these exquisite moments of time were premised on the moment, and were celebrated for that moment’s sake only, without recourse to embedded meaning or knowledge. In their emphasis on sensation, they were viewed as oases of sheer celebration. And art was deemed to give the most intense feeling to these moments of pure sensation.

The Paterian moment was adopted by the Decadents as a way of emphasizing sensations (Nicols 1987: 183), an adoption which alarmed Pater enough for him to withdraw the “Conclusion” from the 1877 version of *The Renaissance* for fear that it would encourage yet more young men into the arms of debauchery. But is this the whole story? In this paper, I aim to show how Pater’s seemingly aesthetic epiphanies, rather than conforming to the gem-like stereotype, embrace mind as well as body, representation as well as will, the ideal as well as the real. His epiphanies, rather than being based purely
on sensation, incorporate the ideal, either through a symbiosis of the ideal and the real, as outlined by F. C. McGrath in his book, *The Sensible Spirit*, or through the relic of "idealism" that replaces the empiricist sense impression, as outlined by Carolyn Williams in her *Aesthetic Historicism*, or purely in their Wordsworthian fusion of subject and object in the act of perception.

I aim to focus primarily on Pater’s 1885 text, *Marius the Epicurean*, which was written as an antidote to what Pater perceived as the extremist interpretations of his "Conclusion" to *The Studies in the History of the Renaissance*. I aim to show how Marius’ epiphanies, rather than anchoring him in the aesthetic/sensation paradigm, connect him to various forms of idealism. By so doing, I also aim to show how Pater’s epiphanies form a link to the Decadents that is more complex and ambivalent than is at first thought. Rather than simply licensing the pursuit of extreme sensations, Pater’s epiphanies embrace forms of idealism that were subsequently ignored or suppressed by the Decadents in favor of pure sensation. In this sense, I hope to show how his poetics both influenced, and yet resisted, Decadent form.

II. Pater’s Dialectics with Decadence

"WE ARE ALL DECADENT NOWADAYS?":
PATER’S AMBIVALENCE AND *THE YELLOW BOOK*
LAUREL BRAKE (BIRKBECK COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)

The first number of *The Yellow Book* appeared several months before Walter Pater died unexpectedly in July 1894. Although he was among those who had been approached, and his name was listed as a future contributor, he offered nothing that met the deadlines of issues 1 or 2 that appeared in April and July respectively. That absence of Pater, the character of his last book (on *Plato and Platonism*), and the date of his demise, before the trials of Oscar Wilde, might suggest that his main contribution to Decadence was its inspiration via Aestheticism, in which formation he is indubitably implicated. Moreover, there are a number of other magazines associated with decadence
in its widest sense that Walter Pater did not patronize. Arguably, in the 1880s and 1890s he opted to publish in mainstream, high culture, morally neutral if not conservative journals such as the Fortnightly Review, the Nineteenth Century, Macmillan's Magazine, the Contemporary Review and the [Church] Guardian, while eschewing the Century Guild Hobby Horse (1884–94), Ricketts and Shannon's Dial (1889 ff) and Douglas's Spirit Lamp (1893–94). By death he missed the incidence of the Savoy (1896), which closed with a long tribute to him. Arguably, the most popular journal to which he ever contributed – the American Harper's Monthly Magazine – constitutes his most explicit participation in Decadence, where his louche short story appears in the same number as Arthur Symons' article on the Decadent movement, in which he includes Pater.

In this paper, I will look at the November issue of Harper's, and Pater's contribution to it, but I will also interrogate his abstention from the press of Decadence. How does it inflect his work, and how does it articulate his particular taste for ambivalence and nuance, detectable in the greater part of his work, not only in the '90s?

**Characterless Aesthetics:**
**Walter Pater and the End of Hegelian Hellenism**
**Andrew Eastham (Independent Scholar)**

Walter Pater’s essay on “Winckelmann” is one of the primary statements of what can retrospectively be classified as Hegelian Hellenism, an important current in nineteenth century Aestheticism running from Théophile Gautier to Pater and J. A. Symonds. Pater’s essay recycled two essential aspects of Hegel’s *Aesthetics*: the evolutionary narrative of art’s three essential phases (the Symbolic, the Classical and the Romantic); and the synchronic theory of media in which architecture, sculpture, painting, lyric, and drama were all essential modes of appearance. Like Symonds, Pater appeared to privilege the Hellenist phase in Hegel’s account, and the associated media of sculpture, but his account of the Hellenic ideal leads to a serious contradiction which would ultimately determine the fate of British Aesthetic Hellenism. Pater uses the example of the statue of the *Adorante* in Berlin to articulate his
"characterless" ideal of an aesthetic personality, echoing his earlier concept of "Diaphaneité." But in his subsequent citation from Hegel's *Aesthetics* he defines the Greek ideal in terms of the "plastic character"—a capacity for strong individualism and formative activity. This slippage between a diaphanous and negative concept of aesthetic subjectivity to an individualist model of expressive productivity encapsulates the dilemmas of Victorian Aestheticism. By the end of the 1880s Hegelian Hellenism had reached a point of crisis, as documented in Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, where the cynical conception of aesthetic subjectivity promoted in Decadent fiction undermined the idealist project to synthesize autonomous appearance with subjective spirit. But if Hegelian Hellenism found its end in the cultural dominance of Decadence, this was an end that was always already integral to its own key texts, and to Hegel's own account of the decline of the Greek ideal of beauty. Reading from "Winkelmann" through to *The Picture of Dorian Gray* clarifies the circularity of Aestheticism and Decadence, but it is equally a testament to the persistence of an idealist desire which became more virulent in its cultural obsolescence.

**Pater’s Cosmos**

*Megan Becker-Leckrone (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)*

"Pater's Cosmos" is part of a larger, long-term project I am planning that takes as its central and predominate issue the matter of defining a specifically "decadent" poetics. What I mean by a "decadent poetics" is some unifying, or at least variably manifested, treatment or theory of representation, which I believe makes a radical turn towards the emphatically non- or even anti-mimetic. The broad name I would like to give this anti-mimetic turn (a response to many things: the Romantic valorization of nature, or the realist and naturalist privileging of the "real") is *cosmesis*. The usefulness of this term, for me, is that it references the root, *kosmos*/*kosmesis*, that, in Greek means *both* the original life-giving, ordering of the cosmos by God or other deities *and* adorning, decorating, or refashioning. So, in the root word itself, we get precisely two historically opposed understandings of creation, one obviously privileged in the history of philosophy and aesthetics, and the other obviously
denigrated in turn. One sense of the term indicates origin and primacy, the other supplementarity. I am fascinated by the rich ambivalence of this root, and the many philosophical/aesthetic terms it generates, work so dynamically at odds with one another. It is my belief that the decadent poetics developed and exercised by Pater exploits this very ambivalence, and that is what I would like my paper to explore. My formulation of this term, *cosmesis*, I borrow, in a certain sense, from Barbara Spackman’s *Decadent Genealogies*, but also draws on the rich and seemingly contradictory function of *kosmos* in literary representation and its theories that Angus Fletcher explores in *Allegory: Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. Max Nordau’s *Degeneration* is also a kind of inspiration, though of course mostly for how instructively wrong he gets just about everything about this period in literary and social culture. In this paper specifically, I shall focus first on Pater’s essay on “Style” (as well as some other moments from *Appreciations*, such as “Sir Thomas Browne” and “Wordsworth”); in particular, I am interested in Pater’s challenging consideration of ornament. Of course, that is the traditional understanding of style as linguistic or rhetorical ornament — that it is something added or supplementary to the actual content of a text. Pater’s entire essay works towards a deeper understanding of style as indeed, if not primary, than at least constitutively central to all the data conveyed by a work of prose. Pater links style to temperament, to personality; the mark of a superior and distinct style, furthermore, links one aesthetic/scholarly personality to others like it. A key argument in “Style” is that it is both the marker and the glue, so to speak, of a like-minded community, of a finer and more discerning strain that the population at large. That argument, that aesthetes or aesthetic critics form a fraternity that transcends both time and place, is obviously everywhere in Pater’s work; there would be little value to making that argument as such.

Instead, I am interested in the way the question of the “ornament” plays into these larger Paterian themes, for I believe it adumbrates a possible “poetics” that is at once peculiar to his work (his style) and in keeping with other manifestations of an anti-mimetic *cosmesis* in many different kinds of work we have conventionally called decadent. In this paper, specifically, I would simply like to explore the rich implications of valorizing a style that goes beyond mere ornament; indeed, it’s not original to say that style is neither supplementary nor secondary in Pater’s aesthetic world. But by
focusing on the question of ornament specifically, I would be able to tease out the etymological, and in turn aesthetic/philosophical, implications of that term, which derives from the Greek cosmos – a fact made clear by Baudelaire’s “Eloge du maquillage” and Beerbohm’s related essay from the first issue of The Yellow Book, “A Defence of Cosmetics.” The cosmetic is itself, by definition, ornamental – added to or improving some pre-existing natural state, as both authors claim it does (in trenchant, ironic, and highly over-determined ways, beyond the scope of this particular paper).

III. The Paterian Fragment

The Decadence of Pater’s Blanks:
A study in Paterian composition technique
Lene Østermark-Johansen (University of Copenhagen)

When flicking through a pile of Pater’s manuscripts, one is struck by the many blanks of varying lengths which appear on the pages. In his MS “The Writings of Cardinal Newman,” for instance, Pater left blank spaces for anything from an individual word, a phrase, a couple of sentences, to an entire paragraph. Pater’s blanks seem to hold the key to the balance between form and matter in his compositions, and as they appear on his pages, they invite questions of surface and depth. Are they blanks, blots, spots or dots, indentations or protrusions, of no importance or of the greatest significance? Are they waiting for the most important Paterian mots justes to land, so important that by the time Pater abandoned his manuscripts, they had not yet emerged from the depths of his artesian well? Or are they quantitative units in linear or aural space rather than semantic entities?

None of these blanks are visible behind the mask of the neatly printed page, which corresponded to the Paterian mask, described by both James and Symons, revealing nothing or only very little of what went on underneath it. The essay on “Style” provides a range of formal, conceptual and compositional ideals not always supported by the evidence in the manuscripts. Indeed, I would like to demonstrate the discrepancy between Pater’s sculptural ideal put forward in “Style” and his painterly practice revealed in the manuscripts, between the monolithic and the
mosaic. In so doing I place Pater’s compositional technique within John Reed’s definition of decadent style as one favoring the ornamental, “free to play within or around a rigid structure, adding to it without becoming genuinely redundant.”

The additive, fragmentary mosaic technique, joining independent units together on the basis of an underlying structure, works, on the surface, with an appeal to the eye’s ability to create unity out of often quite contradictory fragments. Jonathan Freedman commented on Pater’s binary or bifurcated vision as a fundamental aspect of aestheticism, leading in its ultimate refinement to the Wildean paradox. He observed that “the work of the aestheticists often reads like a mosaic composed of such contradictory moments carefully tessellated to produce an exquisite but ultimately enigmatic whole.” Wilde, master of dialogues and paradoxes, observed the mosaic qualities of Pater’s writing, linking them to the predominance of the visual over the aural in the writer. He accused him of composing for the printed page rather than for the ear, and in my discussion of Pater’s compositional technique I intend to explore this literary conflict between the eye and the ear.

NOTES

1 Houghton bMS 1150 (12).
2 John Reed, Decadent Style (Athens, OH: Ohio UP, 1985), 222.

HOW “CONSUMMATE”:
THE PARADOXICAL NATURE OF PATER’S DECADENT LANGUAGE
ANNE-FLORENCE GILLARD-ESTRADA (ROUEN UNIVERSITY)

This reading, which is indebted to Dowling’s work on the language of decadence, aims at examining the idea of the paradox and ambivalence that may characterize Pater’s decadent poetics, bearing in mind the general Exeter CFP’s interest in the relationships between poetics and a culture (possibly sensed as) in decline. I would like to concentrate on the collision between the Victorian marketplace culture and Pater’s style of decadence
(see Dowling’s “aesthetics of delay”), which gives attention to each unit (the page, the sentence, the word) and betrays a fear of dissolution. Pater initiates a language, a dialogue with other decadent writers or aesthetic artists. His language and ideas, which are indissoluble, since the thought is expressed by a very distinct form, with a particular style and mode of writing, are taken up by other figures of the time. For example, see an extract of the painter Frederic Leighton’s 1879 address to his students at the Royal Academy, which is Paterian in its formulation.

There is a tension between the linear and the atomic or fractionary, which escaped Pater, as his very sentences — or imitations, and even pastiches of his sentences — were extracted (often as fragments) from his texts and came to be circulated not only in the serious, friendly writings of the time, but also in critical essays, reviews or even in parodies. This tended to turn Pater’s formulations into catch-phrases such as those found in advertising (see the use of his words, such as “consummate” or the parody of the Heraclitean flux, etc. in Punch, in periodicals, or other types of parodies of Aesthetic culture). Wilde himself is the best example of this use of Pater’s phrases, which are turned into aphorisms that both have a “high,” serious, philosophical dimension and a “low,” commercial-like, trivial dimension. This may be one aspect of decadence in general, since the reflection associated with it was taking place in a fast-changing society of words of another kind. Pater’s poetics and ideas may therefore be considered as being deeply destabilized by the cultural context: words escaped him and disseminated without his controlling them (attempts at control may be found in his dialogue with Wilde).

PATER, DECADENT HISTORICISM, AND THE POETICS OF THE FRAGMENT: GASTON DE LATOUR AND IMAGINARY PORTRAITS
YURI COWAN (GHENT UNIVERSITY)

From the Greco-Roman twilight that infiltrates the late-second-century world of Marius through to the memorable portrait of Winckelmann suspended between his eighteenth century and the classical past, Walter Pater shows a consistent interest in epochs that mark a state of transition and selves with hybrid natures. In spite of Thomas Wright’s characterization of him
as a writer who “stands for white marble” and Arthur Symons’s contention that Pater’s oeuvre contains “not a page that is not perfectly finished,” Pater’s imaginary and critical portraits reveal a writer who can find significance equally in unfinished works, in ideals unreached, and in bodies rended and torn.

This paper will chart the connections between Pater’s sensitivity to moments of historical mutation or change (taking his unfinished fiction *Gaston de Latour* as its example), his use of material objects with problematic provenance or imperfect execution (like the unfinished architecture and mysterious unearthed flask in the early movements of “Denys L’Auxerrois”), and his portrayal of human bodies and their relics in the act or state of dismemberment, translation, or decay (in the final movements of “Denys”).

Drawing on Dennis Denisoff’s description of Pater’s sense of the “porosity of the carnal” (441) and on Jonathan Loesberg’s characterization of Pater’s method as one that “starts with the world and ends with our awareness of self slipping through our fingers” (22), I want to unsettle still further our residual notions of Pater as an idealist in his aesthetic aims, in the process also suggesting that Pater’s aestheticism and historicism both share an attitude of calm acceptance to inevitably frustrated creative or percipient purpose. Just as the stonemason in “Denys L’Auxerrois” finds a slippage between his inspiration and his capability, so the Decadent writer and poet purposely takes refuge in vague but evocative descriptors (“peculiar,” “ornate,” “mysterious”) and Gaston himself, in spite of his demand for a “corporeal poetry,” is simultaneously moved and not moved by “the beautiful faces of antiquity which are not here for us to see and unaffectedly love them.” No matter how corporeal the aesthetic world of the present, the subjectivity of the aesthetic percipient is always fragmented – just as, ultimately, Orpheus-like, Denys’s body is dismembered as well.

So, in “Duke Carl of Rosenmold,” Pater evokes “times of decadence or suspended progress” (136) as eras in which death is fetishized in material culture. But in spite of the fact that such ages seem, as Pater says, to have buried the whole world in their tombs, he will not allow any subjectivity to be buried for long. Duke Carl stages his own death and returns to the land of the living. Denys in the last stages of his enthusiasms takes to the work of a sexton, translating the relics of the dead from place to place and back
again. Pater’s own historicism of suspended progress and aestheticism of the material fragment, holding pure classicism at arm’s length, engages in the same sleight of hand, refusing to settle for perfection.

IV. Pater and Wilde

PATER AS INTELLECTUAL HERALD OF BRITISH DECADENCE
ELISA BIZZOTTO (UNIVERSITY OF VENICE)

At least since the publication of Mario Praz’s *The Romantic Agony* (1933), it has been generally accepted that distinctive notions of British decadent literature and art originate in Walter Pater’s poetics. Notwithstanding this, a single comprehensive study of Pater’s theoretical influence on Decadence has never been produced. Besides, while much has been said about Pater’s legacy to Oscar Wilde or, to a less extent, Vernon Lee, his influence on Aubrey Beardsley, Ernest Dowson and even Arthur Symons, the main theoretician of the Decadent Movement in Britain, remains considerably uninvestigated.

The aim of my paper is to re-trace the evolution, and occasionally involution, of Pater’s poetics in the works of British Decadent artists who maintained a dialogical attitude with his writings and to offer comparative analyses of their re-readings of Pater’s ideas. I will conduct my study by privileging such characteristic concepts of Pater’s poetics as art for art’s sake, the quest for stylistic perfection, the dynamics of artistic reception and the hybridization of arts, genres and modes.

Art for art’s sake is a shaping principle not only for Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and for such a major Decadent text as Symons’s *The Symbolist Movement in Literature* (1899), but also – as is probably less known – for Vernon Lee’s treatise *Belcaro, Being Essays on Sundry Aesthetical Questions* (1881), whose aesthetic radicalism signals the passage between Aestheticism and Decadence in British culture. Another characteristic concept of Pater’s doctrine, the apology for critical impressionism in the “Preface” to *The Renaissance*, radicalizes in Wilde’s representation of the critic as necessarily professing passionate partiality of judgment in “The Critic as Artist” (1891).
Starting from Pater's and Wilde's premises, the role of subjectivism and emotional involvement in artistic fruition is brought to extreme consequences in Vernon Lee’s essay *The Beautiful: An Introduction to Psychological Aesthetics* (1913), where critics and spectators of art are not only expected to manifest their impressions of it, but physically participate in it.

Pater's aesthetics, mainly articulated in the essay on “Giorgione” (1877), lays the foundations for Symons's theorization of *Anders-Streben* as distinctive of Decadent art in *Plays, Acting and Music* (1903) and *Studies in Seven Arts* (1906). In elaborating a type of writing that approaches poetry and music in their prose poems, Dowson and Wilde carry out Pater's idea of mutual illuminations of the arts and his aspiration to stylistic perfection.

My exploration of Pater’s aesthetic legacy to British Decadence will conclude with fiction, where Pater’s role as an intellectual herald is perceived in all its complexity. Originated at the crossroads between literature and the arts, prose and poetry, realism and the fantastic, his imaginary portraits inspired Wilde, Symons, Dowson, Lee, and Beardsley to experiment with osmosis of the arts, crossing of literary genres, and hybridization of literary modes.

"Fiery-coloured Life: Wilde's Exploration of Pater's Interart Thinking"  
Elicia Clements (York University, Canada)

The influence of Walter Pater on Oscar Wilde has certainly been established and, indeed, has quite an extensive history in critical scholarship. Critics attempt to determine whether or not Wilde was writing in support of Pater or against him in the novel *Dorian Gray*, for example, and, logically, biographical readings (particularly reliant on the reviews they wrote of each other's works) often provide the backdrop against which claims are made for either side. But I would like to shift the focus away from influence to explore the connection in intertextual terms by examining the interart thinking that circulates in both *Dorian Gray* and *The Renaissance*. Investigating the dialogic relation between their texts ultimately enables new possibilities to emerge in the area of their mutual concern to articulate aesthetic principles.

In Chapter 2 of *Dorian Gray*, for instance, the protagonist makes the
ominous oath concerning the painting: he would give his soul to be always young like the picture, and the ensuing, Gothic tale unfolds accordingly. But the painting is formed in a decidedly interartistic moment: the scene opens with Dorian sitting at the piano leafing through Schumann's "Forest Scenes," as the narrator and Lord Henry Wotton make fluctuating pronouncements throughout the chapter about differences and similarities among the arts, particularly those of literature, music, and painting. These oscillating declarations are the seemingly sinister, yet "fiery-coloured" (Paterian), food that feeds, so to speak, Dorian's transformation, all the while transpiring as he is sitting for his portrait. The claims of the novel, I will argue, depend much more on this fascinating intermixing of the arts than on just the visuality of portraiture and its ekphrastic link to literature. Correspondingly, similar interartistic conjecture takes place in The Renaissance, notably in "The School of Giorgione," the essay in which the now infamous dictum that "All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music" is stated. My paper will consider, therefore, what critical possibilities open up when we understand Pater and Wilde's texts in both interartistic and intertextual terms.

**WHEN GASTON MEETS DORIAN: PATER READING WILDE**

**Bénédicte Coste (Montpellier University)**

The relation between Pater and Wilde is conventionally regarded as a matter of influence, with the older Pater exerting authority over the immature Wilde. This simplistic view has served to inhibit serious discussion of the way in which their texts echo, allude to, cite and even contradict each other, and has obscured a real if partial appropriation that operated persistently between both authors. Though Pater's influence on Wilde is very apparent, a novel like Pater's unfinished Gaston de Latour has all the signs of Wilde's thought. I propose seeing their texts as predicated on an ongoing and continuous dialogue and shall concentrate on how in Gaston de Latour, Pater may be read in terms of Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray to negotiate the status of Decadence, thus conducting one of the most interesting textual relationships of the late nineteenth century. Responding to Wilde's novel enables Pater to concentrate on defining what was already known as the Decadence in
order to situate his own writings both as accepting and contesting a budding movement predicated on intertextuality, fragmentation, mercantilization, time, and subjective dislocation. Significantly Pater chose to answer the writings which he thought had systematized Decadent aesthetics and ethics.
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Schedule

9.00 - 9.15 Welcome from Organizers
9.15 - 10.45 Participants’ introductions
10.45 - 11.00 Coffee
11.00 - 11.30 Issue 1: The scope of the project. Facilitator: Ken Daley
11.30 - 12.00 Issue 2: Organization of materials. Facilitator: Stefano Evangelista
12.00 - 12.30 Issue 3: “Model” editions and editorial processes. Facilitator: Yuri Cowan
12.30 - 1.00 Issue 4: The digital domain. Facilitator: Laurel Brake
1.00 - 2.00 Lunch
2.00 - 2.30 Learning from past successes and miscues. Editors: Stephen Arata, Joe Bristow, Lesley Higgins, Gerald Monsman
2.30 - 3.30 Small groups
Reprise: After all the ideas and opinions that have been expressed, what are the key elements that should define a Collected Works of Walter Pater?
3.30 - 4.30 Final plenary discussion
WELCOME

The organizers – Laurel, Lesley, and Lene – explained their reasons for having the workshop: given the large number of Pater scholars at the “Decadent Poetics” conference, the timing seemed appropriate to initiate a long-overdue discussion concerning how, when, and by whom a collected works of Pater might be prepared.

INTRODUCTIONS

Participants were asked to introduce themselves and provide an answer to the following question: *As a researcher, teacher, and reader of Pater, what are the three most important features or elements that a Collected Works should include?* (The summaries that follow paraphrase the individual responses to this question.)

**Gerald Monsman:** There are many contentious issues concerning a Pater Collected Works. How to organize the material, for example, is particularly fraught with difficulties. A simple chronological ordering will not be sufficient because Pater rewrote his works so thoroughly and so often. Pater’s penchant for rewriting has also deterred publishers in the past.

**Kate Hext:** I would like to see good translations of the Greek and Latin quotations throughout the various works.

**Martine Lambert-Charbonnier:** Most importantly, the unpublished Portraits must be made available in a Collected Works. Also, the collection should be a critical edition, with references to Pater’s sources.

**Michael Davis:** I’m concerned about the organization and the question of chronology. Also, I was wondering what people’s thoughts are on including the visual art that Pater refers to so often. Should we include illustrations for the contemporary reader even though Pater himself did not?

**Anne-Florence Gillard-Estrada:** I have done a substantial amount of editing and translating of Pater’s work into French. Most important to me would be the publication of hard-to-find materials such as “The Aesthetic Life” and other unpublished works, as well as the different versions of the editions, which are very hard to find in France.
Bénédicte Coste: I would like to see all of the references to other authors included in the notes.

Joe Bristow: As editor of the OUP edition of Oscar Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, as well as the major Wilde undergraduate notebooks, I can tell you there are many difficulties when it comes to a large editing project such as this. You never feel like you know enough to edit. With Pater, there is such an importance placed on knowledge of the classics. I would recommend that you have on board at least two gifted classicists.

Stephen Arata: I think annotations for teachers, students, and scholars are important. I would also like to see illustrations. It would be good to include textual essays, especially in a digital age, as we could have many versions, multiple texts and contexts. We need to think about whether or not this will be a collection with data interpreted by scholars or not.

Elisa Bizzotto: I would like to see the unpublished materials as well as substantial annotations. We should focus on the different versions and receptions of Pater.

Ken Daley: If we are talking about ideals and I use my imagination, I envision a hybrid kind of collection, both print and electronic. We could print six volumes using scholarly copy-texts (Hill’s *The Renaissance* and Monsman’s *Gaston de Latour*), for example, with critical explanatory material, then put the rest online. This would dismantle the posthumous Pater. Users would have access to all the pieces; chronology issues would be up to the person browsing the digital archives. Also, I would like to see the rest of the unpublished materials included.

Yuri Cowan: I agree about the importance of electronic editions. I also think annotation should not turn into interpretation. I would suggest we use bibliographical headnotes for everything, give a textual history in a big introduction by a scholar, but also try to open up avenues rather than put forward argument. I would be in favor of a “clear text” edition, with no editorial interjections. It needs to be typographically attractive. There is a great difference between doing a diplomatic edition (respect the original and show what the editor has done) and a “clear text,” where we remove everything, like the Hill [edition of *The Renaissance*].
Stefano Evangelista: The collection should not only be for literary scholars, classicists, and art historians. We need the collection to be accessible, especially to students. Also, we should be thinking about some paperback editions for teaching.

Catherine Maxwell: I would like to see annotations, at the level of Hill and Monsman, as well as manuscript materials, and perhaps some of the elusive works around the texts.

Lene Østermark-Johansen: The manuscripts in the Houghton are a high priority for me. I would like to have illustrations included, or a picture database available. There are many different levels of reading Pater. The collection should balance Pater as a journalist and a writer of books. We also need to include an edition of the complete letters. I would also like to see an electronic text for/with searchability. As the new editor of the *Pater Newsletter*, there may also be things that we can assist with online or in print.

Laurel Brake: The published articles and journals need to be clear texts. I think we should provide general and marketplace context, and include the uncollected works, with reference to the posthumous materials. Basically, I see an electronic version, with e-readers. The move from information to interpretation can be addressed through the electronic form. I am in favor of a possible hybrid version, or a print run, but digital is the model for the future. It would be so useful, for example, to have contextual materials easily accessible, Wilde's review of *Appreciations*, for example, beside Pater's review of *Dorian Gray*. With the letters, there should be space for critical scholarship and we should use extant editions that are updated rather than a new *Gaston*, for example. We could have links to essays and other resources. We need to remember that low-use volumes are being discarded by libraries so I think we need a website that includes all of it, in addition to the print volumes.

Lesley Higgins: I would like to flag the importance of inclusivity. We need to include the published texts, but also the manuscripts. There is a need for all of the first editions and the manuscripts to be published simultaneously because the editing changed. Ideally, we need an edition that makes as much of the material available as possible. We also need to be thinking about
how we respect the text. The interdisciplinarity of Pater needs to be taken into account, the Greek, German, Latin, and English, as well as all of the visual art. This should be a highly collaborative endeavor given Pater’s wide-ranging expertise in so many areas. We should be thinking in terms of an editorial team because of this.

A short discussion ensued, given the issues that surfaced during the introductions.

*Lesley:* We also need to keep in mind that this is an international group. Who is our reader? This affects the level of annotation. But, of course, the economics will be key.

*Laurel:* This just supports the argument for the Web because change can be accommodated.

*Stephen:* The Web also has a mortality and demands sustainability. Digital means constant maintenance. Print might be high cost, but it will be there indefinitely. The afterlife of digital needs to be considered: it will never be complete, but it will eventually end.

*Lesley:* OUP has a commitment to print, but they also have plans for the OET online, which puts the texts into a digital mode or archive. Additionally, they have the compilation volume-paperback versions.

*Joe:* There are always economic issues.

*Martine:* Scholars are your audience in France. The Web versions are the most useful.

*Lesley:* But who owns what? Some things are in the public domain, but the manuscripts are different. There could be high fees for unpublished materials.

*Joe:* When a project like this occurs, legatees come out of the woodwork.

*Gerald:* I had to get permission from Constance Ottley, then the Jones sisters; I’m not sure if they are still alive.

*Stefano:* The Houghton does not own the rights, just the papers, so they charge for access but not for the copyright.

*Gerald:* I would hire a genealogist to find the Jones sisters; they gave me the okay for *Gaston.*
Megan: Other non-literary figures could provide examples of editions. The Freud Collection, for instance, includes translation information, subject index, explication of terms, changing definitions of terms, and other definitions. I would also be interested in concordances.

Lesley: There is also the relationship between the single volume and the collection to consider. How extensive is the index? What ancillary materials are included? Do we incorporate chronologies?

Laurel: Could we use the electronic version as prep for a paper edition? It would be useful to have a website associated with the *Pater Newsletter* that would develop materials for the editions.

Joe: There are many debates about different textual versions. Are they separate texts, or a different work? Hill’s edition is not the 1873 text, for example.

Yuri: The Web provides great access to multiple texts.

Martine: Pater’s quotations of other authors could be a way to introduce context.

Lesley: We would have a variety of readers, to be sure. Publishers will want finite, sellable materials.

Yuri: There are still good CDs, but CDs aren’t linkable.

Megan: We need to make theorized decisions.

Lesley: Yes, this must be the case. We are always making such choices with any editorial project.

Stephen: There are many levels of specificity in language, for example.

The meeting then adjourned for a short coffee break.

**Issue 1: The Scope of the Project**

The following is a précis of the discussion that followed.

*Ken* opened with specific questions: What do we propose to include in the Collected Works? Which versions would we like to see? *Joe* responded by referring to some of the debates in textual scholarship. He used the example of Robert Browning to lay out some of the issues involved in choosing a copy text. Which text does one use? The Oxford editions? The Ohio-Baylor
variorum editions? Or the Longman? Does one take Browning's earliest text and add in notes for every change that came afterward? Does one use the first written or the first published?

Gerald responded with a summary of the choices he made for Marius and Gaston. He thought the first editions were important because the later editions were bowdlerized by Pater himself. As a general rule, he chose the first editions because of the imaginative vision of the author, to keep the freshness of the first appearance of the work. Stephen commented that with Robert Louis Stevenson's work, one could choose the last edition the author had seen and/or changed, if the purpose is to demonstrate that the author is freshly and imaginatively engaged. Privileging the original can unnecessarily rule out later collections. For the Stevenson project, they are using the first published edition for purposes of consistency.

Laurel answered that with Pater, for every instantiation we have a different set of circumstances. Pater's anonymous essays in the Westminster Review, for example, pose a particular problem. The first version is not necessarily the best and this selection can change the weight of interpretations. Again, this proves the usefulness of having more than one version available. Michael asked, what is the point of what we are doing? Are we producing a definitive edition for scholars? Or is this for a more general readership? Laurel: indeed, who is Pater? The concept of authorship is important, the problem of the single author who doesn't exist. The text is a creature of the moment; it is not unique.

Yuri countered that the collection should be for students. He might be able to find the multiple texts, but students would not, yet they would be just as interested in the various versions. Lesley wondered how it would be possible to present the material informatively. The undergraduate poems should be included, as well as the letters, the manuscripts, perhaps some facsimiles, and the notebooks. Ken concurred and raised the issue of the importance of the notes. Stephen stated we could include everything in a digital environment, but this would change the scope of the project. Bénédicte noted that the costs change depending on which medium is chosen. Anne-Florence suggested that the collection's readers would also be scholars who work on other people.
In the conversation that ensued, comments were made about the problems of selection; the importance of cross-referencing (in both print and electronic media); bibliographies; licensing differences between print and digital; the value of a "heavy edit" for the digital version; and the inevitable overlap across Pater's texts (in both print and digital). *Kate* noted that people often dip into Pater, so she wants to be careful not to overwhelm readers; editors should be strict and realistic about for whom we are doing this. Lastly, *Megan* asked, should we have a single principle for all of the volumes?

**Issue 2: Organization of materials**

*Stefano* began by stating that all of these issues speak to the central question: how do we view Pater? The example of the posthumous editions begs the question. Pater didn't put *Greek Studies* together, so do we keep this version intact, just because it has been done, or do we reassemble?

*Martine* asked a similar question about the order and completeness of the *Imaginary Portraits*. *Megan* wondered how we ask publishers to change and update. *Laurel* responded that the ubiquity of the new product will be formative. The definitive editions do have a responsibility, but the market will deal with issues about updating, etc. This is beyond our purview. *Lesley* agreed. There are always competing editions. We do need to be aware of the legacy we are creating, however.

*Laurel* reiterated the issue of the posthumous Pater: the way in which he was constructed after his death is important to consider. In this context, *Miscellaneous Studies* might be more difficult to deal with than *Greek Studies*. We should not repeat the 1910 Library Edition version. *Lesley* suggested some categories for the collection: Fiction, Journalism, Letters, Manuscripts (the manuscripts could be kept separate, transcribed, or they could be edited and placed within the appropriate volumes).

*Michael* asked that we keep in mind the distinction between digital and print. Is it fair to assume that we are only talking about actual, physical texts? He liked the idea of chronological organization for the digital version, but noted that print texts necessitate a different organizational method. He also suggested that it is possible to get Pater wrong. This often happens when
people simply dip into his work. Part of the project here is to get Pater right – to produce a definitive version, a coherent Pater. Stephen observed one can curb “dipping” with the way one puts the texts together. But these scholars might actually be a major part of our audience. He suggested we create a good book, then include all of the factual material in a Web version.

Yuri asked, what are the basic facts that we need? What/who is the coherent Pater: the journalist, the don, the fiction writer? Megan responded, why are we worrying about how the texts are going to be read? How are we going to organize each version? Joe suggested that inflexible rules can wreak havoc. For example, with the Wilde editions, the general rule was to use the first version at all costs, which didn’t always turn out for the best. We need to be very careful about having unbendable rules for everything. And the economic reality affects things more than one can know from the start.

Joe was worried about “the fresh and the new” version of Pater because it is very hard to know what that means. When a work has gone through so much editing, at what moment is it the “right” text? Ken agreed. He was not sure even in the printed version we could find that “text.” Joe recommended that cross-referencing and reprinting of applicable volumes could mollify some of these issues. Stefano asked, is such a “text” presentable to a press? Joe replied that it is, and that Wilde’s materials are a case in point. Michael suggested that the example of Virginia Woolf: the essays are published separately in six volumes. Lesley responded that where Woolf is concerned, the inclusion of the Common Reader within the collected essays solved a bit of the problem. In reference to Pater, we seem to have an illusion of how long the texts actually are. Duplication is not as terrifying as we might think. Megan was concerned that reproducing essays would still accrue more pages. Her sense is that publishers don’t want to publish big long books. Laurel agreed that even with some degree of repetition, the books would not be very long.

Megan then asked, who is going to make the decisions about the selection of the materials? Laurel responded, collaborative boards. Lastly, Martine asked if the collection should reflect Pater or promote him as a philosopher. Kate supported this idea and thought this would be a real contribution.
ISSUE 3: “MODEL” EDITIONS AND EDITORIAL PROCESSES

Yuri opened the discussion with several questions. What about audience? If we are talking about “model” editions, we need to be thinking about the printed version. With this in mind, what sort of format might we suggest as a style? What would we like to see in terms of how the texts look on the page? Do we want a genetic edition or a diplomatic one? What principles of consistency do we want? How many volumes? How might we do one particular volume?

Joe inquired, are there manuscripts for The Renaissance? The response was, no, there are not. He followed by asking, is everyone convinced? Gerald mentioned that with Gaston, this was a significant issue. It could very well be that some collector has the manuscript of The Renaissance squirreled away. Joe cautioned that people do come out of the woodwork, so this needs to be checked. Lesley responded that Joe raised a good point: the editors will have to troll through the archives. Even the manuscript poems bought by John Sparrow have not been authenticated. Joe asked, what about presentation copies? Lesley added that another thing that must be done is the tracking down of all of the Sparrow material. Megan suggested checking to learn if an item had been on auction. Ken specified for the group that John Holroyd-Reece of Lincoln’s Inn was the name we were searching for earlier, the person from whom Harvard Houghton purchased the manuscript materials included in the Sotheby’s sale. The Sparrow holographs are at Brasenose College. They represent the most extended collection of various manuscripts.

Yuri raised several additional points. How will the editorial situation be organized? Will we have different editors for each volume? Will we stipulate a coherent editorial practice for whole book? How much freedom will there be among editors? How do we want the editions to look? Megan replied there should be cohesion among volumes. Laurel concurred, but noted differences still needed to be taken into account. This is what editorial boards are about. These things need to be argued out, and resolved.

Ken observed: Joe raised the issue of the copy-text. Are there other major issues that we need to be taking into account? Laurel responded that copy-text is less difficult now because of the Internet; one can decrease the privileging of the copy-text. Joe suggested there are two primary Paters: the Pater who is fresh
and lovely, and the Pater who is the reviser, perhaps even an earlier reviser and a later reviser. Hill’s text might be a good model for the collection to follow. Lesley added that the press might determine some of this. There could be translations right on the page in the text, with most everything else in the back to give a clear page. Do we or do we not want to interrupt the process of reading, as a general principle? Joe replied, with the Wilde, for translations we put them in the braces, but it sounds to me that with the Pater, you are going to have a great deal of variance throughout the editions. Perhaps using line numbers throughout the text would be helpful.

Lesley then suggested that there should be no more than two general editors; from the press’s point of view, it will want to deal with one person, or at least a single voice. Volume editors would be chosen by an editorial board. Yuri summarized: it sounds like we are coming to an organizational model.

ISSUE 4: THE DIGITAL DOMAIN

Laurel opened with a few suppositions: the notion of “users” has to be multiple; scholars must be included in the digital version; and this, in turn, must include students. Stephen made the point that our users are humanists, for the most part, but when one is working with technology, the people involved are not necessarily humanists. Whoever is involved on the digital side should try to be as imaginative as possible for what we want, and then should turn it over to people with technological know-how. Laurel suggested that at least one of the people on the editorial board had to be digitally literate.

Catherine asked: are user subscription fees often dictated by the press? Laurel responded that unless someone applies for a grant – that can buy access for a school, for one example – there are ways of making groups available by other means. Lene noted that libraries often buy into these things. Ken concurred, and suggested that with a hybrid edition, if a library bought the print version, it could get the online database as well. Joe mentioned that with the Taylor and Frances periodicals project, one can buy print copy only, but there are payoffs with the online subscriptions.

– Lunch –
Editors: Learning from Past Successes and Miscues

Stephen spoke about his experience as an editor for the Robert Louis Stevenson *Collected Works* project. Emory UP had published Sir Walter Scott, so it was also interested in publishing Stevenson’s materials. There are four general editors of the Stevenson project; 38 volumes in both print and digital editions. Thus far, there has been more movement and output on the print side of things. This process is much quicker because digital technology changes so quickly. Indeed, this lag has become a bit of a sticking point. The print aspect of the project is moving along well. There will be four volumes out in 2013, four more in 2014. Five volumes of Stevenson’s essays will come out simultaneously. And there will be four volumes of short stories. The collection as a whole is organized more or less chronologically. The editors are dispersed all over the world, as are the manuscripts and texts. There is a substantial body of posthumous work. There are important questions about what has been and should be included. We will have a digital archive that is supplementary to the text, making them open-source available to scholars. But this is a digital archive; we are not thinking about a digital version of the texts. Laurel wondered whether starting with a hybrid model would produce different results, since print editions followed by digital editions tend to delay the latter indefinitely. Stephen responded that the editors didn’t want to delay the print for the digital. There are also plusses for scholars to have open-source material that anyone can access, in addition to actual digital editions.

Next, Joe summarized his experience with the Wilde materials and OUP. For this project, there is no digital component. The guiding principle has been that good editions should have solid bibliographical information included. The material circumstances of any given text are very important, as is controlling the amount of notes. Ian Small, the general editor, did not want the edition to engage in literary criticism, so it doesn’t. Lene asked whether he had grant money or institutional support for his edition. Joe answered no. He used his own time and didn’t need too much else in terms of money. Stephen said that small departmental grants have helped him. He is getting ready to submit an application for an AARC grant as well as an NEH grant, but the editors want to have a few volumes completed to make a strong case for such a large project. Funding bodies often like to see an international roster of scholars involved.
Gerald Monsman summarized his experiences with the publications of Gaston and Marius. There were two projects. John Sparrow [who owned the manuscript of Gaston] had always wanted the novel to be published, so he was helpful. Gerald made copies of the original manuscript (kept in the vault at the University of Arizona). Support at the beginning of the project from an editorial team would have been beneficial; the book's design, for example, was a unilateral decision. When the volume was set up in digital form, ELT wanted the pages to be relatively "clean" (free from editorial markings). With Marius, print on demand was meant for graduate and undergraduate students, so the footnotes were extensive. Kate drew the conversation back to economic concerns, especially with regard to readership: Pater is not going to get the same sort of readership as Wilde or Stevenson. Gerald replied that the economics are in our favor much more so now than 15 years ago.

Laurel stressed that we are in no position to have a conversation with OUP yet. And, if OUP decides it doesn't want to do it, there are still ways to publish it, like publishing on demand, or Valencourt. Having a publisher will give one clout for applying for grants; but, without a set of general editors, no publisher is going to talk to us anyway. We need to be very informed before we talk to a publisher. One learned scholar and one Web-savvy person, at least, need to go into this negotiation. Oxford generally feels committed to publishing Oxford authors. We might consider, she added, other publishers; Pickering and Chatto are putting out good editions, and Rotunda too. If all else fails, she remarked, it is also worth thinking about open-source. The Pater edition need not founder because a publisher doesn't take it on.

Laurel stated that one of our most important tasks is to find the General Editors. Martine asked how we would choose them. Megan asked, what clout would be needed to pitch this project to Oxford or other possible presses? Would General Editors need to be established people for OUP to sign on? Joe argued that the most experienced are Gerald, Lesley, and Laurel. And then he asked: where are the three of you at with all of this? Joe suggested that Stefano might also be helpful because he is at Oxford and linked with the press. Lesley replied that her responsibility to the Hopkins project is her current priority, and she, while happy to help, doesn't think she can take on a Pater project as well. She and Laurel disagree about the issue of whether or not an editor learns on the
job or one should have an editorial background to begin with. Editing a volume without that background is really difficult. *Laurel* rejoined that she didn’t believe in born editors. What is needed is someone very smart, with a lot of energy, and a commitment to Pater. We do have a good example of someone who learned on the job in Joe Bristow. People agreed. *Gerald* said he wouldn’t want to start something that he couldn’t finish.

*Megan* asked *Lesley* whether she, *Laurel*, and *Lene* (or *Gerald*) might get the initial contract and then delegate others to come on board as General Editor(s). *Joe* argued that without them, it wouldn’t happen. If *Lesley* could set a prospectus on its feet, we would have a solid start, and could continue from there with other possible editorial arrangements. A lot of energy has been built up today but it’s not going to fly without the three of you, your clout and expertise. *Joe* felt it was urgent to seize this energy, just to get a document moving. *Laurel* commented that it would be useful to produce a document that we could share with future General Editors. *Lesley* responded that she would help to initiate the conversation but could promise nothing beyond that.

**Small groups**

The groups were asked to devise a possible organization for the Collected Works from different perspectives.

**Digital Group**

The group felt a digital edition would provide the most accessibility. Illustrations would bring the texts to life. The edition should be tightly organized with great scope, but not too overwhelming. Having a fully searchable text would be key; searchability would be enabled by an excellent concordance. The group also envisioned a chronological organization with cross-referencing, but with different ways of categorizing texts.

**Manuscripts Group**

The idea of Pater as “revisionist” was the foundation of this group’s suggestions. The five volumes that Pater put together would be maintained and
ordered largely chronologically and generically (although the group noted the
difficulty of fixing Pater's work generically). These would include The Renaissance,
Marius the Epicurean, Imaginary Portraits, Appreciations, and Plato and Platonism.
Additional volumes could include the Letters, the Philosophical Writings, Periodical
Publications (Fiction and Nonfiction), and perhaps a separate Fiction volume (that
would include Gaston). The manuscripts could be parceled out to the apposite
volumes. Materials could also appear twice among the various volumes.

**Fiction Group**

This group wanted a "clear text," with critical apparatus, and the variants
of the text at the back, not disruptive to the text (with translations at the end as
well). The short portraits, the two fragments, would be in an appendix, but they
would include the four Imaginary Portraits from the 1887 edition, and three from
Miscellaneous Studies. Concerning the order of the larger collection, The Renaissance
would come before the Imaginary Portraits and there would be separate volumes for
Marius and Gaston.

**Ad Hoc Group**

This group suggested that we should think about producing some shorter,
less intimidating editions before taking on the larger, quite overwhelming,
project. It was concerned that we might lose the great momentum built up
from the workshop if we are not able to do the whole project. Using the Pater
Newsletter website to collect manuscript materials was another suggestion.
*Joe* wondered about overlap and needless duplication. He asked if the 1873
and the 1893 editions of The Renaissance would be treated as separate works.
*Gerald* replied, yes. *Joe* added that this might be justification for a distinctive
dition by putting them side by side: this would be more manageable for
the researcher, and, because it has never been done before, it would appeal
to a publisher. *Ken* noted that everyone seemed okay with dismantling the
posthumous compilations of Greek Studies and Miscellaneous Studies. *Laurel*
added, however, that they would still need to be acknowledged.

Lastly, *Lesley* concluded that there could be a preliminary advisory
group of Lene, Gerald, Laurel, and herself that would put together a tentative
prospectus and send it out to the group. Then they would send it to OUP. At that point, however, someone else would have to step up to be the General Editor. She reiterated that she recommended no more than two General Editors should be appointed. The Editors would be assisted by an advisory board. The advisory board would choose the volume editors; a team needs to be built that will get things done. Ultimately, the General Editor’s position is very different from that of editing a particular volume.

Lesley closed the discussion by thanking everyone for coming, and thanking the organizers of the “Decadent Poetics” conference for accommodating us. Gerald invited the entire group to thank the workshop’s organizers.
The Collected Works of Walter Pater

A Proposal

The following proposal was and is very much a collective effort: Lesley Higgins drafted the plan in the aftermath of the lively discussions at the Workshop; the other members of the ad hoc advisory board – Laurel Brake, Gerald Monsman, and Lene Østermark-Johansen – helped to refine it considerably; then members of the Workshop contributed comments and further suggestions.

Walter Pater was the last person who wanted to be famous, let alone notorious, in late Victorian cultural circles. By all accounts a reticent and self-effacing person, he nonetheless published some of the most vivid and – for some – scandalous art criticism and some of the most intriguing prose fiction of the era. Compared with Dickens or Ruskin or Stevenson, Pater (1839-1894) was not a prolific author, but he was one of the most diverse and multidimensional: the ten volumes of the New Library Edition assembled after his death included art criticism and literary criticism, journalism, “imaginary portraits,” two novels (one complete, one half-published), and lectures on ancient Greek art, drama, religion, myth, and philosophy. No collected edition has appeared since the 1910 “Library” Edition.

The Bishop of Oxford wanted to burn Pater’s 1873 study of Renaissance art and artists; Oscar Wilde considered it to be his “golden book.” Our understanding of Pater’s significance as a critic, aesthete, prose stylist, and cultural icon has grown steadily since the 1960s, intensified by the insights of multi-disciplinary approaches to Victorian studies, inter-art appreciation, gay studies, and reassessments of Pre-Raphaelite art, Aestheticism, and Decadence. Pater contributed to and helped to shape the avant-garde critical discourses of his era, and had an indelible impact on modernists such as James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and T. S. Eliot.

Several Pater texts have been capably edited in the past, particularly The Renaissance, Marius the Epicurean, and Gaston de Latour. What students
and scholars of Pater have always lacked, however, are the full resources of a scholarly edition of all extant writings: texts that are carefully edited, historically situated, and fully indexed and illustrated. For the first time, the *Collected Works of Walter Pater* would bring together his correspondence, previously unpublished manuscripts, his many contributions to the leading periodicals of the day, and all of his prose fiction.

**Collected Works overview**

The *Collected Works of Walter Pater* would feature nine volumes arranged generically, thematically, and chronologically. Readers familiar with the 1910 "Library" edition of his works would easily find their bearings in this new arrangement, which foregrounds the five volumes published by Pater in his lifetime but augments each appreciably. The editors' primary aim is to make all of Pater's extant writings available in formats that respect the works' publishing histories and provide comprehensive textual and explanatory notes and academic resources. The latter would include: a substantial Introduction to each text and its historical and editorial contexts; a Chronology; Biographical Register; full index; and illustrations. Mindful that readers from very different disciplines will want to use these books, we would annotate amply but judiciously. Translations of all foreign phrases and quotations (from the French, German, Italian, Latin, and Greek) and full citations would be provided, another first in Pater studies.

- **Volume 1:** Correspondence
- **Volume 2:** The Renaissance
- **Volume 3 and 4:** Essays, Reviews, Articles
- **Volume 5:** Greek and Classical Studies
- **Volume 6:** Marius the Epicurean
- **Volume 7:** Imaginary Portraits
- **Volume 8:** Gaston de Latour
- **Volume 9:** Manuscripts, Fragments, Poems
PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE: PRINT AND DIGITAL DOMAINS

The Collected Works of Walter Pater is envisioned as a tripartite project: a print edition, an online edition, and a digital archive. The editorial work carried out for the print edition would be utilised in all three aspects of the Collected Works. The on-line edition should be fully searchable, and deploy appropriately developed software to enable users to explore Pater's writings as fully as possible. Whereas costs would determine, in part, the number of illustrations to be featured in the print edition, the on-line edition could be more inclusive in this regard. The digital archive, which would supplement existing research and encourage new Pater studies, would include: PDF copies of the 1910 “Library” edition, for posterity; PDF facsimiles of Pater’s key periodical essays; a number of digitised manuscript pages (to be negotiated with the Bodleian and the Houghton); and research materials and hyperlinks contributed by the various volume editors.

ADVISORY BOARD

The multidisciplinary range of Pater’s writings is one of the great pleasures of studying his works – and one of the great challenges. The project’s general editor will establish an Advisory Board that includes a classical scholar, art historian, philosophy and book historians, and a Victorianist, and draw upon their expertise throughout the planning and publication stages. Individual volume editors will also have the advantage of consulting with Advisory Board members at any and every phase of their work.

COLLECTED WORKS SUMMARIES

VOLUME I: CORRESPONDENCE

Building on the work of Lawrence Evans’s excellent 1970 Letters of Walter Pater (OUP), this new edition will feature previously unpublished letters; letters from correspondents when available; and thorough annotations. The Biographical Register will be especially helpful for readers trying to “place” Pater among correspondents such as Sidney Colvin, Emily Pattison Dilke, Edmund Gosse, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Vernon Lee, Alexander Macmillan, Arthur Symons, and Oscar Wilde. (The on-line edition could be linked to the ODNB to expedite research.) Other research aids will include a complete Bibliography of
Pater’s writings, and a Chronology.

Now that the Evans book is out of print, readers will be especially glad to have access to this volume, enlarged and enhanced.

**Volume 2: The Renaissance**

Pater was not only committed to a philosophy of “flux” and mutability, he approached each publishing experience as an opportunity to revisit, reconsider, and even reconstruct his volume. This is especially true of *The Renaissance*. When originally published in 1873, and entitled *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, the book featured a “Preface,” eight essays, and a “Conclusion.” Much of the controversy it generated focused on the “Conclusion” and its sensational argument for “self-culture” and the need to “burn always with this hard, gem-like flame,” whether experiencing life or art. Consequently, when the second edition, published in 1877 and re-named *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*, appeared, the “Conclusion” had been omitted and one of the essays notably enlarged and re-titled. For the third edition, 1888, Pater reinstated the “Conclusion” and added “The School of Giorgione,” now recognized as one of his most original and ground-breaking meditations on the boundaries between the arts. The fourth edition of 1893, featuring numerous small editorial changes throughout, was the final version supervised by Pater. To demonstrate the development of the text and its many permutations, the *Collected Works* will feature a comparative presentation of the 1873 and 1893 editions. (Readers of the *Collected Works* will have access to the periodical versions of the various essays in Volumes 3 and 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1873</th>
<th>1893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Preface”</td>
<td>“Preface”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aucassin and Nicolette”</td>
<td>“Two Early French Stories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pico della Mirandola”</td>
<td>“Pico della Mirandola”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sandro Botticelli”</td>
<td>“Sandro Botticelli”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Luca della Robbia”</td>
<td>“Luca della Robbia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The School of Giorgione”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Joachim Du Bellay"  “Joachim Du Bellay”
“Winckelmann”  “Winckelmann”
“Conclusion”  “Conclusion”

**Volumes 3 and 4: Essays, Reviews, and Articles**

For the first time, all of Pater’s numerous contributions to the leading journals of his day—the Academy, the Athenaeum, the Bookman, the Contemporary Review, the Fortnightly Review, the Guardian, Macmillan’s Magazine, the New Review, the Nineteenth Century, the Pall Mall Gazette, the Westminster Review—will be presented, in chronological order. Extensive cross-referencing will effectively explain the relationship between various texts and Pater’s contemporaries: how the incendiary “Coleridge’s Writing” (1866) and its argument for “relativism,” for example, became the circumspect “Samuel Taylor Coleridge” (1880); how the final paragraphs of “Poems by William Morris” (1868) were reconstituted as the “Conclusion” to The Renaissance (1873); how Pater alternately provoked and answered the criticism of John Ruskin in a series of architectural and painterly studies; and his engagement with contemporary fiction. Essays that were subsequently revised and reworked for The Renaissance will be presented in their original state.


**Volume 5: Greek and Classical Studies**

Professionally, Pater was an Oxford don, tutor, and professor of classical studies. This volume includes the published versions of public talks; occasional essays on ancient Greek art and drama; and the collected lectures on Plato and Platonism he presented, to substantial acclaim, in 1893.

“The Myth of Demeter and Persephone” (2 parts; 1876)

“A Study of Dionysus” (1876)

“The Beginnings of Greek Sculpture. I. The Heroic Age of Greek Art” (1880)
"The Beginnings of Greek Sculpture. II. The Age of Graven Images" (1880)
"The Marbles of Aegina" (1880)
"The Bacchanals of Euripides" (1889)
"Hippolytus Veiled: A Study from Euripides" (1889)
"The Age of Athletic Prizemen: A Chapter in Greek Art" (1894)

Plato and Platonism: A Series of Lectures (1893; PP)
"Plato and the Doctrine of Motion" (1892)
"Plato and the Doctrine of Rest" (1893)
"Plato and the Doctrine of Number" (1893)
"Plato and Socrates" (1893)
"Plato and the Sophists" (1893)
"The Genius of Plato" (1892)
"The Doctrine of Plato" (1893)
"Lacedaemon" (1892)

The Republic (1893)
"Plato's Aesthetics" (1893)

Volume 6: Marius the Epicurean

Academics and general readers alike have long acknowledged that Pater's 1885 novel is one of the major bildungsromane of the Victorian era, a book to be read in the company of Newman's Loss and Gain, Dickens's Great Expectations, and Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre. Set in 2nd century CE Rome, in the age of Marcus Aurelius, the novel charts a young man's quest for spiritual and personal certainty among the competing possibilities of ancient chthonic religions, Stoicism, Christianity, and Epicurean "self-culture."

Volume 7: Imaginary Portraits

Following the example of Gustave Flaubert's Trois contes, Pater published a series of innovative "imaginary portraits" and fictional biographical studies. Only four, however, were collected in the 1887 volume Imaginary Portraits. The compelling subjects range from resurrected ancient gods to a European aristocrat, an actual
eighteenth-century French painter, and an impressionable young Englishman.

"Imaginary Portraits I: The Child in the House" (1878)
"Imaginary Portraits 2: An English Poet" (1878; unfinished; 1931)
"A Prince of Court Painters" (1885; IP)
"Denys L'Auxerrois" (1886; IP)
"Sebastian Van Storck" (1886; IP)
"Duke Carl of Rosenmold" (1887; IP)
"Emerald Uthwart" (1892)
"Apollo in Picardy" (1893)

**Volume 8: Gaston de Latour**

Only half of the novel was published, serially, in Pater's lifetime; subsequently the manuscript chapters were variously withheld, sold, coveted, and stored away by literary executors, heirs, and collectors. Readers had to wait until Gerald Monsman's 1995 edition of *Gaston de Latour: The Revised Text* to understand the novel's complex compositional history and read the book in its entirety. Monsman's meticulous editorial scholarship will be incorporated into the *Collected Works* version of *Gaston*.

**Volume 9: Manuscripts, Fragments, Poems**

Students and researchers are particularly eager to have access to the texts now housed in the Houghton Library, Harvard and the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. These manuscripts are indispensable for a full understanding of Pater's scholarly, aesthetic, and creative endeavours. Some of the fragments are elegant sentences preserved for later use; some are sketches for additional imaginary portraits; others are all-but-finished essays and lectures. The poems, long attributed to Pater but never before published, were part of a portfolio owned by the late John Sparrow, Warden of All Souls and an ardent collector of Pater materials.

*Art and Aesthetics*

"The Aesthetic Life," "Arezzo," [Corot], [Notre-Dame de Troyes], [The Parthenon]
Fiction
[The young Romantic], "Tibalt the Albigense," "Gaudioso the Second," [Reflexions by Lake Geneva], [Thistle], [An imaginary portrait]

Literary Studies
[English literature; notes on Chaucer], [Notes on Chateaubriand], [Dante]

Miscellaneous fragments

Philosophy and Classical Studies
"Pascal," [The history of philosophy], [Moral philosophy], "Introduction to Greek Studies," "Plato's Ethics," [Essay on Plato], [draft of a page from Plato and Platonism], [Essays on Plato: fragments], [Hobbes], ["The Marbles of Aegina – A Lecture"], [Evil in Greek Art]

Religion
"Art and Religion," "The Writings of Cardinal Newman"

Translations
Translations from Plato's Republic; Translations from Feuillet's La Veuve, chapter 9; "The Youth of Michelet," from La Jeunesse de Michelet; Translations from Flaubert's Correspondence

Poems

Anna Budziak’s *Text, Body, and Indeterminacy: Doppelgänger Selves in Pater and Wilde* (2008) is the most sustained attempt to honor the complexity of Pater’s *Imaginary Portraits* (1887) yet published. Budziak devotes the first half of this ambitious monograph to close analysis of the four portraits, and, in the latter half, illuminates the affinities between Pater’s portraits and Wilde’s “The Sphinx Without a Secret” (1887), “The Portrait of Mr. W. H.” (1889), “The Fisherman and His Soul” (1890), and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890). The result is a flawed but often richly rewarding book.

Budziak interprets Pater and Wilde’s work through the lens of the American neo-pragmatist tradition, suggesting that the two Victorian writers deploy the motifs of the *doppelgänger* and the *flâneur* in ways that dovetail with the terms of a debate between the philosophers Richard Rorty and Richard Shusterman. In a lucid and engaging introductory chapter, Budziak declares her preference for Shusterman’s pragmatism over Rorty’s and makes a compelling case for the value of Shusterman’s concept of “somaesthetics” as a framework for reading Pater and Wilde. Shusterman is something of an errant disciple of Rorty’s, crediting Rorty with his conversion to pragmatist thought yet defining his own vision against Rorty’s. Budziak filters her discussion of Rorty largely through a recapitulation of Shusterman’s critique of his work; some readers may find Budziak’s engagement with Rorty’s ideas somewhat cursory and secondhand. According to Budziak, the key difference between the two thinkers is that where Rorty understands the self as a chiefly discursive phenomenon and insists that interpretation goes “all the way down,” Shusterman emphasizes that the self is also crucially shaped by non-linguistic, bodily experience. Shusterman’s project, “somaesthetics,” is an attempt to formulate a non-essentialist philosophy of embodiment. He defines it thus:
the aim [of somaesthetics] is not to provide essentialist philosophical definitions but to bring together and deploy the various things we know (or can learn) about embodied perception (aesthesis) and action, and about socially entrenched body norms and practical somatic disciplines, so that this knowledge can be used, in actual embodied practice, to enrich our lives and extend the frontiers of human experience as we now know and imagine it. (85)

The congeniality of many of Shusterman's ideas to Pater’s work will be clear to readers of this journal. Like Pater, Shusterman aims to remedy the tendency of Western philosophy to denigrate or ignore the embodied nature of perception, and he offers an optimistic account of what a full recognition of the unity of mind and body might yield. Throughout her book, Budziak juxtaposes Shusterman's somaesthetics with Rorty's ideal of the ironist who has repudiated the search for absolute truth and learnt to enjoy the contingency of the various discursive masks he adopts. The Rortian ironist, ever in pursuit of new and more fertile “vocabularies” for self-definition, is for Budziak the postmodern twin of the nineteenth-century decadent aesthete, ever in pursuit of more refined sensations in a quest to stimulate a jaded sensibility.

A real virtue of this book is that its efforts to find points of convergence between Victorian thinkers and postmodern philosophy generally feel easy and organic, and never come at the expense of close engagement with the former. Budziak emphasizes that Rorty and Shusterman share Pater and Wilde's preoccupation with the nexus between ethics and aesthetics, and notes that Victorian aestheticism has a complex afterlife in Rorty and Shusterman's works, with Pater and Wilde occasionally making cameo appearances. Budziak's allegiance to Shusterman, however, at times seems to produce a rather Manichean portrait of nineteenth-century decadence and aestheticism: Shusterman is identified with a virtuous aestheticism that tries to heal the rifts between body and mind, the ethical and the aesthetic, while Rorty is identified with a cold, cerebral decadence that expropriates discourses for the thrill of textual play. Arguably, this dualism is loosely faithful to ambivalences within Pater and Wilde’s engagements with aestheticism and decadence, but it leads to some distortions as well. This is most visible in Budziak's chapter on “A Prince of Court Painters,” in which Budziak's
ahistorical tendency to identify any distrust of sensuousness or the body with a Rortian intellectualism results in what seems to me a dramatic misreading of the narratorial tone. The pious, unworldly narrator of this story – who strikes me as a sympathetic creation – becomes in Budziak’s hands a weirdly villainous figure, guilty of subjugating others to a chilly, logocentric understanding of the world.

It is necessary to read Budziak’s introduction carefully to grasp the intricacy of her argument about the Imaginary Portraits. To the reader who turns first to any of the four chapters on Pater, Text, Body and Indeterminacy will perhaps seem mainly like a pendant to Gerald Monsman’s Pater’s Portraits: Mythic Pattern in the Fiction of Walter Pater (1965), albeit one which substantially enhances our understanding of the intellectual scope and allusive texture of the portraits. Budziak’s book is certainly a valuable synoptic guide to their intellectual contexts and representational strategies; while she rehearses many points made by earlier critics, perhaps most notably Monsman, John Coates, and Billie Inman, she synthesizes these into an attractive unity and makes a number of fresh observations. In particular, the fact that Budziak is – unlike most Pater critics – largely incurious about Pater’s tendency toward veiled autobiography means that she treats the narratorial voices of each of the Imaginary Portraits as far more problematic than previous critics have done. Where Pater scholarship has tended to construe these narrative voices as surrogates for Pater’s critical persona or autobiographical impulse, Budziak reads them as radically unreliable, and argues that their constructions of the world are always subtly undermined by indeterminacies that Pater sews into the narrative.

It is easy to lose sight of Budziak’s argument in her painstaking, thickly annotated explications of the myths, philosophical ideas, and tropes that run through the Imaginary Portraits, since it only crystallizes at the very end of each chapter. It is also at such points that Budziak’s investment in the debate between Rorty and Shusterman tends to surface explicitly. Budziak argues that Pater always underscores the inadequacy of the discourses or Rortian “vocabularies” that the key protagonist of each portrait draws upon in his creative self-fashioning, as well as the serious limits of those used by the narrator of each portrait in his or her endeavor to analyze the protagonist in question. She also claims that Pater (like Shusterman) ultimately gestures at a corporeal or “somatic” reality that eludes all such bids at discursive self-definition, as well as the overly schematic and intellectualized modes of interpretation practised by the narrators.

Budziak sometimes risks mystifying and essentializing the “somatic” in her
very attempts to emphasize its unfixed nature; she frequently refers to the "mystery of soma" (ix), "the unaccountable somatic reality" (72), and the "indeterminacy of soma" (viii). The word "soma" begins to acquire some of the quasi-sacral aura that terms such as "aporia" or "alterity" radiate in academic theory. Elsewhere Budziak appears to equate her concept of indeterminate "soma" with nineteenth-century biological materialism, and I wished for clarification of how she understands the relationship between these paradigms. In particular, I wondered if Budziak would find anticipations of somaesthetics in other Victorian writers and in Victorian materialism more broadly conceived, or if such an enlightened conception of the embodied self is a special achievement of the aestheticisms of Pater and Wilde. With respect to the Imaginary Portraits, Budziak's invocations of "soma" (or of her awkward synonym for it, "bodiness" [73]) sometimes obscure that she is merely referring to the fact that each portrait concludes with the death of the key protagonist. This in turn creates the misimpression that Budziak's concept of "soma" is reducible to the fact of mortality, or more precisely, to the rather banal insight that death represents the triumph of matter over mind. As Budziak elucidates it, Shusterman's "somaesthetics" stresses the liberatory and creative possibilities of embracing the oneness of mind and body. Although major parts of Pater's oeuvre could be fruitfully read alongside Shusterman's philosophy (The Renaissance [1873] and Plato and Platonism [1893] seem obvious choices), the Imaginary Portraits actually seem to drag against Shusterman's (and Budziak's) hopeful rhetoric insofar as the portraits are preoccupied, even obsessed, with the miseries of embodiment, particularly one's vulnerabilities to illness and violence. Despite her interest in the trope of the doppelgänger and her otherwise thorough surveys of the generic modes of the portraits, Budziak glosses over the extent to which the Imaginary Portraits represent embodiment in Gothic terms. Likewise, Budziak does not fully acknowledge the extent to which Pater portrays the metaphysical aspirations of the stories' narrators and/or protagonists sympathetically, even if he does not grant such longings any clear intellectual warrant.

This book deserved better editing. It is marred by a number of minor solecisms and infelicities, and Cambridge Scholars Press has done Budziak a disservice by failing to remedy the moments where she slips out of idiomatic academic English. I do not wish to overstate this problem, however: on the
whole, Budziak's prose is precise, and it is a testament to the quality of the book that it can be read with pleasure in spite of these blemishes. In this era of the slim yet anxiously wide-ranging monograph, it feels luxurious to read a three-hundred-page book focused on only two authors, and permitted to devote whole chapters to the close reading of short stories.

Queen Mary, University of London

WORK CITED

ANDREW EASTHAM

WHITELEY, GILES. AESTHETICISM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF DEATH: WALTER PATER AND POST-HEGELLIANISM. STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE 20, LEGENDA: OXFORD; 2010, £45.00, 188 PP.

The starting premise of Giles Whiteley’s Aestheticism and the Philosophy of Death is that the young Walter Pater had a sickness called “Hegelianism,” which he continually struggled with and to some extent managed to overcome, primarily in his fictional works, but also, at least partially, in his unpublished philosophical manuscripts. The key text here is the unpublished essay on “The History of Philosophy,” and very specifically, Pater’s assertion that Hegel’s work uncovered a “radical dualism,” the implications of which Hegel himself could not admit. According to Whiteley’s thesis, Pater’s relation to Hegel had a series of phases: following his resistance to Hegelian dogmatism in the “Conclusion,” Pater embraced a revisionary Hegelianism, but then later awoke from this dogmatic slumber in the unpublished philosophical manuscripts. The fiction that Pater wrote in the 1880s, in the same period or after “The History of Philosophy,” is then read as the finest fruit of Pater’s post-Hegelian phase, in which, in Nietzschean fashion, he both diagnoses the sickness of his former idealism and intimates a way beyond dialectical reason.

Whiteley’s thesis is schematic and very persistent, but it does have a number of problems, some of which I shall cover here. It begins with a very sudden proliferation of dogmatic claims, including a Nietzschean analysis of Pater’s ressentiment that will recur throughout the book. His argument’s basis is biographical and psychosexual. Considering the theoretical ambitions of this work, it is surprising that the author chooses to position the recent historical discovery about Pater’s affair with William Money Hardinge as the fundamental basis of his ressentiment, and consequently the reason for his theoretical turn to Hegel. According to this naive biographical reading, Whiteley develops a familiar post-idealist skepticism about the ideology of the aesthetic. Terry Eagleton’s polemic of this name is important to Whiteley’s conclusion, and like Eagleton, Whiteley ultimately seeks to reclaim the aesthetic from the bounds of ideology and idealism. Yet, in spite of the book’s titular concern, it is not at all clear where Aestheticism sits in this analysis. Is Pater’s Aestheticism intimately associated
with what Whiteley diagnoses as his early bondage to Hegelianism? Or did he manage to develop a Dionysian vision that might stand as a radical alternative to idealism and nihilism? If so, what was the place of art as form and practice in this philosophy of life? Was it to be surpassed in the coming of an aesthetic life? Or could it be made central to the Dionysian vision of cultural renewal, in the way that theatre and poetry were central to Michael Field’s post-Paterian embrace of Dionysus?

The theoretical underpinning of Whiteley’s reading is Kojève’s premise that Hegelianism is a “philosophy of death.” But there is a great deal of unqualified assertion as to how this relates to Pater’s very suggestive comments about Hegel’s “radical dualism.” Whiteley seems to be assuming that his audience will have full knowledge of the unpublished Houghton Library manuscript, with its sometimes indecipherable but hugely suggestive intellectual resources. At the moment of writing there is a pressing need for an explicative and introductory approach to this material, but before this has been undertaken, Whiteley has already piled up a series of over-determined equations from a few quotations. Hegelianism and Christianity are mutually demonized, and dialectics is derided as the denial of “animal life.”

Aside from his assumptions about readership, there are major philosophical problems with Whiteley’s anti-idealist message. He begins with the assertion that “Pater’s anti-Hegelianism was itself a variation of Hegelianism” (12) because it was “still dependent on dialectical methodology.” But it should be clear from critical theory after Adorno that we can take a dialectical method to a limit point that is not bound by the totalizing qualities of Hegel’s work. In “The History of Philosophy” Pater might be said to be uncovering a force of dialectical contradiction that is unresolved by spirit or the ethical life of community, but Whiteley’s premise from the beginning is that Pater’s assertion of “radical dualism” surpassed or exploded dialectical method. His continual references to Bataille and Deleuze make for a very tendentious piece of comparative theory, since it should be clear from a reading of “A Study of Dionysus” that Pater and Bataille are poles apart, in spite of their mutual allegiance to the Bacchic deity. Pater reconceived Dionysus as a civilizing force, and he was clearly skeptical of Dionysian excess in his essay on “The Bacchanals of Euripides,” while Bataille was unblushingly eager to found a sacrificial cult for the twentieth century.

Whiteley attempts to force his argument about the post-dialectical Pater by
a very selective textual resource, in which the *Imaginary Portraits* has a privileged place. In the reading of “A Prince of Court Painters,” Watteau’s idealizing style is read by direct analogy to the Hegelian *Aufhebung*, and it is assumed when Marguerite refers to the painter’s “tact of omission” that Pater is implicitly criticizing his idealizing distance. Perhaps so, but any reading of Pater’s approach to painting here surely needs to address the proximity between this vision of Watteau’s art and the Giorgionesque mode that Pater theorized so comprehensively, drawing, as Billie Inman has noted, on Hegel’s theory of painting as well as Baudelaire’s. Yet the context that might complicate matters is not addressed. The reading of “Sebastian von Storck” is more promising, based on the premise that whilst the object of Pater’s critique is ostensibly Sebastian’s Schopenhauerian idealism, this life-denying transcendental aspiration is actually a product of Hegelian monism. Whiteley does find some good evidence for this in Sebastian’s metaphysical dialogue with himself. The problem is that to fully develop such an argument would require an extended history of idealism, encompassing Spinoza’s legacy, and the different ways that Schopenhauer and Hegel responded to Kant’s transcendental critique. It would also require a patience with Pater’s texts that is often missing here.

Whiteley’s reading of the short fiction does raise some compelling issues of literary form, and it is frustrating that he does not have more space to follow these through. He cites Pater’s letter to George Grove concerning the open and suggestive genre of the imaginary portrait; Pater’s idea is that the portrait should be a means to speculation about what became of its subject. Whiteley takes Blanchot as his theoretical and literary ground, and this is a convincing comparative focus, since Blanchot himself articulated the legacy of Schlegel and the Romantic fragment, which was equally important to Pater, particularly in “The Poetry of Michaelangelo.” But the suggestive possibilities of this form are ultimately lost in Whiteley’s insistent return to a dogmatic anti-Hegelian message. He declares at one point that the novel is the “quintessentially Hegelian form,” a contention which I can only imagine convincing readers whose literary diet is constituted entirely by repeated uncritical readings of *Middlemarch*. Otherwise, it is an astonishingly narrow claim. Hegel himself avoided the novel in his own account of aesthetic modernity, and it has been argued that Hegel was forced into this selective blindness by the very democratic openness of the novel as medium. In any case, by the time Whiteley has demonized the novel, his attention to the
idea of open form in the *Imaginary Portraits* has been lost. Rather than taking Pater's incompleteness as a spur to imaginary futures, all of Whiteley's analyses conclude schematically; “Sebastian's sacrifice is speculative: no kind of sacrifice at all” (93), whereas Denys is “abstract negativity as Nietzschean affirmation.” Watteau, familiarly enough, represents the sickness of idealism, but then what of Marie-Marguerite Pater, the most tentative, incomplete, and open of Pater's characters? At no point does this analysis place its faith in Marguerite, Pater's diaphanous reserve, and ask what her future might be after Watteau's death, her capacity for affirmation tentative, her position in existence a twilit area in between the spiritual and the aesthetic dimensions.

Whiteley likes to cite the famous phrase from Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, in which dialectics involves a tarrying with the negative, a moment of restless curiosity and anxiety that will ultimately be surpassed and resolved in the progress towards spirit. The problem with Whiteley's book is that he refuses to tarry with Pater for long; in the relentless return to a panoply of anti-Hegelian thinkers which Whiteley uses to justify his readings, many of the key legacies of Pater are lost: Pater's style, whether it be terse and ambiguous, or elusive, paratactic, and poetic; and the complex engagement with Hegel's *Aesthetics* in his early writing, where Pater appropriated or subverted idealist thought with a deftness that fully justified his retort against dogmatism in the “Conclusion.” Finally, many of Pater's most important works are absent: “The Study of Dionysus” gets only a cursory reading, and “The School of Giorgione” is barely mentioned. It is not surprising then that the sensuous particularity of writing and its aspiration towards music is lost. It is a shame that a work with such an urgent and ambitious remit could not marry the task of critical theory with the devoted attention that Pater himself gave to aesthetic criticism.
Elisa Bizzotto


The Macmillan Edition of Pater's works, at the centre of debate at the recent "Decadent Poetics" conference in Exeter (July 2011), also plays a key role in Max Saunders's Self-Impression: Life-Writing, Autobiografiction, and the Forms of Modern Literature, where it acts as a catalyst for modernist ideas. The publication of the Library Edition in the crucial year 1910 brought Pater to the attention of young artists who were then beginning to articulate and refine their aesthetics. As Saunders, echoing Woolf, asserts, "the challenges [Pater's] work presents were part of the reason 'human character changed.'"

In this very wide-ranging and intellectually stimulating study, centered on modernism's engagement with what Saunders defines as "auto/biography" or "autobiografiction," Pater becomes a gatekeeper for new forms of life-writing that, passing through the works of Ruskin, Proust, and Gissing, among others, will assume a more definite shape in the early twentieth century. In the modernist period, these late-Victorian forms of writing will develop into imaginary autobiography (Joyce, Svevo, and Pessoa), into verse (Pound), and satirical auto/biografiction (Aldington and Lewis), and finally into the innovative fictional (auto)biographies of Woolf and other Bloomsburyites. Their experimental writings will continue to flourish in the following decades and then, as documented in Saunders's final chapter, well into postmodernism through the meta-autobiografictional "afterlives" of Sartre, Nabokov, Lessing, and Byatt.

The initial chapter of Saunders's volume is devoted mainly to Pater as the originating force for these various forms of twentieth-century life-writing, and his presence resonates throughout the whole book, particularly in the first part on the fin de siècle. In Saunders's view, it is the "Conclusion" to The Renaissance that initiates the peculiar overlapping of fact and fiction that is characteristic of Pater's writings and greatly influential for later authors. In his most famous essay, Pater substitutes
the traditional Western concept of the soul with that of the self, an entity which pursues experience for its own sake and tends to dissolution. Elusive and fading, experience can lead to the perception that fact and imagination are indistinguishable. Such ideas were transmitted to impressionists, modernists, and even postmodernists through the imaginary portrait, here seen as a fundamental, though still much under-rated, contribution to subsequent discourses in life-writing, aesthetic literature, and inter-art poetics, especially those elaborated “on or about” 1910.

Saunders plugs a gap in Paterian criticism by providing a novel contribution to what he considers an interlacing of forms, rather than a genre, on account of its radically heterogeneous and hybrid nature. The imaginary portrait, he contends, blurs the lines of definitions. Not only is it a combination of forms, but the forms themselves also happen to be the result of different genres, arts, and aesthetic media. This emphasis on the imaginary portrait’s fluidity makes any attempt at categorization questionable – an original argument that lays stress on the imaginary portrait’s modernity and gives convincing reasons for its impact on the following generations.

More traditional is Saunders’s identification of the imaginary portrait with the four 1887 portraits along with “The Child in the House,” “Emerald Uthwart,” and Marius, with only occasional mention of “Apollo in Picardy” and Gaston and no reference to “Hippolytus Veiled.” These texts are seen as rewriting the “Conclusion” in their presentation of the self as volatile – as perceptible for a brief instant before turning into another self. The connection between the “Conclusion” and the mature portraits is quite reasonably identified with the seminal expression of all Pater’s imaginary portraiture, “The Child in the House,” whose significance as the bildung of an artistic personality and an exploration in self-uncertainty Saunders acutely illuminates. Starting from “The Child in the House,” he also ponders the oxymoronic nature of the expression “imaginary portraits,” which can be comprehended only by thinking of Pater’s texts as a succession of “brief lives” that are ultimately imaginary self-portraits. They convey the necessity to shadow and at one time expose the author’s true self and can be seen as a way to articulate his sexuality through his work. Autobiografiction, with its emphasis on personality, becomes a channel for
otherwise silenced gender issues.

From a formal point of view, Pater is one of the first to posit questions which challenge writers of autobiographical fiction, whether aesthetes or modernists. Yet, while Saunders recognizes Pater’s involvement with history and autobiography as typical of his time, he also senses that the imaginary portrait’s fusion of autobiography with history, fiction, and aesthetics makes the writer’s contribution to modernism more cogent. Similarly, if Pater’s criticism still manifests a somewhat Arnoldian pursuit of objectivity—he actually wants to see the self, though not art, as “in itself it really is”—it’s contradictory relation to subjective forms of writing suggests a (proto)modernist bent and represents a necessary step towards Eliot’s (and others’) championship of impersonality.

Further points of contact with later authors stem from Pater’s style and technique. Saunders associates the writer’s impressionism and subjectivism with his obsessive textual revisions, exemplified by the well-known editorial history of the “Conclusion.” The “Conclusion” in its turn undergoes an extreme operation of rewriting in Marius, which is even more paradigmatic of Pater’s ruminative method of composition. Yet Pater’s style does not only result in a pastiche of styles from previous personal works, but also from past ages and traditions, as illustrated by the incipit of “Duke Carl of Rosenmold.” Quite paradoxically for a writer whose prose has often been considered very idiosyncratic, then, Pater’s style does not turn out to be as strikingly subjective. For Saunders this is indicative of Pater’s constant description of a disintegrating self and signals his swerve to (post)modernism.

Conspicuous in its originality, Saunders’s interpretation nevertheless inscribes itself within a tradition of modernist-focused criticism that since the 1980s has granted attention to Pater’s legacy to modernist writers. Such assessments include Perry Meisel’s The Absent Father: Virginia Woolf and Walter Pater, F. C. McGrath’s The Sensible Spirit: Walter Pater and the Modernist Paradigm (not mentioned in Self-Impression) and Frank Moliterno’s The Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce. Saunders is on the whole appreciative of these studies, yet notes their tendency to concentrate on the influence of Pater’s style and aesthetics rather than on the reshaping of his formal experiments by authors who merge auto/biography, fiction, history and criticism.
After such in-depth analysis, Saunders leaves no doubt as to Pater being the foremost representative of an aesthetic self-consciousness that pervades the modernist engagement with life-writing. Pater's experimental work determines the transformation of self-representation throughout the last decades of the Victorian age and well into the twentieth century, the principal temporal concern of the volume. This opening chapter, though organic and indispensable to what follows, constitutes an outstanding contribution in and for itself. It deserves to enter the canon of Paterian criticism.

IUAV, University of Venice

_Walter Pater’s famously rhapsodic invocation of* La Gioconda _in The Renaissance_ (1873) is duly accorded a central place in this slim, elegantly composed monograph on the myth of the Medusa and its suggestiveness as an allegorical figure for the complexities of representation. Drawing upon psychoanalytic and poststructuralist theory, Thomas Albrecht provides luminously clear and methodical close-readings of a small number of (mostly short) texts that use the Medusa myth as a means of reflecting upon the precariousness of their own representational strategies: D. G. Rossetti’s poem “Aspecta Medusa” (1870), Freud’s notes on the Medusa, posthumously published as “Das Medusenauge” (1940), Nietzsche’s *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872), Pater’s essay “Leonardo da Vinci” (1869), Algernon Charles Swinburne’s essay, “Notes on Designs of the Old Masters at Florence” (1868), and George Eliot’s novella, _The Lifted Veil_ (1859). Albrecht claims that these texts not only engage with the myth of the Medusa at the level of theme, but illustrate a representational dynamic that he calls “the Medusa effect.” In his account, an artist or thinker apprehends a truth or vision too profoundly disturbing to be confronted directly, like the Medusa’s petrifying gaze. The artist or thinker then performs an ingeniously oblique act of representation in a bid to control and thereby mitigate the original horror, but in the process inevitably preserves it in a sublimated form, just as Perseus artfully slays the Medusa by capturing her reflection in his shield, and then brandishes her head as an apotropaic device—a reversal which seems to attest paradoxically both to Perseus’s ultimate victory and to the endurance of the Medusa’s power to horrify. Albrecht’s readings emphasize the ambivalent character of representation, its structural kinship with both Freud’s theories of castration anxiety and the fetish, and with Derrida’s concept of the *pharmakon* (that is, a phenomenon that is both remedy and poison): representation at once assuages an overwhelming fear and guarantees the survival of that fear in a displaced guise.
Despite its title, Albrecht’s book has only a loose mooring in the Victorian period. With the exception of Freud, whose theorizations of the castration complex and of the fetish inform the book’s central argument and constitute the subject of its first chapter, Albrecht might have replaced his group of Victorian authors with classical or contemporary ones, since he does not seek to capture a moment in the history of aesthetics but instead to delineate a fundamental, enduring problematic that inheres in acts of interpretation and representation. Yet presumably Albrecht is attracted to the Victorian texts he discusses, precisely because they do not merely furnish him with examples of “the Medusa effect” on a structural or subliminal level but also make explicit reference to the Medusa myth, and this means that the reader is continuously being asked to repress the obvious question that the book’s title prompts: why were Victorian writers so invested in this particular myth? In his “Conclusion,” Albrecht gestures at the fact that we face no dire shortage of historicist readings of the Gothic tropes of Victorian literature (117-18), and it seems narrow-minded to fault this book for only canvassing in a perfunctory fashion the cultural and historical determinants of Victorian figurations of anxiety. Albrecht’s book, however, tends to stand aloof not only from cultural history but from the histories of art, literature, and aesthetics, and a livelier engagement with such scholarship – surely compatible with Albrecht’s psychoanalytic and poststructuralist modes of reading – would have enriched his thesis, particularly his chapter on the aesthetic criticism of Pater and Swinburne. Like the book as a whole, this chapter is finely wrought and offers thoughtful readings of its chosen texts.

In its meticulous attentiveness and contemplative calm, Albrecht’s prose style is reminiscent of J. Hillis Miller’s (who is the book’s dedicatee), and he does not commit what were once considered the besetting sins of psychoanalytic and poststructuralist criticism: he is never obscurantist, and he almost entirely eschews jargon. Indeed, it is a pleasure to read such patient close readings of both Pater and Swinburne, who are too rarely studied alongside one another. More generally, it is rare to find a writer who is so scrupulous in clarifying the subtleties of his argument. Yet the ambivalence which Albrecht takes as his subject – his “Medusa effect” encodes both the fascinating power of disturbing truths or images and the imperative to evade or disavow them – grants him an interpretive latitude which at times can make his arguments feel capricious to the reader. This is most true of the
chapter on Swinburne and Pater, where the paradoxical logic of "the Medusa effect" seems arbitrarily split between the two writers: Pater's essay on Leonardo exemplifies an anxious will to mastery, a desire to treat interpretation as a quasi-scientific discipline which enables the critic to distinguish sharply between types of impression and thereby imaginatively conquer its subject, while Swinburne's essay is a "failure" because he is too entranced by a horrifying spectacle, and thus mires himself in rhetorical contradictions. In other words, neither Pater nor Swinburne can win: Pater is too repressed and Perseus-like, and Swinburne not repressed and Perseus-like enough.

As critics, both Swinburne and Pater often flaunt their capacity to savor disturbing images and ideas as varieties of aesthetic pleasure. This characteristic could be understood in terms of Albrecht's paradigm — perhaps their emphasis on aesthetic pleasure protests too much, and only reflects the work of sublimation; perhaps they are only exposing their Perseus-like will to master a Medusan image. Yet to this reader a striking continuity between Pater and Swinburne — and one which is sometimes considered the most distinctive feature of Victorian aestheticism — is in fact their shared emphasis upon the value of risking psychic disturbance by tarrying with distressing contradictions without striving to resolve or sublimate them (a kind of Keatsian negative capability).\(^1\) The conviction that there is insight or pleasure to be derived from lingering over shocking and painful images is a common Romantic trope that receives a highly refined and self-conscious elaboration in Victorian aestheticism and decadence, perhaps particularly in the works of Swinburne and Pater. It is also a subject that has been powerfully anatomized by Catherine Maxwell, whose book on the nineteenth-century sublime also draws upon Freudian paradigms (particularly the castration complex) and is strangely omitted from Albrecht's bibliography. Similarly, it is perplexing that Lene Østermark-Johansen's essay on serpentine tropes and Swinburne's rhetorical manoeuvres in "Notes on Designs of the Old Masters at Florence" should not be granted any acknowledgment: like Albrecht, Østermark-Johansen analyzes the myth of the Medusa at length, including a discussion of Freud's notes on the Medusa's head, and pairs Swinburne's essay with Pater's on Leonardo.

Perhaps at the bidding of his publisher rather than out of personal preference, Albrecht favors long discursive footnotes over engaging directly
with other critics in the body of his text, and this means that *The Medusa Effect* unfortunately seems to mime the very structure of disavowal that it discovers in nineteenth-century texts. James Heffernan, W. J. T. Mitchell and Grant F. Scott are usually jointly credited with the influential "Medusa" theory of *ekphrasis*—a model for reading ekphrastic texts which conceives of them as anxious attempts to negotiate a perceived antagonism between visual and verbal media, and which, like Albrecht’s argument, closely correlates the nature of representation to the traditional features of the Medusa myth. Although Albrecht duly acknowledges Heffernan and Mitchell (though not Scott, whom Heffernan credits as the originator of the idea [Heffernan, 108]) in a lengthy footnote, a reader unfamiliar with the literature on *ekphrasis* might not recognize the extent to which Albrecht’s Medusa effect dovetails with and arguably impinges on it. The prior existence of this literature need not threaten the value or originality of Albrecht’s book; he might have reasonably argued that what Heffernan, Mitchell, and Scott suggest is a dynamic peculiar to *ekphrasis* is in fact more generalizable as a way of interpreting nineteenth-century literature or representation as such. In this, he misses a vital opportunity to situate his book in relation to an established critical paradigm, and thereby enlarge its scope and complicate its argument.

In his chapter on Nietzsche, Albrecht maps “the Medusa effect” onto Nietzsche’s Apollonian/Dionysian binary, and identifies the Apollonian qualities of coherence and clarity with a Perseus-like will to interpretive mastery, and Dionysus with the discountenancing power of the Medusa (that is, the apparently prior, frightening and elusive subject of representation). This book is itself markedly Apollonian in both its virtues and flaws: it is remarkably lucid, cohesive, and polished, but it might have been a more satisfying book if it had been more willing to approach the Medusa of existing scholarship.

*Queen Mary, University of London*

**WORKS CITED**


**NOTE**

When Pater began his studies at Queen's College in October 1858, the murals in the Oxford Union library depicting scenes from Thomas Malory's *Le Morte D'Arthur* were being created by a group including Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Edward Burne-Jones, William Morris, and Alexander Munro. In the 1890s, Pater was reconsidering Burne-Jones as a consummate example of the "aesthetic life." Anyone wanting or needing to know more about Pater's Pre-Raphaelite contexts should look no further than Colin Cruise's sumptuous and comprehensive new book (a companion for the 2011 exhibition *The Poetry of Drawing: Pre-Raphaelite Designs, Studies, and Watercolours* shown in Birmingham, England and Sydney, Australia). The initial chapter considers why drawing "provided the [professional] key" to the artists and how the drawings should be read in relation to Pre-Raphaelite canvases; a subsequent chapter tracks how "a new understanding of the art of drawing" was encouraged by Swinburne, Pater, Rossetti, and Burne-Jones. Subsequent chapters carefully survey the PRB's various and sometimes surprising intertextual connections; the particular significance of Ruskin in terms of their drawing (both theoretically and practically); portraiture and caricature; the engagement with modernity in their works (which might surprise those who associate the PRB aesthetic solely with medievalism and Shakespearean tales); the production and dissemination of drawings in the 1850s and 1860s; and the impact of PRB drawing on Aestheticism, the Arts and Crafts movement, and the aesthetes of the 1890s. The book is best enjoyed twice: once, for the pleasure of considering the beautifully-produced illustrations, and once again for the substance of Cruise's cogent, well-researched, and lucid argument.

*Lesley Higgins*
BOOK CHAPTERS


If Walter Pater's denomination of his own "intellectually rich age" as "eclectic" has met with little resistance from subsequent scholars of the period, Christine Bolus-Reichert's engaging and erudite monograph reveals just how complicated and anxious was the response of post-Romantic nineteenth-century culture to one of its predominant characteristics (246). Seeking to revive "eclecticism as a critical term," Bolus-Reichert traces its various incarnations through different media over the course of seventy years, as it develops from a descriptor used primarily to denote the lack of an original and defining style to a philosophical method intent on distilling from various systems of thought their respective truths to an aesthetic principle that encapsulates the belief that true creativity in the modern moment is always, as Pater says, a "mixed situation" (4, 235). Eclecticism, Bolus-Reichert argues, offers "a way of thinking about historical inheritance," and it manifested itself in nineteenth-century culture both as an unconscious response to the burdens of history as well as a deliberate strategy for dealing with those burdens (8). The former tendency is seen in the naïve and unreflective hoarding and juxtaposition of fragments from other times and places—the intellectual equivalent of the collecting of bric-a-brac. The other shows itself in the deliberate and discriminating production of something new from select fragments—a form of bricolage. The book's final chapter, "Walter Pater and Thomas Hardy: 'Triumph in Mutability,'" considers the literary efforts of these late-Victorian "volitional eclectics" to promote eclecticism as the process through which the individual's negotiation of different styles, creeds, and philosophies resolves in the "formation of the self," a "modern self" whose eclectic worldview offers "the best hope for survival under the corrosive conditions of modernity" (16). Looking at Pater's Studies in the History of the Renaissance and Marius the Epicurean as well as Hardy's A Laodicean, Bolus-Reichert highlights how eclecticism provides a means of navigating between
the Scylla of "ideological polarization" and the Charybdis of syncretism, in that it encourages the individual to look to history not with longing for what is irrevocably lost but rather with enthusiasm for how elements of the past can influence and invigorate the present. In mapping out for the reader the ways in which nineteenth-century authors found in eclecticism a means of staving off their terror at the sheer plentitude of those spoils they carried home from explorations of myriad actual and ideational brave new worlds, *The Age of Eclecticism* also seeks to point the way towards a new direction in Victorian studies, encouraging a scholarly perspective that is equally cosmopolitan, transnational, comparativist, and, of course, eclectic.

*Meghan Freeman*


In Lynne Walhout Hinojosa’s book, “Renaissance” primarily refers not to an actual historical period or cultural movement so much as it does to a “concept,” one employed by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British authors in their efforts to “define and legitimize English cultural identity” (4). The “Renaissance concept,” she argues, provided writers and artists with a means of bridging the divide between modernist and nationalist models of culture, linking a flowering of the arts to the formation of a cohesive nation-state. Looking at Victorian and Modernist histories of the Italian and English Renaissance, Hinojosa finds an enduring preoccupation with patterning contemporary culture on these earlier models. Moreover, she sees the legacy of the Renaissance application of Christian hermeneutics to secular subjects in the way that these nineteenth- and twentieth-century works of cultural history read the Renaissance both typologically (as the prototype for which their culture was the actualization) as well as allegorically (as a model that provided material for future emulation). The early chapter “Renaissancism in England: Arnold, Symonds, and Pater” presents these three Victorian writers on the Italian Renaissance as crafting examples of what she calls (building on the work of Peter Burke) “classical cultural history,” “history that relies
on period-making, which places the Renaissance at a pivotal moment in human history, and which ascribes autonomous cultural characteristics to broad spans of historical time and geographical space” (18). Yet, whereas Arnold and Symonds, it is asserted, “develop narratives of historical progress within which contemporary England is to be judged,” Pater’s resistance to standardized methods of periodization and his emphasis on “self-culture” make him something of an awkward fit within Hinojosa’s schematic (64). Thus, she concludes that “in rejecting classical cultural history’s model of unified periods and nations, [Pater’s] theory of the renaissance ends up being the most liberal of all,” influencing later nationalist and modernist writers to look to individual aesthetic experience as “the key to restoring national and communal culture” (80).

Meghan Freeman


This chapter forms the conclusion of a study that in general terms aims to argue against the classic position that sees the novel as “the most this-worldly” of forms (3), and investigates the importance of theology to Victorian novels whose primary interests do not appear to be in the realm of religious controversy. Clearly Robert Elsmere and Marius the Epicurean do not fall into this category, but Perkin, in this final chapter, investigates why both continue to hold critical interest while other novels of faith and doubt have been long forgotten. The chapter begins with the drawing up of a general contrast of Ward’s position in Robert Elsmere and Pater’s in Marius, and a brief comparison of each writer’s review of the other’s novel. Perkin argues that both Ward and Pater dramatize the spiritual journey towards what would later become known as a Christian-modernist position, but whereas Ward attempts to re-configure faith without dogma (the better to proof it against intellectual attack), Pater’s account of this journey in Marius the Epicurean is more radical, and anticipates the methods of postmodern theology. Broadly speaking, Perkin reads Marius’s journey as a movement from village Anglicanism (the religion of Numa),
through an Arnoldian quest for aesthetic perfection (Cyrenaicism), climaxing in the promise of a new, modernist form of Christianity which in part draws on Newman’s theory of assent. In Perkin’s reading, this is Pater’s articulation of a new type of faith as he hopes it may emerge in the late nineteenth century, novelistically expressed through a depiction of a new type of Christianity emerging in the second. For Perkin, Pater’s novel anticipates later postmodern “radical orthodoxy” by combining extreme philosophical scepticism with an anti-materialist assertion of the values of community, charity, and aesthetic experience.

Matthew Bradley

ESSAYS


In this complex and rewarding essay, Andrews reads Pater’s imaginary portrait and the three Watteau poems from Sight and Song in relation to the nineteenth-century French literary/critical reception of the Rococo painter. The French Watteau reception is marked by important poems by Baudelaire and Gautier and, above all, by the Goncourts’ influential essay from their 1860 L’Art du dix-huitième siècle. The Goncourts shape Watteau as a paradoxical figure of grace and melancholy, the painter of both the idealized social world of the fête galante and the melancholy spectator who stands apart from that world, associated, in the literature of the nineteenth century, with Watteau himself. Pater’s Watteau, Andrews suggests, like the Watteau of the French tradition, takes on the role of the melancholic nonparticipant increasingly disillusioned with the great social world he portrays. Like Marie-Marguerite, the other protagonist in Pater’s portrait, he is a figure of frustrated desire. In contrast, Michael Field’s “poetic renderings of Watteau’s paintings envisage the potential fulfillment of desire” (454). In their first two Watteau poems, Andrews argues, Cooper and Bradley develop the fête galante as “a quasi-
utopian realm, where same-sex desire remains protected, however tentatively, from social disapprobation" (465). In the second half of “A Fête Champêtre,” however, and even more in the development of “L’Embarquement pour Cythère,” Michael Field returns to the dialectic of “melancholic impotence” and “utopian aspirations” that characterize the French reception of Watteau.

Kenneth Daley


In her essay, Elisa Bizzotto provides us with interesting insights into the history and metamorphosis of what might be considered as a topos in relation to both the cultural climate of British Aestheticism (from a “decorative art” philosophy to the valorization of interior design and the beautifying of everyday life) and Water Pater’s fictional and prose works. Weaving together the strands of a Puritan legacy, a secularized conceptual framework and Pater’s refined sensibility, she guides us through a fertile territory of influences and creative responses by investigating the relevance of the “House Beautiful” motif and its varied shades of meaning. Taking as her starting point the allegorical path trodden by John Bunyan’s Christian in Pilgrim’s Progress — where the wise and welcoming Family of the Palace Beautiful offer the protagonist relief and counsel halfway through his wearying journey towards the Celestial City — Bizzotto proceeds to illustrate the changes that this wondrous piece of architecture and its religious symbolism gradually undergo. Pater’s momentous contribution to such a transformation inside the radiant, immanentist “midregion” of aesthetic spirituality is lent weight by carefully reasoned arguments which take their cue from “The Child in the House,” with its fittingly resonant title, and then veer backwards to his seminal essays “Wordsworth,” “Romanticism,” and “Two Early French Stories” (the first texts to be explicitly connected with the “House Beautiful” trope) and forward to a cluster of other works (Marius the Epicurean, Imaginary Portraits, Gaston de Latour). What is finally brought into
focus is a modern, multi-faceted conception of the house paradigm as the realm of harmonic synthesis and of the creative imaginary (the “House of Art”) and as the mythical place of origins (the “ancestral home” of childhood memories). The salient feature of beauty is then shown to grow more and more pervasive as the noble, inspired soul learns to translate the religious overtones into the ethos of the aesthetic/hedonistic creed as well as the late-Victorian vocabulary of taste and mastery of interior design, since the House Beautiful is also, ultimately, a mirror image of the self’s episteme.

Laura Giovanelli


Bénédicte Coste adopts a very stimulating Lacanian approach to highlight Pater’s modern vision of Mérimée. In her view Pater’s analysis of impersonality follows a pattern akin to the later findings of psychoanalysis in the 20th century as Mérimée’s authorial retreat from the text results in a celebration of the ultimate truth about man – the power of primeval human instincts. Pater defines a new facet of impersonality that puts to the fore Kantian relativism as Mérimée is using irony to keep his reader constantly on his guard against his own beliefs. Impersonality is for him a way to denounce fanaticism and aestheticism as new deceptive beliefs after Kant’s denial of the absolute. In Mérimée he found what he loved in historic criticism – a care for facts and details above all. Bénédicte Coste analyzes Mérimée’s fiction – “La Vénus d’Ille,” Colomba and Il Vicolo di Madame Lucrezia – to demonstrate the validity of Pater’s approach for French studies, since she considers that Pater lacks recognition as a critic of French literature. The article is clear, innovative and convincing and it also allows French readers to discover Pater through Bénédicte Coste’s excellent translations.

Martine Lambert-Charbonnier

Lecourt's deft evaluation of Pater's liberalism focuses on his commitment to self-culture and expansion through the lens of the conversion plot of Marius the Epicurean. Noting Pater's interest in E. B. Tylor's anthropological studies of cultural forms and their "survival," he persuasively argues that Marius dramatizes cultural history as a process based on "the survival and transformation of aesthetic forms from age to age." Religion is part of this "organic totality," continuously recycling rituals, objects and narratives from the past so they take on a symbolic resonance. Because this process transforms (but maintains) the old, participation in cultural heritage by surrendering "to the determining influences of history" offers access to an enlarged range of feelings, "values and practices"; their familiarity guarantees their authority and provides a sense of belonging and continuity. Early Christianity appeals to Marius because "its deeply syncretistic nature encourages a stance of perpetual openness to further expansion." As Marius's passive, pensive and ambiguous death shows, Pater turns aside from the Evangelical loss/gain model of personal conversion, a pattern for Victorian liberalism that emphasizes individualism and agency. Like an ethnographer, Marius is a "participant-observer," immersing himself in cultural forms that move him deeply and offer a sense of "historical community" while remaining an outsider, open to additional possibilities. Similarly, Pater's project of liberal self-culture combines outward submission to resonant cultural forms with detachment and self-restraint. Such "reflective individualism" becomes the best guarantor of continued self-expansion and empowerment.

Maureen Moran


This article investigates the political implications of the tension between freedom and unfreedom in Pater's aesthetics. Morgan points out that, on the one hand, Pater presents autonomy as an essential component of both the diaphanous individual in "Diaphaneité" and of the work of art in The
Renaissance. On the other, in “The Child in the House” Pater describes Florian’s experience of beauty as “a kind of tyranny of the senses over him” (740). Pater seems to affirm an independence from outside forces for both the aesthetic critic and the work of art, while at the same time finding at the core of aesthetic experience a tyranny of natural forces over the perceiving subject. In his analysis of this opposition, Morgan rejects three previous ways of reading Pater’s aesthetic autonomy: 1) Peter Bürger’s critique that fin-de-siècle aestheticism offers a mere ratification of the ideology of the “bourgeois individualist subject,” 2) the “too easy equation of decadent and postmodern modes of destabilization” that depend on Pater’s “subversive queerness,” and 3) the attribution of Pater’s “ambivalence about the concept of autonomy” to his philosophical confusion (733-34). Morgan thus seeks to resist both the too critical dismissal and the too uncritical celebration of Pater’s varying accounts of aesthetic freedom, while taking Pater seriously as a philosopher.

Morgan develops this philosophical approach through an analysis of Pater’s appropriations from Hegel in the essay on Winckelmann. Pater, like Hegel, finds in the aesthetic a unique fusion of spirit and matter, but Pater remains “[s]keptical of the Hegelian dialectic, which strives toward an ever higher universality” (747). Where Hegel envisages “the freedom of reason” leaving aesthetics behind as it moves toward higher forms of Spirit in philosophy, Pater sees instead “an irresolvable antinomy in which freedom is at best conditional” (747). Morgan closes by suggesting that Adorno’s Aesthetic Theory may provide a helpful way of understanding the political implications of this antinomy. What Pater articulates as “the tension between autonomy and heterodoxy,” Morgan points out, is “the precise tension in which Adorno locates the political possibility of art” (751). By refusing to resolve this tension, Pater’s aesthetics, like Adorno’s, “interrogates the foundations of individuality,” revealing an element of unfreedom otherwise obscured by “the bourgeois consciousness of freedom” (751).

*Kit Andrews*
As the title indicates, the essay situates Pater’s ideas on sculpture in relation to Gautier and Baudelaire, both of whom by mid-century “had declared the death of sculpture as a modern art form” (181). While Pater, with Swinburne, sought to reawaken the aesthetic appreciation of sculpture, his “ongoing dialogue” with the major writers of French Aestheticism continued to influence his ideas regarding the art form. Østermark-Johansen suggests, for instance, that it is largely due to Baudelaire’s influence that Pater is “not wholly uncritical of Winckelmann” (187). In his selection of the fragment from the Elgin Marbles as the supreme work of Greek sculpture, Pater essentially sides with Baudelaire, and with Leonardo before him, both of whom advocated a “pictorial approach to sculpture” (187), preferring sculptural relief over the sculpture in the round. Indeed, Østermark-Johansen argues that throughout his career, Pater “finds the three-dimensionality of sculpture problematic” (181), and increasingly “moves towards more painterly and atmospheric ideals, to texture and relief, to tactility in two-and-a-half dimensions rather than in troublesome three dimensions” (181). The essay, including readings of Pater’s essays on Luca della Robbia and Michelangelo, whets the appetite of readers for Østermark-Johansen’s impressive and beautifully illustrated new book, Walter Pater and the Language of Sculpture (Ashgate, 2011) 364 pp. (To be reviewed in a future issue of The Pater Newsletter.)

Kenneth Daley
ESSAYS WITH NOTABLE REFERENCES TO PATER


Taking his cue from the Götterdämmerung, Jonathan Bate situates his investigation of Shakespeare's role in the evolution of German Romanticism at the movement's twilight, looking at Victorian receptions of the play Measure for Measure for a means of explaining how the political and aesthetic nation-building projects of writers such as Goethe, Herder, and Schiller eventually resolved into the "toxic nationalism" of the Nazi regime. Richard Wagner, as one might expect, plays a key role in this development, but Bate argues for the necessity of recognizing the degree to which Wagner's career was determined by the increasing divergence of the "two great cultural legacies" of high Romanticism—"aesthetic freedom" and "nationalism"—into separate ideological channels. In Wagner's early opera Das Liebesverbot, a comedic and formally experimental adaptation of Measure for Measure, Bate finds a possible explanation for the composer's abandonment of "the late Romantic Shakespearean tradition" as well as the progressive ideals of the "Young Germany" movement, which advocated "free thought and free love, setting itself against the conservative political and religious order" (17). With the opera's commercial failure, Bate suggests, "the two strands of the Romantic inheritance were split apart," and Wagner turned towards the mythic and militaristic subject matter that eventually would make his name nearly synonymous with "Hitler's conception of a distinctly German art and culture" (19, 14). Designating Wagner as representative of the "nationalist" strand, Bate then turns to England for exemplars of Romanticism's legacy of "aesthetic freedom": the "late Romanticism without nationalism" of Algernon Swinburne and Walter Pater (19). Bate uses Swinburne and Pater's critical writings on Measure for Measure as a yardstick by which to gauge the distance between their "aestheticist" interests in Shakespeare and the political dimension that interested their German counterparts. Yet, in Pater's essay, Bate also notes certain correlations to the interpretation of a young Wagner. Both composer and critic recognized the "centrality of Measure for
Measure to the mind of Shakespeare,” viewing it as the purest expression of the playwright’s ethical vision (23). Its complicated morality also provided each man with the opportunity to speak to the importance of possessing a sympathetic awareness of how circumstances influence human action, a lesson much needed by a culture hovering on “the threshold of modernity” but one that, Bate intimates, was heeded too late (13).

Meghan Freeman


Art historian Whitney Davis attempts to theorize the notion of a queer family romance and to demonstrate, through one extended example, how an alternative queer family romance structure might be and actually was constructed through particular practices of collecting, displaying, altering and otherwise inflecting objects of visual art. While the first half of the essay is dedicated to the theoretical task of teasing out from Freud’s concept of the family romance, particularly from Freud’s 1910 monograph on Leonardo da Vinci, a queer concept, the second half is dedicated to elaborating the example of the famous queer collector William Beckford (1760-1844). It is in the first, theoretical half that Davis mentions Pater on three different occasions. While these might be passing references, the first two are significant. In the first, Davis acknowledges Pater’s role in the construction of an idea, an image even of “queer beauty,” citing and even reproducing the hallmark image of the Leonardesque drawing of a young boy that graced the second edition of The Renaissance, while in the second Davis acknowledges Pater’s role in constructing a canon of queer art (Leonardo, Michelangelo, etc.). Davis’s third mention of Pater is perhaps more perfunctory, extending from his analysis of Freud’s essay on Leonardo, in which he observes Freud’s footnote on Pater’s earlier essay on Leonardo. While the first two references remind us of Pater’s important role in the post-Enlightenment project of articulating the same-sex subject, at once the human subject and the topic of inquiry, it is less these references than the essay as a whole that could be important for Pater studies insofar as it suggests to us ways in which Pater himself might have been involved
in the particular project of already queering family romance and doing so through his own analysis of artists and their art.

*Michael Davis*


While literary critics have tended to portray Henry James as being sympathetic with the upper classes alone, Lawson demonstrates how James’ formative years were spent in a constant state of worry over finances and in bitterness over how his friends – and his brother William – were able to live more of a life of the mind than he was because they had access to more money. Consequently, James found himself more than a little receptive to Walter Pater’s representation of the spiritually and economically bankrupt man in the article “Poems by William Morris.” Pater’s article had been, in some ways, a rewrite of Marx, transforming economic terms into aesthetic ones. This article, as well as *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, inspired James to express his own, deeply personal view of aestheticism on a budget in the book *Roderick Hudson*.

*Marc DiPaolo*


Claire Murray-Masurel has written a very consistent and interesting article on the meaning of Roman Catholic sacraments in decadent literature, in particular in works by Ernest Dowson, Lionel Johnson, Frederick Rolfe, Algernon Swinburne, Arthur Symons and Oscar Wilde. The core of the essay is also on Walter Pater’s own vision of religion, since she considers that he is a determining influence in the way decadents use religious rites as symbols conveying an aesthetic, rather than a religious ideal. She convincingly studies passages taken from *Marius the Epicurean*, “The School of Giorgione,” “Dante
Gabriel Rossetti, “The Child in the House,” and “Pascal.” She compares Newman's and Pater's definitions of “analogies” in order to highlight Pater's distance from religious faith and his concern for aesthetic perfection through the harmony of form and matter. The essay also develops the importance of Pater's moment of experience for the decadents. The demonstration is clear and convincing, yet we may disagree with a purely aesthetic approach to Pater and argue that in *Marius the Epicurean*, for instance, the emphasis on Marius' impressions and doubts is not incompatible with a very deep metaphysical and religious quest. Another quality of Claire Murray-Masurel's article is the analysis of sacramental imagination in post-Romantic literature – in particular Ruskin and Rossetti – as well as interesting parallels with later writers such as A. Burgess, T. S. Eliot and W. B. Yeats.

*Martine Lambert-Charbonnier*
KIT ANDREWS, Professor of English at Western Oregon University, is currently researching the reception of German Idealism in nineteenth-century British literature and philosophy. He has recently published an article in ELT concerning the figure of Watteau in Pater’s “A Prince of Court Painters” and Michael Field’s Sight and Song, and an essay on Pater as Oxford Hegelian for The Journal of the History of Ideas. His article on Carlyle and Fichte is forthcoming in Literature Compass.

MEGAN BECKER-LECKRONE is Associate Professor of English at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, where she specializes in the history of critical theory and late-nineteenth-century British literature. She is the author of Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory (Palgrave, 2005) and of essays on Wordsworth, Wilde, Pater, and Joyce. She is the North American book review editor for the Edinburgh UP journal, Victoriographies: A Journal of Nineteenth-Century Writing. She was editor of The Pater Newsletter from 2006–2011 and is now production editor of the journal.

ELISA BIZZOTTO is a lecturer in English Literature at IUAV University of Venice. She has written on Pater, Wilde, Vernon Lee, Beardsley and Pre-Raphaelitism and is especially interested in genre, gender, myth, inter-art and comparative approaches. She is the author of La mano e l’anima. Il ritratto immaginario fin de siècle (2001) and has co-edited the first Italian edition of the Pre-Raphaelite magazine The Germ (2008). She is currently co-authoring a book on Pre-Raphaelite aesthetics.

MATTHEW BRADLEY, Lecturer in English at the University of Liverpool, is currently writing a book on decadence and apocalypse. He has published a number of articles on the relation between the aesthetic movement and theology; he was also principal editor and compiler of the Gladstone Reading Database at Gladstone’s Library. His edition of William James’s Varieties of Religious Experience is forthcoming from Oxford World’s Classics.

ELICIA CLEMENTS is Assistant Professor of English and Humanities at York University, Toronto. She has written articles and book chapters on Walter Pater, Virginia Woolf, Gertrude Stein, and the composer,

**Kenneth Daley** is the author of *The Rescue of Romanticism: Walter Pater and John Ruskin* (Ohio UP, 2001), and several essays on Ruskin, Pater, and Keats. He currently serves as Chairperson of the English Department at Columbia College in Chicago. He is the Bibliographer for the *Pater Newsletter*.

**Michael Davis**, an Associate Professor of English at Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York, specializes in Victorian and Modern literature with particular interests in sexuality, aesthetics, psychoanalysis, and narrative theory. He is currently completing a study of Pater ("Walter Pater's 'Latent Intelligence' and the Conception of Queer 'Theory'") and a book on Virginia Woolf tentatively entitled "Dating Mrs Dalloway: Self-Reflexion, Suicide, and the Ends of Modern Fiction." He is also interested in contemporary critical and cultural theory.

**Marc DiPaolo** currently teaches at Oklahoma City University, having previously taught literature and film courses at Alvernia University, Kean University, and Drew University. He is the author of *Emma Adapted: Jane Austen's Heroine from Book to Film* (Peter Lang, 2007) and principal editor of Pearson's literature anthology *The Conscious Reader*. His essays have appeared in *A Century of the Marx Brothers, The Amazing Transforming Superhero, Beyond Adaptation and Pimps, Wimps, Studs, Thugs, and Gentlemen: Essays on Media Images of Masculinity*. Formerly a reporter for the *Staten Island Advance*, DiPaolo writes the blogs "Dandies and New Women", "Bedford Falls Movie House," and "The Adventures of Italian-American Man." He has a Ph.D. in English from Drew University.

**Andrew Eastham** is an independent scholar and writer who has published widely on Pater, Aestheticism, Modernism, and Contemporary Literature. His monograph *Aesthetic Afterlives: Irony, Literary Modernity, and the Ends of Beauty* has recently been published by Continuum. This begins with an investigation of Pater's musical ideal, conducts an enquiry into Aestheticism's twentieth-century legacies, then concludes with an autobiographical account of his meeting with the undead Mr. W. P.
MEGHAN A. FREEMAN recently received her Ph.D. in English literature from Cornell University, having completed a dissertation investigating the treatment of aesthetic theory and spectatorship in British and American novels of the nineteenth century. Currently, she is an Assistant Professor in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film at Oregon State University.

KATE HEXT is a Teaching Fellow in English literature at the University of Exeter. She has published various articles on Pater and Aestheticism. Her first monograph will be *Individualism and Aesthetic Philosophy: Walter Pater, Romantic Modernist* (Edinburgh UP, 2013).


LAURA GIOVANELLI, who holds a Ph.D. from the University of Florence, is a Researcher in English Literature at the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literature, University of Pisa. She is an associate editor of the academic journal *Anglistica Pisana*. Her research interests include Anglo-American Modernism, postmodern and postcolonial fiction, eighteenth-century poetry, and the fin de siècle. Among her monographs are *Le vite in gioco. La prospettiva ontologica e autoreferenziale nella narrativa di Peter Ackroyd* (1996), *Falsi d’autore. Percy, Macpherson, Chatterton* (2001), and *Il Principe e il Satiro. (Ri)leggere “Il ritratto di Dorian Gray”* (2007).

MARTINE LAMBERT-CHARBONNIER is Maître de Conférences at the Université de Sorbonne-Paris IV. She is the author of *Walter Pater et les “portraits imaginaires”: Mirroirs de la culture et images de soi* (L’Harmattan, 2004), as well as several essays for the *Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardiens*. Her “Poetics of Ekphrasis in Pater’s Imaginary Portraits” appeared in the collection *Walter Pater: Transparencies of Desire* (ELT, 2002), edited by Laurel Brake, Lesley Higgins, and Carolyn Williams.
Bill Livolsi holds a B.A. in English from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and is a professional technical writer.

Sara Lyons is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of English at Queen Mary, University of London, where she is completing a dissertation on the relationship between Victorian aestheticism and secularism in the works of A. C. Swinburne and Walter Pater. She has published a book chapter on this subject in relation to the poetry of Mathilde Blind, which appears in the collection Writing Women of the Fin de Siècle: Authors of Change, eds. Adrienne E. Gavin and Carolyn Oulton (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), and has contributed a chapter on Swinburne’s critiques of Victorian religious doubt to the forthcoming collection Swinburne: Unofficial Laureate, eds. Stefano Evangelista and Catherine Maxwell (Manchester UP, 2012).

Catherine Maxwell is Professor of Victorian Literature at Queen Mary, University of London. She has published the monographs The Female Sublime from Milton to Swinburne: Bearing Blindness (Manchester UP, 2001), Swinburne in the British Council series Writers and Their Work (Northcote House, 2006), and, most recently, Second Sight: The Visionary Imagination in Late Victorian Literature (Manchester UP, 2008). She has co-edited, with Patricia Pulham, Vernon Lee’s Hauntings and Other Fantastic Tales (Broadview, 2006) and Vernon Lee: Decadence, Ethics, Aesthetics (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). She has guest edited the special issue “Victorian Literature and Classical Myth,” Victorian Review 34 (Fall 2008), and, with Stefano Evangelista, the special issue “The Arts in Victorian Literature” of the Yearbook of English Studies 40.1 & 40.2 (2010). She is currently co-editing with Stefano Evangelista a collection of essays on Swinburne.

Maureen Moran is Emerita Professor of English Literature, Brunel University (London, England), where she served as Head of Department and Dean of the Faculty of Arts. Her research specializations are Victorian religion and literature, sensational writing, the prose and poetry of Aestheticism and Decadence, and Victorian gender issues. Her recent publications include: “Walter Pater’s House Beautiful and the Psychology of Self-Culture” (ELT, 2007), Catholic Sensationalism and Victorian Literature (Liverpool UP, 2007) and “The heart’s censer: Liturgy, Poetry and the Catholic Devotional Revolution,” an essay in Ecstasy and Understanding: Religious Awareness in English Poetry from the Late Victorian to the Modern Period, ed. A. Grafe (Continuum, 2008).
Lene Østermark-Johansen, Reader at the University of Copenhagen, is the author of Walter Pater and the Language of Sculpture (Ashgate, 2011) and Sweetness and Strength: The Reception of Michelangelo in Late Victorian England (Ashgate, 1998), the editor of Nose Book: Representations of the Nose in Literature and the Arts (Middlesex UP, 2000) and, with John Law, has edited Victorian and Edwardian Responses to the Italian Renaissance (Ashgate, 2005). She has also published on Pater’s Leonardo and Luca della Robbia essays, on Pater and Heraclitus, and Pater and Euphuism. She is currently working on a critical edition of Pater’s Imaginary Portraits to appear in the MHRA Critical Texts series in 2013.