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Welcome to the New Editor

It is a pleasure indeed to present Jay Losey to you as the new Editor of The Pater Newsletter. In July 1998, Bonnie J. Robinson resigned as Editor, although, fortunately, she remained on the Publication Staff as Annotator of "Recent Publications." The same group of previous editors of the newsletter and officers of the Pater Society of the United States and the United Kingdom who had appointed Dr. Robinson to the editorship in June 1997, offered the position to Dr. Losey, who graciously accepted it. His term of
appointment as Editor is five years, with the possibility of reappointment. Having taken his M.A. degree at the University of Michigan in 1978 and his Ph.D. degree at the University of Virginia in 1986, Jay Losey is now Assistant Professor of English at Baylor University specializing in British literature of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. He is currently serving as Director of Graduate Studies in his department.

Most readers will remember that Jay Losey emerged as a Pater scholar in the late 1980s with significant essays on epiphanies in Pater’s fiction—“Epiphany in Pater’s Portraits” (ELT 29:3, 1986) and “Pater’s Epiphanies and the Open Form” (South Central Review 6:4, Winter 1989). In the latter essay, Losey sets Pater’s epiphanies in the context of epiphanies in writings from Wordsworth to Yeats and Joyce, showing the importance of the epiphany, not only to the development of character and theme in the works considered, but also to the structure of those works. He carries his study of epiphanies deep into the twentieth century in his most recent essay—“‘Demonic’ Epiphanies: The Denial of Death in Larkin and Heaney,” forthcoming in Moments of Moment: Aspects of the Literary Epiphany, edited by Wim Tijges (Amsterdam: Rodolpi, 1999). He has also written on Conrad and Wilde. His “The Aesthetics of Exile: Wilde Transforming Dante in Intentions and De Profundis” (ELT 36:4, 1993) revealed new insights into Wilde’s reading of Dante and the affinities, as well as the differences, between the two authors. Among his book reviews are three contributed to The Pater Newsletter—on Richard Dellamora’s Masculine Desire (No. 26, Spring 1991), David Bromwich’s A Choice of Inheritance (Nos. 28/29, Spring 1994), and Frank Moliterno’s Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce, in the present number.

Losey attended two of the centenary conferences on Pater, reading “The Aesthetics of Existence: Refashioning the Self in Pater and Wilde” at the Conference on Walter Pater and the Culture of the Fin-de-siècle in Canterbury in July 1994, and participating in the Colloquium on the Centennial of Pater’s Death at Eastern Michigan University. He also participated in the Third International Pater Conference at West Virginia University in August 1996, reading “Pater’s Modernist Mode in Wilde and Joyce.”

The new Editor brings both experience in Pater scholarship and fresh energy and creativity to the newsletter. As Treasurer of the International Walter Pater Society, ex officio, he will work with the President and Vice President to vitalize the Society and make the newsletter an even more useful means of communication among Pater scholars than it has been since its founding in 1977. Welcome, Jay!

Billie Andrew Inman
Editor's Note

Over two years ago, Billie asked me whether I'd consider putting my name forward as a potential editor of the newsletter. At the time, I declined; I was preparing for my tenure review and completing research projects necessary for a successful review. This summer, Billie once again asked me if I'd reconsider my earlier decision. I had succeeded in gaining tenure, but still I hesitated. When Billie indicated that I would have her, Carolyn, Lesley, and B.J. on the publication staff, I thought, "This is a no-brainer. How can you refuse? Just think about the Pater scholars you can turn to for advice and expertise." So I agreed to put my name forward and am now beginning a five-year term as editor. I hope that you all will be patient with me as I adjust to this new position.

All Paterians owe B.J. Robinson a huge debt of gratitude. Her decision to create a journal format for the newsletter is forward-thinking. In my view, the new journal format gives us a marketing edge and certainly gives us a new professional appearance. I intend to continue B.J.'s format approach. Please let me know your thoughts about the appearance of the newsletter, which has now been in continuous operation since 1977.

I'm experimenting with designs for the newsletter. This particular issue reflects a house motif. Pater's love of houses and interior spaces is legendary. What gave me the idea is the emblem Billie generously sent to me (see masthead). Billie writes, "The Latin statement is a headnote to Chapter III of Marius: 'Lord, I love [or have loved] the habitation of thy house'—Psalm 26:8." I hope to make this beautiful emblem a kind of Paterian signature for future issues of the newsletter.

Thanks to Billie, Laurel, Hayden (all former editors of the newsletter), Carolyn, and Lesley for their support of my nomination to be editor. I'm grateful for the trust they have in me and hope to be a loyal, conscientious editor.

I'd also like to thank Baylor University for enabling me to establish an agency account for the newsletter and the Department of English for absorbing mailing costs. I especially want to thank Leigh Ann Marshall of the Information Technology Center at Baylor for her technical assistance in creating a Pagemaker format and Designer Club clipart for the newsletter.

Jay Losey
Results of the Ballot

The sixteen subscribers who found the ballot enclosed in *The Pater Newsletter*, Nos. 35/36, and returned it unanimously approved the following propositions.

Proposition No. 1:
That the name of the society sponsoring *The Pater Newsletter* be changed from the Pater Society of the United States of America and the United Kingdom to the International Pater Society. (At a suggestion from Eugene Brzenk, Billie Inman proposed to the voters and to as many other subscribers as could be reached by e-mail that *Walter* be added to the name of the Society. The twenty-seven subscribers who responded all approved the addition—thus the name of our organization is the International Walter Pater Society.)

Proposition No. 2:
1) That *The Pater Newsletter* Editorial Board be expanded to include one member from each of the following geographical areas where the publication currently has significant numbers of subscribers: Canada, Continental Europe, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
2) That Editorial Board members be appointed by the officers of the Society (President, Vice President, and Treasurer).
3) That the term of office for Editorial Board members be four years, with the possibility of reappointment.
4) That members of the Editorial Board aid the Editor of *The Pater Newsletter* by sending news from their areas, especially concerning papers read or to be read at conferences, works in press, related Internet activities, and publications that a bibliographer based in the United States might not find; by trying to increase the number of subscribers in their areas; and by giving advice and working with the Editor when consulted.

Since there were no additional nominations for President and Vice President of the IWPS, the scholars nominated by the nominating committee were elected. They are Laurel Brake, President, and Carolyn Williams, Vice President. They will serve for a term of four years, with possibility of re-election. Jay Losey is Treasurer of the IWPS by virtue of his office as Editor of the newsletter.

A Generous Gift to the International Walter Pater Society

portraits and "Diaphaneité"), with an Introduction (Harper and Row, 1964)—has given the Society $5,000. For this magnificent gift we express our deep appreciation to Gene. His money has been deposited in a savings account, with Sir Michael’s Levey’s gift from last year and Sharon Bassett’s recent contribution, where it is drawing interest. Part of our “new wealth” will be used to help defray expenses for the conference and the plaque described below.

Conference in the Year 2000

Arrangements are being made for the Fourth International Pater Conference, to be held at Brasenose College, Oxford, early in August 2000. The officers of the International Walter Pater Society, in consultation with the Editorial Board of The Pater Newsletter, will soon appoint a Program Committee and an Arrangements Committee for this conference. If you would like to volunteer to serve on either of these committees, please contact Laurel Brake, Carolyn Williams, or Jay Losey, by February 1, 1999.

A Plaque to Commemorate Walter Pater

All literary scholars who have hunted the residences of their favorite English authors have seen the blue circular plaques that commemorate the authors who have resided in various houses. There is no plaque on any house where Walter Pater resided. Laurel Brake and Michael Levey are trying to secure permission to have such a plaque affixed to Number 2, Bradmore Road, Norham Gardens, Oxford, where Pater and his sisters lived from 1869 to 1886. If arrangements can be made, the plaque will be unveiled during the Conference.

A Subscriber and Book Collector in Military Service

Thierry Vourdon, who participated in the Third International Pater Conference in Morgantown, began his year of compulsory military service in France on September the 1st, interrupting his work toward the Ph.D. degree at the Centre for Translation Studies, the University of Metz. However, he is not “carrying a gun”; he has a special scientist status and is serving as English Instructor at the National Academy for Non-Commissioned Officers in Saint-Maixent-l’École. While at the University of Liverpool in 1997, Vourdon began collecting rare books related to Pater and other Victorian authors, and he continued making acquisitions until his recent induction. One of his most interesting acquisitions is Pater’s copy of William Morris’s Life and Death of Jason, signed Walter H. Pater, “royal 8vo bound in red cloth.” He also acquired “a nice copy” of the First Edition of The Renaissance, “bound in half green calf with gold and red flowers on the spine by Zaehnsdorf.”
Review of Ellis Hanson, *Decadence and Catholicism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997). Pp. xii + 403. $49.95; $19.95 (paper).

Paterian Devotions

Ellis Hanson’s book is only partly about Pater, but in many ways it constantly aspires to the condition of the Paterian, both in technique and in explicit precept. Pater’s example is most notably invoked in the opening sentences of the book, which pay homage to the “Preface” to *The Renaissance*:

> To know one’s god as in itself it really is has been justly said to be the true aim of religion; and in religious criticism the first step toward seeing one’s god as it really is is to know one’s own impression as it really is, to discriminate it, to realize it distinctly. *Decadence and Catholicism* is a study of such religious impressions among the so-called decadent or symbolist writers of the late nineteenth century. (1)

But it is a disconcerting portent that Hanson’s outwardly exacting parallel invokes “religious impressions.” Pater of course makes the object of his criticism of “impressions” unadorned, following the lesson of Hume and avoiding the logical incoherence of presuming that impressions come to us presorted into conceptual categories. What, then, is a religious impression? An impression of a religious object? An impression received in a religious state of mind? But Hanson’s ostensibly Paterian stance declares that the nature of the “religious” is precisely what is at issue. So how are specifically religious impressions to be distinguished from impressions in general?

This unacknowledged circularity brings into focus many of those “perennial questions of Pater criticism” (169) which Hanson addresses: in what sense(s) is Pater (or any other “decadent”) a religious writer? What is the place of religion in aesthetic experience, and the aesthetic in the religious? These are important questions that have been too often neglected or trivialized in earlier scholarship (although not so thoroughly as Hanson suggests). But the haze enveloping the knowing wink of his opening allusion seems to me symptomatic of his responses to those questions: for all its intelligence and erudition, the book is too often exasperatingly vague, reductive, and even glib in its treatment of a marvellously rich topic.

Much of the problem stems from a relentlessly oppositional habit of mind. At the local level, Hanson tends to display a rather smug condescension towards antagonists, or almost any object he finds unsympathetic, and to pursue a withering irony that sometimes is cavalier with facts, or lapses into
downright cliché. In his discussion of Marius, for example, Hanson shrewdly emphasizes that Pater is more interested in the decay of the family than in the family itself, and that sexuality tends to be articulated outside of traditional familial configurations. And yet this insight is obscured by arch invocation of the coarsest received wisdom about things Victorian. "Pater speaks quite sentimentally about family life, but what has he done with all those big happy bourgeois families so abundant in the Victorian novel?" (186). Could someone name a few major Victorian novels full of "big happy bourgeois families"?

A more fundamental problem stems from the insistently agonistic structure of Hanson's literary history. We have neglected the religious significance of decadence, he argues, because we remain under the sway of a modernist criticism that could not reconcile faith and sexuality. In the "modernist rejection of decadence," he urges, "any degree of erotic or aesthetic pleasure . . . immediately disqualifies a sensation as heterodox and irrelevant to any serious discussion of Catholicism" (17). This is badly confused in at least two respects. First, it is staggering that a book centrally concerned with Catholicism would assume that the "heterodox" is "irrelevant to any serious discussion of Catholicism." But few modernist critics were exercised by an alleged heterodoxy among imaginative writers—as if they thought that Pater, say, were a Catholic theologian. The legacy of Arnold, in T.S. Eliot's famous critique, was not heterodox belief; it was the lack of any religious belief whatsoever. Second, and more importantly, the notion that modernism is a straightforward extension of Pauline contempt for the flesh is a mere caricature. Such an attitude may inform the scholarship of Karl Beckson and Jean Pierrot—Hanson's rather eccentric exemplars of "modernism" at this juncture (17-18)—but Hanson's claim comes just ten pages after he has quoted from T.S. Eliot's famous, complex, deeply-engaged essay on Baudelaire. To suggest that the author of The Four Quartets thought "any degree of erotic or aesthetic pleasure" inimical to religious seriousness is bizarre.

Hanson is led into this confusion by recasting as a thoroughgoing asceticism what is really the more palpable reality of modernist homophobia, under which—as he rightly stresses—"literary and religious criticism turns into a pseudo-psychological case study as soon as the specter of homosexuality is raised," while "religion itself becomes a pathological symptom" of "deviant sexuality." This is indeed a familiar dynamic in twentieth-century reception of decadence, and Hanson's effort to disarm it is valuable. But it does makes him seem less interested in decadent religion than in decadent eroticism: the power of eroticism to transfigure religion, that is, seems less engaging to him than the transfiguration of transgressive sexuality through association with religion. This is a perfectly plausible emphasis, but Hanson's conception of a modernism well-nigh Manichean in its antithesis of faith and desire leads to extreme tunnel vision. He argues persuasively, for example, that Catholicism has long been an especially rich and vivid arena not merely for aestheticism but for sensuality and sexual longing, including transgressive eroticism and eroticized shame. But it is not clear that any reader glancingly familiar with the Italian Renaissance, say, will be greatly surprised or agitated by this conclusion—
aside from those modernist ascetics (whose alleged views would compel them to disdain much of Western art). Perhaps those same ascetics, too, are the readers for whom it is triumphantly adduced, "To speak of Catholic sexuality, then, is by no means an oxymoron" (21), a pronouncement that this non-Catholic reviewer found another bewildering round of intellectual shadow-boxing. Nor is it startling that Christian asceticism articulates extraordinarily complex patterns of desire: these have received scrupulous, probing, and wide-ranging analysis in the work of Peter Brown and, more recently, Geoffrey Galt Harpham's *The Ascetic Imperative in Culture and Criticism* (1990). But this scholarship is passed over in favor of a sub-Wildean epigram: "There is nothing more decadent than the sensuality of the chaste and the art of the artless" (17).

Having summoned up a specifically "Catholic sexuality," Hanson offers little sense of its distinctiveness, since his narrow, agonistic focus leads him to neglect the extent to which religious experience generally (including asceticism) is energized by sensuality and erotic longing. A service at the Vatican or Brompton Oratory, Hanson avers, makes clear that "there is much in Roman Catholic orthodoxy—its ritual, its theological tradition, its mystical literature—that might reasonably be qualified by terms like bizarre, sensuality, and reverie" (15; author's italics). "Bizarre, sensuality, and reverie" seems a peculiar collocation of "qualifiers," but if one is seeking out this conjunction it surely may be found abundantly in the careers of Jonathan Edwards or John Donne—not to mention all those ecstatic worshippers swooning into unconsciousness on any number of cable television channels across contemporary America. What then is specific in the decadent appeal of Catholicism? We learn that Verlaine "set the tone" for a number of decadent conversions, "in which grace was experienced passively as an overwhelming and mysterious sensation of peacefulness that follows a period of great dissipation or perturbation of mind" (64). But how is this experience of grace a distinctive property of either decadence or Catholicism, given that it is likewise central to Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, as to a long tradition of Protestant life-writing that ultimately derives from Augustine's *Confessions*?

The distinctions between Protestant and Catholic, as subtle and sometimes porous as the boundaries between them may be, are surely not irrelevant to an historically specific conjunction of Catholicism and decadence (particularly as it applies to British writers). But Hanson early on appeals to "poststructural notions of textuality" to conclude that the indeterminacy of "discourse" renders "suspect, if not wholly untenable, the very concept of religious orthodoxy" (19). If, more generally, "Christianity has no essential content of its own," then of course neither do particular sects; such meanings as they have are wholly matters of social practice, ultimately of self-designation. (Dare one call this a variation of Protestantism unknown to Bossuet?) And thus Eliot's provocative engagement with decadence simply dissolves. So, for example, compare Eliot's searching scrutiny of Baudelaire with Hanson's bald assertion that for Baudelaire, "the spiritual surely was no more than a poetic reality" and his evocation of original sin "a theatrical performance" (54). As "Christianity" (which Hanson tends to use as a synonym for "Catholicism") is emptied of both metaphysical
grounding and doctrinal content and turned into performance, an "art" like any other form of life, one unsurprisingly discovers manifold congruences among art, eroticism, and religion, all of which Hanson understands as both "arts" and "discourses." But the cost of this move is (among other things) an inability to understand why the decadents themselves experienced a sometimes acute sense of the conflicts among these realms. Perhaps this move explains why Hanson cannot quite surrender intimations that religion remains different in kind from other discourses—as in his remark, "The divine contagion that is religion is traceable in part to the viral quality of language itself" (21). "The viral quality of language itself," "always in motion, corroding our every defense, and inevitably contaminating its putative referent with its peculiar and alien inflection" (21), surely must erase essential differences among "discourses." Yet "divine contagion" manages to suggest that religion remains distinctively exalted (do accountants experience "divine contagion" in their audits?) even as its "contagion" derives at least "in part" (and how does one make that distinction?) from the levelling indeterminacy of language. As Stanley Fish once wrote, Pater giveth and Pater taketh away: this is equivocation worthy of the master himself.

These historical and conceptual vagaries do not in themselves undermine Hanson’s understanding of Pater. But in his effort to rescue Pater’s sexuality from modernist sneering or erasure, Hanson offers us a weirdly static account of Pater’s career, in which nothing fundamental in his attitudes—towards art, towards sexuality, towards religion—ever seems to have changed. His religious ideas were “often in flux,” Hanson concedes, but in the previous paragraph he has offered this typically unqualified pronouncement: “Religion is for Pater . . . the very model for aesthetic experience at its most perfect” (178). Here, by contrast, is Pater himself (from the 1873 version of “Winckelmann”): “Christianity, in its uncompromising idealism, discrediting the slightest touch of sense, has lighted up for the artistic life, with its inevitable sensuousness, a background of flame.” It is hard to see how a religion that “discredit[s] the slightest touch of sense” can be seen as “the very model” for aesthetic experience. This bold antagonism, characteristic of the aggressively skeptical young Pater—and, accordingly, removed from later editions of The Renaissance—simply flies in the face of Hanson’s claim, as well as his later suggestion that “the very distinction between matter and spirit was not in Pater’s view an essentially Christian one” (177)—a claim tellingly supported by reference to the essay on Rossetti, written nearly fifteen years after “Winckelmann.” Such discrepancies not only suggest an inattentiveness to Pater’s texts, but also the brittleness that results from severing Pater’s view of “religion” from consideration of any particular “religious ideas.”

For the young Pater, Christianity is the antagonist of both art and sexuality. This fundamental fact is crucial to Pater’s career, not only the striking intellectual and erotic exhilaration of the early essays, and the sense of danger they aroused, but the undertone of real anxiety and even despair that runs through so much of the later preoccupation with ever-tentative, vacillating, inconclusive approaches to an imagined serenity of belief. When it comes to the play of homoerotic desire in Pater’s writings, particularly
Marius, Hanson’s readings are generally perceptive and persuasive (although tending to collapse the homosocial into the homosexual—a tendency in recent Pater scholarship that William Shuter has pointedly criticized in his article, “Outing Walter Pater”). He is particularly good in exploring the interrelations of homoerotic friendship and virgin motherhood in its Catholic affiliations, an association summed up in the chapter title, “Pater Dolorosa.” But Hanson veers away—much like Pater himself—from telling us whether “evoking in Christian forms . . . traces of maternal and homoerotic desire” (217) is the same thing as Christianity.

Does any sympathetic response to Christian forms and traditions express Christian allegiance? The conception of religion as “discourse” tends to undercut the question by blurring agency: is participation in a discourse a form of assent? But for this reason, whatever the metaphysical imperatives to regarding Christianity as one more discourse, one more “art” of living, that conception does not do justice to the momentousness that Pater, in common with so many of his contemporaries, freethinker and devout alike, attached to the question of belief. In this regard, Hanson’s book seems to me a retreat from earlier studies that discerned substantial and complex—if not necessarily irresolvable—tensions between aesthetic and religious experience in Pater’s writings. And this weakness is in part the product of a final oppositional strain in Decadence and Catholicism: that toward earlier writers on Pater. Most notably, not only does the book ignore the many studies that have sympathetically examined Pater’s engagement with Christianity (such as the work of Nathan Scott), it dismisses out of hand David DeLaura’s extended scrutiny of Pater and Newman in Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian Britain (a book arraigned for postulating a “normative” Christianity [178]), and—in some ways most strikingly—fails to mention Carolyn Williams’s Transfigured World (1989), a landmark in Pater studies that bears centrally on the complex relations between aesthetic experience and intellectual assent. Instead, from reading Hanson’s scant references, one would think that the reception of Pater before the 1990s was little more than a litany of homophobic innuendo. This is a sad irony, because it tends to reinforce the very dichotomies of religion and sexuality that Hanson rightly deplores. Hanson has certainly contributed to the momentous recovery of Pater’s sexuality. Perhaps the stage is now set for recovering one of the last neglected categories of contemporary cultural analysis: faith.

James Eli Adams
Indiana University, Bloomington
In a chapter called “Visiting the Dead,” William Shuter begins with an image of Dante’s blackening bones as they were placed on display for the veneration of visitors during the celebration in 1865 of the six hundredth anniversary of the poet’s birth. Shuter claims that, since Pater was in Italy at the time and accompanied by Charles Shadwell, who would become a translator of Dante, he must certainly have been among the pilgrims who admired these relics. Enshrined as they were in a crystal urn on an altar-shaped dais and covered with a white cloth, Dante’s bones must certainly have appealed to the decadent in Pater, and in Shuter’s account they seem to exercise a magnetizing force on the sensibility that appreciated more profoundly than any other writer of this time the allure of dead yet exquisite things. This bit of funereal tourism might serve as an allegory for the antiquarian scholarship and retrospective rethinking that makes Rereading Walter Pater worth rereading. Pater’s work is fraught with survivals, second thoughts, suspended judgments, and recontextualizations, such that the return to dead things was not merely a scholarly habit but an aesthetic and intellectual principle. Pater’s Renaissance, his early meditation on culture, always retains something of the sweet and morbid greenness of the grave. I have remarked on it myself in the past: to read and certainly to reread Pater with pleasure is always to be a little in love with death.

Shuter has spent a lot of time rereading Pater rereading. When, as an editor and annotator of Pater’s later texts, he undertook to reread the earlier books, he was struck by the way the earlier texts seemed to anticipate the later ones in ways that he had never noticed before. Moreover, his rereading seemed to be authorized by Pater himself, who he claims was engaged in much the same task. Shuter begins with what he calls an “initial reading” that suggests that there is a profound shift in Pater’s work over time and that Pater became more Christian, more conservative, more cautious, more apologetic, and more uncertain over time. Even his sentences seemed to get longer and cast themselves adrift in the later work, distracted as they are with doubts, afterthoughts, and tangential associations. Shuter then proceeds with his retrospective reading in which he discovers many of those qualities in the earlier texts. Pater’s habit of returning to the same well-sifted ground, of re-engaging his old ideas in new contexts, renders the distinction between “later” and “earlier” highly problematic.

One of the strengths of Shuter’s book is the attention he gives to the later work, especially Plato and Platonism, a book that no one but a subscriber to this newsletter is likely to reread—or even just read. In a chapter on Pater’s Christianity, Shuter picks over the sometimes unpublished, often rather uninspired late writings on cathedrals and Cardinal Newman, and he rehearses the dubious contention that Pater became more pious toward the end of his life. He then offers his very different rereading in which he discovers that “Pater’s most characteristic religious conceptions are anticipated in texts that were hardly written in the interest of traditional Christianity.” In other words, Pater had said it already. Shuter makes a similar
move with “Emerald Uthwart,” offering the initial reading that the story is about rigid discipline and stasis and that Pater has somehow renounced the sensual and intellectual playfulness of the “Conclusion.” In Apocalyptic Overtures, Richard Dellamora has already done much to undermine this rather lame interpretation by presenting “Emerald Uthwart” as a critique of imperialist rhetoric about masculinity, but Shuter has ignored this essay (along with Pater’s eroticism more generally). Instead, he pursues the question of stasis and movement in the story and defines Pater as a “periegetic” critic, a paradoxical figure who is engaged in continual movement but who is also constantly arrested by what he sees. He is, in other words, a creature of pauses. His disciplinary severity renders the play of his mind all the more athletic. One would think this reading would be evident the first time around, given the typically Paterian references to wandering and movement in the opening paragraph of the story. A similar argument is made about the uses of Plato and Heraclitus. It has been said that Plato and Platonism represents a drifting away from an earlier Heraclitean flux; nevertheless, Heraclitus scarcely appears at all in The Renaissance; whereas, the Plato of Plato and Platonism seems to be valued precisely because of his resemblance to Heraclitus. Pater remakes Plato in his own image and speaks of “that other sort of Platonism, a habit, namely, of tentative thinking and suspended judgment”—all diffidence, reserve, scruples, and second thoughts.

Shuter says much that is wise about Pater. I must say, however, that I too have had cause recently to reread Pater, but much of what Shuter says was clear to me the first time around (though not necessarily in the intriguing historical detail that he brings to his subject). The conception of a profound conservative development in Pater has never made sense to me. By some invitingly perverse method of parthenogenesis, Pater seems to me to have sprung full grown from the head of one his own sinewy and reposeful deities. The chronology of his texts never much matters, since we find him preoccupied with the same themes, the same ideas, even the same syntax in every book. In fact, I find Shuter’s initial readings maddeningly untenable in that they are usually constructed of absurdly selective quotation.

For this reason I find his distinction between reading and rereading even more problematic than his more thoroughly questioned distinction between early and late. Sometimes it is difficult to say what rereading is attributable to Pater and what to Shuter himself, so closely does he identify himself with his own subject. Shuter says that he has “devoted most of his study to rereadings authorized by Pater or conducted in their spirit,” but this spiritism strikes me as a bit fanciful at times. As if in the throes of a literary seance, he seems lorded over by the ghost of Pater, a scholarly projection who commands and authorizes all manner of dubious critical moves. In the opening paragraph of the preface, Pater is already rapping insistently on the table as Shuter claims the texts “had imposed a reading,” that “Pater’s writings demanded, it seemed, a twofold reading,” that they “asked to be read in the order in which they were written” but “they also asked to be reread, as it were, in the inverse order....” By way of example, Shuter speaks of the famous footnote in which Pater explains his omission of the “Conclusion.” Because Pater says that he has “dealt more fully in
Marius the Epicurean with the thoughts suggested by it." Shuter concludes that "Pater himself suggests that the sort of retrospective interpretation he encourages may be accomplished by reading these texts in the reverse order from that in which they were written." I find the logic of this deduction rather strained, but even stranger is the practice of calling upon authorial intention—or authorial permission—to justify one's own reading practices. Should our rereading follow Pater's? Does Shuter's rereading follow Pater's? Does rereading presume a particular content that rereading does not? Is Pater demanding that we reread his work, or is he just elaborating on it and recontextualizing old ideas?

Shuter's preoccupation with his own rereading is the weakest aspect of the book. Wisely, he dispenses with it altogether in the chapter on visiting the dead. In his conclusion, he tries to submit the concept to analysis: "Rereading, moreover, inverts an initial order of priority. Sections of a text that in an initial reading are read before others are, in rereading, read after them. The sections that in an initial reading are read only after others have, in rereading, been read before." The style of this little paragraph is numbing enough, but the insights it offers are not likely to bring us to the edge of our seats either. On the last page of the book, Shuter discovers deconstruction—not rereading, but misreading—and grudgingly admits that this "conception of writing may also be said to collapse the distinctions on which the present study is based—the distinctions between reading and rereading, earlier and later writings, original and revised texts." Well, quite! But Shuter can then console himself with the not unfamiliar claim that Pater's aestheticism prefigures deconstruction. One wonders then why the spirit of Pater did not authorize him to take a rather different approach.

Ellis Hanson
Cornell University


Aesthetic Clashes
Towards the end of his study, Frank Moliterno provides a statement that succinctly summarizes his critical engagement:

Throughout their writings, Pater and Joyce explore epistemological conflicts between matter and spirit. These inquiries are often discourses on empiricism and idealism, and the dialectical tensions within them help form Pater's and Joyce's aesthetics. The clash resembles debates between the empiricists Aristotle and Locke and the idealists Plato and Berkeley. (125)

When Moliterno focuses on matter and spirit, he seizes upon epiphany as the major reconciling agent between them. Dealing with abstract philosophical notions, notions derived from Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690) and Berkeley's Treatise Concerning the Principles
of Human Knowledge (1710), Moliterno ambitiously attempts to work out his notion of matter and spirit through Paterian and Joycean epiphany. Moliterno is most successful when he explains how Pater’s and Joyce’s subjectivity make them soulmates; he rightly stresses the subjectivity of the “Conclusion” to The Renaissance and its importance to Joyce’s aesthetics.

In his philosophical engagement with Pater and Joyce, Moliterno offers many astute comments about literary applications of epiphany; however, he seems unreconciled to the aesthetic and religious significance of epiphany in both writers, especially in Pater. Does Pater, as Moliterno asserts, “reject the notion of transcendence” (143)? Although Pater celebrates a hedonistic temperament in The Renaissance, does he continue to reject the notion of transcendence in Marius the Epicurean and Gaston de Latour? Both philosophical novels—or, to use Pater’s terminology, imaginary portraits—deal with a favorite Paterian moment: cultural transition. In Marius, the transition is from pagan to Christian; in Gaston, from Catholic to Protestant. Does, for example, Marius, who feels a natural affinity to Christianity, die a Christian convert? (Moliterno says no [52-3].) For Moliterno, Pater and Joyce both depict protagonists who “... pass through alternating phases of sensual and spiritual experience” (7)—that is, protagonists who develop an appreciation for the conflict between art and religion. Religion is subsumed into art, chiefly through “aesthetic metaphors” (20). The issue of faith in Pater’s writings is extremely valuable and often overlooked; in my view, the study of epiphany—what it is, how it is deployed, and who it affects—is one way to understand the dynamic interaction of art and religion.

So one might expect, given the above summary, that Moliterno would draw upon recent work on epiphany in Pater and Joyce and develop his claims about the dynamic between matter and spirit, art and religion. Because he does not explain the significance of Augustine’s Confessions (397-8), Rousseau’s Confessions (1770) and The Reveries of the Solitary Walker (1782), and, most importantly, Wordsworth’s Prelude (1805, 1850), Moliterno does not convince me that he has a sufficient conceptual understanding of his topic. Borrowing from Pater, Moliterno asserts that epiphany is a synthesis of “sense/spirit” occurring “in the mind” (61). He believes that both Pater and Joyce create similar epiphanies and that, as a consequence, Joyce is dependent upon Pater for his understanding of epiphany. Morris Beja (whose seminal Epiphany and the Modern Novel goes uncited), Ashton Nichols, Robert Langbaum, Martin Bdinley, Marguerite Harkness and others have all focused on Joycean epiphany and almost all of the critics I cite have explained the significance of Pater in their discussion of Joycean epiphany; these same critics also stress the importance of the Romantics, particularly Rousseau and Wordsworth, on Pater. In the chapter titled “Joyce’s Epiphanies and Pater,” Moliterno discusses the two main types of Joycean epiphany (dramatic and lyric), arguing that since both types appear in Pater “he was a significant contributing influence” (86). Perhaps, but what about Wordsworth, whose “spots of time” or epiphanies also include dramatic and lyric elements?
This lack of critical grounding gets Moliterno into some tight spots. What, for example, is a "pseudo-epiphany," a coinage he mentions on at least three occasions (86, 90, 111)? Can one have an inauthentic insight? He also distinguishes, dubiously in my view, between "genuine and false epiphanies" (91) and "self-liberating" and "dark" epiphanies (95). Whether privileged moments or epiphanies, Pater and Joyce present characters who feel their way into insights and truths about themselves (the "subjectivity" that Moliterno rightly stresses).

Let me cite two examples of Moliterno’s misreading of epiphany in Pater. One involves the episode in which Marius sees Cornelius for the first time (ME 1:170). Analyzing the passage in which Marius believes “as if he were face to face, for the first time, with some new knighthood or chivalry, just then coming into the world,” Moliterno indicates that “Cornelius emerges as a symbol for Christianity. In a memorable epiphany, Marius’s vision of Cornelius prefigures the Christian knight” (113). What exactly is the epiphany? Does Marius have a vision or is he constructing a persona for Cornelius (“a symbol for Christianity”)? Is this passage simply allegorical in its significance? Pater provides quiet, revelatory moments, but he does not employ epiphany symbolically or allegorically. Another example involves the episode in which Gaston, overhearing a shepherd and shepherdess, feels himself witnessing “fragments of love’s ideal and eternal communing” (Monsman, Gaston 29). Moliterno argues that this “scene reveals its defining ‘quiddity’ [Joycean “whatness”] in a ‘sudden spiritual manifestation’ [part of Joyce’s definition of epiphany in Stephen Hero, the novel that he revised and published as A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man]”(101). Moliterno also quotes this line from the passage: “The physical beauty of humanity lent itself to every object, animate or inanimate, to the very hours and lapses and changes of time itself.” How can a “sudden spiritual manifestation” take place over hours? How does Pater create an epiphany that involves “humanity”? Who is undergoing the epiphany: Marius, the reader, the author? Epiphany is a specific, nonrational moment that occurs in the consciousness of characters and, by its specific effect, is felt by readers. Moliterno stresses the synthesis of matter and spirit in such moments, but he does not adequately indicate how the epiphany occurs and what specific effect it has on characters.

Having offered these objections to Moliterno’s rendering of epiphany, I still recommend his study to Paterians. Moliterno shows how Marius, Gaston de Latour, Sebastian van Storck, Florian Deleal—the male loners in Pater’s canon—create a world fairer than the one in which they live. This tendency, both aesthetic and spiritual, serves as an animating impulse for them all.

Moreover, Frank Moliterno strikingly resembles one of Pater’s real-life creations: Oscar Wilde. Like his mentor Perry Meisel, himself a former student of Harold Bloom, Moliterno is contributing to “anxiety of influence” studies: “… Portrait and Marius resemble each other far too closely to dismiss the idea that Pater’s novel did not influence Joyce’s. I believe that Marius is the principal precursor to the Portrait” (146). As Wilde to Meisel’s Pater, Moliterno in his study has offered a valuable continuation

Jay Losey
Baylor University

**Works in Progress, Works in Press**

*Simons’s Research on Pater at Birmingham University*

Philip Simons, who is working toward the MPhil. at Birmingham University (England) under the supervision of Professor K. Thornton, has sent the following description of his work. He would very much appreciate your comments and advice on his line of research.

I am researching four Pater texts—*Marius*; *Renaissance; Imaginary Portraits; Plato and Platonism*—in an attempt to ascertain their generic form or lack of it. My work begins with that famous analysis of Pater by Ian Fletcher: “His work seems to lie in a twilight of categories between criticism and creation; between art and literary criticism, belles-lettres, classical scholarship, the *journal intime* and the philosophic novel” (*Walter Pater* 3). Much recent work has been carried out on genre theory, and I am particularly interested in the study of Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature* (Oxford, 1982). He puts forward the case that any work of literature must belong to a particular genre; and, if a work seems to lie outside categorisation, then it is, in a sense, creating its own generic form.

In my research, I am looking at the possibility that Pater deliberately challenged each of the genres in which he worked, creating, in the process, texts that lie in the “twilight of categories.” Pattison’s famous review of *The Renaissance* illustrates the confusion Pater created for his readers by such generic non-conformity.

During 1997 my work concentrated on *Imaginary Portraits*. In looking at surveys of the Victorian short story—*Victorian Short Story*, by Harold Orel (Cambridge, 1986), to give one example—I have been struck by the absence of any reference to the work of Pater. Or, if Pater is mentioned, he has been given only marginal acknowledgment. Since Pater does not figure in an analysis of the Victorian short story, his “imaginary portraits” must be a unique form; and, in many ways, a form that he created. Pater’s letter to George Grove of 1878 indicates that Pater is aware of the uniqueness of the “imaginary portrait” and that the narrative relies on the idea of “speculation”: *in other words, a narrative that has uncertainty as its main*...
constituent. In my research, I have found it difficult to trace influences on Pater in the genre of short fiction. In his letters, Pater mentions Wedmore, Vernon Lee, and Lemaitre; but the most important influence appears to be Mérimée. From evidence of Pater’s lecture on Mérimée, and letters to Vernon Lee, he admired the short narratives written by Mérimée, particularly “La Venus d’Ille.” There are many similarities between this story and “Denys L’Auxerrois.” Pater would have appreciated Mérimée’s use of the unreliable narrator and the absence of an overarching meaning within the short story.

An analysis of Imaginary Portraits, from a generic point of view, reveals that it is a text that challenges the “conventional” short story in numerous ways. For example, Imaginary Portraits confronts the “conventional” short story by its use of different narrative methods. Pater’s use of narrators, within the “portraits,” makes meaning complex and unclear. The problems caused by the narrative uncertainties of “Denys L’Auxerrois” have already been analyzed by M. F. Moran and Steve Connor, but “A Prince of Court Painters” exhibits a similar inconclusiveness. Is Marie-Marguerite simply a passive observer of Watteau’s life and career, as many Pater critics have stated; or is she of central importance, being the interpreter of Watteau’s art and, through the use of her journal, a precursor of the romantic movement in France? Pater’s form of the “imaginary portrait” does not make the meaning clear; and, as readers, we can only “speculate.”

Over the next few months my research will concentrate on Plato and Platonism. I would like to establish whether a “conventional” scholarly view of Plato existed within the Oxford environment, and if it did exist, how far Pater’s views, as put forward in Plato and Platonism, turned aside from this view.

Daley’s Book on Pater’s and Ruskin’s Significance to Romanticism

Kenneth Daley, Assistant Professor of English at Ohio University, describes his work as follows:

The book that I am working on, The Rescue of Romanticism: Walter Pater and John Ruskin, focuses on Pater and Ruskin as theorists and critics of Romanticism. Pater’s legacy has attracted a great deal of critical attention, but the genealogy which leads from Romanticism to Pater has not. My book helps to address that critical gap by establishing and defining Pater’s relation to Ruskin. Specifically, I read Pater’s theory and reception of romantic art as a response to Ruskin’s more ambivalent theory, which regards the modern period as a perversion of the romantic ideal. My aim is to distinguish the theoretical manipulations through which Pater transforms Ruskin’s provocative ambivalence into his own highly influential nexus of late romantic ideas. I argue that Pater is the first cultural critic in England to advocate the socio-political benefits of romantic art and philosophy. He resists what he perceives to be Ruskin’s conservative approach, which associates modern romantic art with antinomianism, faithlessness, and social anarchy. In so doing, he establishes the debate over the nature of Romanticism as a site of intense political and cultural disagreement.
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Frank Moliterno has begun a book with the working title *Pater and Wilde: Appreciations, Appropriations, and Misreadings*. His first chapter is entitled "Oxford: 1870s." The second chapter will treat the influence of French literary works on both writers. The next three chapters will treat Wilde's use of Pater's works in his poetry, *Intentions*, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*; and the last chapter, Wilde's influence on Pater's *Gaston de Latour*.

**Articles on Literary Influence**

Three of the articles in John Powell and Derek Blakeley's *Makers of Western Culture, 1800-1914: A Biographical Dictionary of Literary Influences* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, forthcoming) will be of special interest to subscribers. Billie Inman has contributed the entry on Pater; and Thierry Vourdon, the entries on Jules Michelet and Hippolyte Taine. Powell and Blakeley state in their "Prospectus": "*Makers of Western Culture* will be a practical tool to assist scholars in tracing the actual reading experience of several hundred of the most significant figures responsible for the general cultural development of Europe, Great Britain and the United States between 1800 and 1914. It will serve as a starting point for examinations of the rich complexity of the relationship between reading and cultural expression...-[This book will give priority] to demonstrable connections between reading and the formation of literary, social, political and artistic ideas that helped transform the cultures of which they became a part."

**Pater in the Third Edition of the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature**

Volume IV (1800-1900) of the five-volume *CBEL 3*, which has been in preparation for some time, is likely to be published in the fall of 1999. It has been compiled and edited by Joanne Shattock, of the Victorian Studies Centre, the University of Leicester. Cambridge University Press's "Notes for Contributors" describes the difference between the coverage of this volume and the nineteenth-century volume of the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature (1969-1974)*:

*CBEL 3 will concentrate on primary material, and on secondary material which is nearly contemporary with the first publication. It will update and recheck the accuracy of all existing (NCBEL) entries, and supply new entries for many hundreds of writers omitted by NCBEL. At the same time it will reorganise the structure and procedure of the NCBEL model for greater reader-convenience.*

Some subsequent secondary material will also be included, but on more closely defined principles than in NCBEL. The introductory sections to each volume on book production and distribution, and on literary relations with the continent will be retained (and substantially augmented).
Billie Inman contributed the Pater entry to the 
CBEL 3, Volume IV, in May
of 1996. In the new format, Inman's entry is considerably different from
John Sparrow's chronological listing in the NCBEL of approximately 165
reviews, articles, and books published on Pater between 1873 and 1965. It
contains, in the following order, sections on Pater's manuscripts; bibliogra-
phies and reference works (to the present time); collections of Pater's
works, with a list of reviews for each collection; books of selected works
by Pater; each of Pater's books published between 1873 and 1896 in its
various editions and translations, with a list of reviews of each; posthu-
mous collections of previously uncollected works by Pater and publica-
tions of previously unpublished works (to the present); a list of periodicals
in which Pater published; Pater's Introduction and Notes; biographical
works, including primary sources (to the present); obituary notices and es-
says; pre-1920 criticism and reminiscences (76 items, including 43 not listed
by Sparrow), and textual/bibliographical criticism (to the present).

Seiler's New Book

We are happy to announce that the Athlone Press, in London, will soon
release Robert Seiler's The Book Beautiful: Walter Pater and the House of
Macmillan. Most readers of the newsletter will have read Seiler's earlier
1995) and Walter Pater: A Life Remembered (University of Calgary
Press, 1987). With Seiler's permission, a major section of the "Preface" to his
new book is quoted below.

The letters reproduced in this volume make up a small but important chap-
ter in the story of Walter Pater's literary career. They do so by virtue of
recording in some detail the relations between this Victorian man of letters
and his publisher, Macmillan and Co., as they affected the form as well as
the content of the books they produced. Of course, such relations are diffi-
cult at the best of times. This was doubly so with Pater who, like Dante
Gabriel Rossetti before him and William Morris, James McNeill Whistler,
and Oscar Wilde after him, believed that the book should be thought of as
an aesthetic object. All too often these relations between author and pub-
lisher go unnoticed, because the letters and the documents exchanged re-
garding their joint enterprise are not preserved. Fortunately, this is not the
case with Pater. The letters reproduced here make accessible valuable lit-
erary as well as historical information. Moreover, they offer insight into
the principles as well as the practices of modern bookmaking.

In this complex undertaking, we can take our bearings from two students
of bookmaking. First James G. Nelson (1971) helps readers see bookmak-
ing through the eyes of the Bodley Head, the small book shop and publish-
ing firm that produced the books which summed up the aesthetic milieu of
the early 1890's. Secondly, Jerome J. McGann (1991) helps us appreciate
the signifying mechanisms which are comprised in the physical aspects of
the book, the linguistic and the bibliographical features. The lesson we
learn here is that any literary text comes down to us via complex "social"
processes, which together constrain the way the reader “decodes” the meaning. An author may exercise some control over the linguistic aspects of textual production, namely, the words, but in the vast majority of instances the publisher exercises total control over the bibliographical aspects, such as page layout, typography, paper, and binding. Consider the way Pater’s “texts” have come down to the twentieth century. Initially, he wrote for a variety of periodicals; subsequently, he revised many of these works for publication in book-form; moreover, much of the remaining material (unfinished or uncollected) has come down to us via the mediation of his literary executor, Charles L. Shadwell, who had his own ideas as to what Pater wanted to convey to his readers (Brake and Small, *Pater in the 1990s*, 1991). In other words, the “Pater” we read is the product of a number of decisions, some authorial but many editorial. Gerald Monsman (“Editing Pater’s *Gaston*,” in *Pater in the 1990s*, 1991) and Ian Small (“Editing and Annotating Pater,” in *Pater in the 1990s*, 1991) have shown that choosing a copy-text is no easy matter. Pater supervised the production of his texts, from first draft to printed book, with close attention, but much of the material needed to construct the pedigree of any one work has not survived (Small, 1991, 34).

My goal in the Introduction is to establish an appropriate context for appreciating the collaboration represented in the letters presented here; I try to indicate a line of thought from Rossetti, through Whistler, to commercial bookmakers at work around the turn of the last century, with the solitary figure of Pater in the background. For reasons of coherence, I present the narrative in a number of parts: I start with Pater’s apprenticeship as a writer, and then shift to the apprenticeship of Daniel and Alexander, who founded the House of Macmillan in 1843. Next, I glance at commercial bookmaking during the last part of the nineteenth century, with emphasis on the small private presses, and then notice the pre-eminence of Macmillan and Co. in the field of quality bookmaking. Finally, I survey Pater’s literary career as a Macmillan author, glancing at the efforts his sisters, Hester and Clara, who made every effort to preserve if not enhance their brother’s literary reputation after his death.

**Notes**

**Why Mallock Took the Letters to Jowett**

by Billie Andrew Inman

My pursuit of knowledge about William Money Hardinge in his own right has turned up a bit of information that suggests how W. H. Mallock could have acquired the “Yours lovingly” letters and why he would have taken them to Benjamin Jowett. (If you are unfamiliar with this subject, you can find it discussed in my “Estrangement and Connection: Walter Pater, Benjamin Jowett, and William M. Hardinge,” in *Pater in the 1990s*, edited by...
Another promising but perhaps over-emphatic personality, to be nipped not many years onwards in the bud, was Leonard Montefiore, much under Jowett's spell, ardent for social service, violent in radical opinions. And there were Arnold Toynbee, the gentlest and most self-effacing of refined philanthropists . . . and Mr. (late Sir) William Davidson, handsome, painstaking, immensely accurate. . . . There was Mallock's friend, the strange, hectic, talented Hardinge—musical, poetical, intensely flippancy and flippancy 'intense,' who on one occasion parodied the poetic vogue of the day in a distich:

   She sealed the letter with a kiss—
   And took it to the post office. (119)

It is remarkable, as well as informative, that Sichel remembered Hardinge as Mallock's friend, since his own association with Hardinge had not ended with their departures from Balliol. Hardinge wrote in 1894, in "Some Personal Recollections of the Master of Balliol": "I am reminded by my friend Walter Sichel of a fairly authentic story [about Jowett] in connection with these essay readings, a story I have not seen told elsewhere" (Temple Bar, October 1894, 177). The "sands of time" seem but to have sharpened Sichel's impression of Mallock and Hardinge's friendship, and his reference to the friendship strengthens the long-established rumor that Leslie in Mallock's The New Republic represents W. M. Hardinge.

Since Mallock was Hardinge's friend, he would have wanted to save him from a possibly dangerous further involvement with Pater and set him on the right course. Knowing that Jowett would tend to blame the older man for the attachment and deal relatively leniently with the younger, he could have delivered the letters to Jowett as a means of protecting Hardinge. He must have obtained the letters directly from Hardinge, whom he could easily have visited in his lodgings. Whether Hardinge knew the use that would be made of the letters we may never know.

May Ottley's Other Persona

by Billie Andrew Inman

Students of Pater's works know May Ottley as the heir, with her husband, Canon Robert L. Ottley, to Pater's autograph manuscripts and personal library and as editor of Pater's "An English Poet" (Fortnightly Review, April 1931); but May Ottley also had a writing career unrelated to Pater. Under the name Deborah Primrose she published two books: A Modern Boeotia;
Pictures from Life in a Country Parish (London: Methuen, 1904) and Beauty of Figure: How to Acquire and Retain It by Means of Easy and Practical Home Exercises, with 72 illustrations, photographs from life (London: William Heinemann, 1905). In the Preface to the former book, she states: "I have tried to write down truthfully some of the experiences of not a few of the clergy and their wives in remote country villages—where they are called upon to fulfil, unaided, the miscellaneous functions of doctor, nurse, teacher, district visitor, sanitary inspector, and relieving officer, as best they may." She is highly critical of the village where she and her husband have served, naming it Snorem's End and describing the landscape in which it is set as "waterless" and "treeless." The people of the parish are, in her opinion, honest in handling money and clean, but not "humble, receptive, simple, affectionate" (13) or "pious, sober, or truthful" (19). She finds no natural affection among these people: "A married daughter will refuse to do the slightest service for her mother unless she is paid for it" (20). She depicts her own family quite differently. She is dedicated to the welfare of her children and open in expressing love for her husband, in lines from Christina Rossetti: "The Desert Would Be / As Gushing of Waters to Me / The Wilderness Be As a Rose, / If It Led Me to Thee, / O My Love" (title page, verso).

In the latter book, after an introduction in which she discusses "physical culture" throughout the ages, emphasizing the norms of ancient Egypt and ancient Greece, Deborah Primrose explains how to do exercises designed to develop various parts of the body, for the sake of both health and beauty. Her explanations are accompanied by photographs of women and girls performing the exercises. At the end of this book, there are about twenty pages of advertising—of all types of aids to health and beauty, from teeth whiteners to corsets. Some of the ads, however, go beyond these fields: for example, Dame Primrose recommends Hotel York in the West End of London.

May Ottley also wrote for women's magazines: Hearth and Home, The World of Dress, and Myra's Journal; for example, at the time her books were published, she was writing a column for Hearth and Home entitled "Health and Beauty," in which she answered readers' questions on how to treat chilblains, how to reduce body weight, how to prevent loss of hair, how to make the complexion soft and delicate, etc. All of her writings can be found at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

One might assume that May Ottley, a clergyman's wife, was trying to conceal her identity in using a pseudonym. However, since Deborah Primrose is the name of the clergyman's wife in A Vicar of Wakefield, as well as the name of the first-person narrator in A Modern Boeotia, a clergyman's wife, the use of the pseudonym seems only a convention. Certainly, Clara Pater must have known about this other persona of her friend and former student.
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Books


Buckton, Oliver S. Secret Selves: Confession and Same-Sex Desire in Victorian Autobiography. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1998. (Chapters on J. H. Newman, J. A. Symonds, O. Wilde, E. Carpenter, and E. M. Forster. No chapter on Pater because his concern in the subject, according to the author, has been well discussed by others; however, “his influence should be discernible in each section” 15.)


Fraser, Hilary and Daniel Brown. English Prose of the Nineteenth Century. London and New York: Longman, 1997. (Sketches of lives and works of thirty-one authors, including Pater, are given at the back of this book; but none of the authors is treated in depth in the body of the book, which consists of three essays, “The Prose of Discovery,” “Life Stories,” and “Discourses of Culture,” introduced by an essay on the rise of periodical literature in the century; contains a chronology of publications.)


MacLeod, Catriona. Embodying Ambiguity: Androgyny and Aesthetics, from Winckelmann to Keller. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998. (No mention of Pater, but excellent background for the study of his conception of androgyny.)

Essays

Barolsky, Paul. “Leonardo, Satan, and the Mystery of Modern Art.” Virginia Quarterly Review 74 (Summer 1998), 393-414. Like a hall of mirrors where the reflection and the reflected upon interchange, Barolsky’s essay traces the lineage of artistic fabulists rendering art in word, from Ovid to Poe, from Vasari to Kenneth Clark and E. H. Gombrich. The fable of Leonardo, or his legend, as Barolsky notes that Pater called it, grew under his own name through such works as Dmitri Merejkowski’s The Romance of Leonardo da Vinci, Freud’s Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood, and Jack Dann’s novel The Memory Cathedral: A Secret History of Leonardo da Vinci—and under the names of fictional artists, such as E. T. A. Hoffmann’s Berthold, Balzac’s Frenhofer, and Pär Lagerkvist’s Bernardo—into the literary and scholarly conception of “the modern artist.” In the process, Leonardo absorbs Narcissus, reflecting himself, and Faust, so intent upon penetrating the mysteries of nature that he yields his soul to Satan, “the sublime destroyer” and ultimate mystery. In the extended legend of Leonardo, Barolsky finds “the origins of Picasso’s claim that a painting is never done and...the deep roots of our own peculiarly modern and pervasive sense of the mystery of art, the sense that it ever eludes, that our own obsessive detective investigations of it will remain incomplete, will never be finished” (414). In this essay, with its dazzling range of reference, Pater figures mainly as a source of apt and impressive quotations.

Chapin, Peter. “Wilde at Oxford / Oxford Gone Wilde.” In Reading Wilde: Querying Spaces—An Exhibition Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Trials of Oscar Wilde. Introd. Carolyn Dever and Marvin J. Taylor. New York: Fales Library, New York University, 1995. Pp. 27-34. This essay discusses the source of Wilde’s Hellenism, aestheticism, his critical attitude that embraces variety and diversity, by discussing the intellectual legacy of Oxford for Wilde, who himself functions at a critical crux of controversy at Oxford. This controversy deplored Pater’s “Renaissance and its...notorious ‘Conclusion’ [which] was being denounced from the pulpit by the Bishop for its immorality” (29). It would eventually encompass Wilde’s own inconsistencies and aestheticism which seemed to serve “in Dowling’s words, ‘as a screen for sodomy’” (30), a Greek worship of nature that “went frequently against nature” (Dowling 91; Chapin 30).
Potolsky, Matthew. “The Fear of Falling: Walter Pater’s Marius the Epicurean as a Dangerous Influence.” ELH 65 (Fall 1998), 701-729. This is the type of essay in criticism that comes along once in a blue moon: it contains genuine, new insights into a work of literature, the author who wrote it, and the readers who are influenced by it. Although the eight pages of notes in small type that accompany this essay give evidence of Potolsky’s extensive and deep reading in Pater criticism, he is not indebted to other critics for his argument and is not a mere counter-puncher building an argument through opposition. He sets out to explain “the diffused sense of threat” associated with Pater and his writings, which he does not think sexual politics accounts for entirely. Potolsky works from a central “educational narrative” in Marius, which casts Flavian as teacher and Marius as student, and Yeats’s fearful question in The Trembling of the Veil about the influence of “the only great prose in modern English... and the attitude of mind of which it was the noblest expression”—whether it had “caused the disaster of my friends” (702). He builds a case for some readers’ inevitably interpreting Pater’s prose as “dangerous,” as Yeats does, in spite of Pater’s understanding the dynamics of “influence” and his attempts in his writings to counteract them. Potolsky begins with the idea that, “for Yeats, Pater’s teaching encourages a triangulation of personal intercourse, by which one related to others not directly but through ‘learning’ and poetry” (703); in other words, the danger is that “his teaching encourages the conflation—to the point of a near identification—of literary with personal relationships, and of literature itself with life” (708). Potolsky sees Yeats’s Paterian teacher in Flavian: “Like Pater, Flavian too is distant and aloof, relating to his student only by means of art and learning. Like Pater, he too both teaches and embodies a conflation of art and life, to the point that he becomes, again like Pater in Yeats’s recollection, almost indistinguishable from the writings he advocates” (708). However, Flavian, like Yeats, wants to shake off the burdens of literary influence, be modern, and sway readers through unique language; for Flavian writing is like waging battle against the forces that would make him conventional. However, “hungry for control, for ascendancy over men” (ME 1:109), he doesn’t reckon on those “quite alien associations” discussed by Pater in “Style,” which have their own influence and defy the writer’s control of the reader’s response, or those quite alien associations in events, which enter unexpectedly to still one’s poem.
with one’s life, in his case infection by the plague. It is Flavian, the teacher, who falls, as if from Yeats’s “rope, tightly stretched”; Marius, the student, “remains unscathed by his education” (709). Pottosky concludes: “To argue by means of art that art cannot reliably deliver the message with which it is entrusted, as Pater’s novel both seeks and fails to do, is inherently paradoxical. Yet it is precisely this paradox, I would argue, that aestheticism is condemned to teach and never to resolve” (721). [BAI]

Weikert, Heidrun-Edda. “Ruskin, Pater, Symonds und Raffaels ‘Stanza della Segnatura’: Früh-und spätviktorianische Perspektiven.” Archiv für Kulturgeschichte Band 79, Heft 1 (1997), 83-103. Weikert compares three commentaries on two of Raphael’s four frescoes in the Stanza della Segnatura, once the study of Pope Julius II, in the Vatican: John Ruskin’s in “Pre-Raphaelitism” (in Cook and Wedderburn’s Edition of the Works, Volume 12, 148-150); Walter Pater’s in “Winckelmann” (in Hill’s edition of The Renaissance, 157-158); and John Addington Symonds’s in Renaissance in Italy: Fine Arts, Chapter VI (in New York: Henry Holt, 1888, 333). These commentaries are brief and selective in their range, but Weikert gives them significance by her ability to set them into the larger contexts of the three authors’ general assessments of art in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. The two frescoes at issue are the Disputa del Sacramento, celebrating divine Truth as represented by great Christian theologians, and Parnassus, or the Spirit of Poetry, with Apollo seated under a laurel tree in the center, amidst the muses, inspiring a gathering of the greatest Classical and Renaissance poets, including Homer, Sappho, and Dante, who are arranged in a semicircle to his left and right. In his commentary, Ruskin objects vigorously to bringing Apollo and his entourage into the Pope’s study and to Raphael’s implication, by his placement of the frescoes, that Pagan Beauty is equal in importance to Divine Truth. His conclusion is that “[t]he doom of the arts of Europe went forth from that chamber, and it was brought about in great part by the very excellencies of the man who had thus marked the commencement of decline” (92; 12:150). Weikert judges (92; 12:150) this “early-Victorian perspective” of Ruskin’s to be simplistic and absolutist (93). She finds what she calls the “late-Victorian perspective” to be highly acceptable. She praises Pater for being able to see the artist’s intention and describe the frescoes objectively, and for detecting that Dante has a place in both frescoes. She finds Symonds’s assessments of the frescoes to be exactly opposite Ruskin’s. The mixing of Christian and Pagan values that Ruskin deplores and Pater acknowledges as “a tradition in human culture,” Symonds welcomes enthusiastically, stating: “The cramping limits of ecclesiastical tradition are transcended” (100; 6:333). [BAI, with the assistance of George Hafkemeyer]
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Lankewish, Vincent Anthony. "Strange Nuptials: Male-Male Desire and Marriage in Victorian Literature" (John Ruskin, Walter Pater, Alfred, Lord Tennyson, Gerard Manley Hopkins). Ph.D. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 1997. DAI 58 (Jan. 1998), 2669-A. Lankewish studies the "problems of genre" caused by Victorian male writers who appropriate the marriage plot to "develop a language of male love." Ruskin and Pater express their anxieties and desires by examining Greek, Medieval, and Renaissance cultures. Tennyson and Hopkins "challenge the constraints of genre" by expressing male love through the epithalamion. And Forster envisions a new Eden where "men may love one another without fear."

Potolsky, Matthew David. "Teaching Decadence: Aestheticism and the Ends of Education in Gautier, Masoch [Leopold von Sacher-Masoch], and Pater." Ph.D. University of California, Irvine, 1997. DAI 58 (July 1997), 158-A. Examining Gautier's, Masoch's, and Pater's "educational narratives," as well as the place of imitation in education theory, Potolsky observes that "the dangerous teachers and misled students who populate aestheticist narrative dramatize the extent to which education is both enabled and disabled by imitation." He argues that "aestheticism, far from constituting a mere valorization of art over life, offers a challenge to conventional uses of art in education." He concludes that "rather than seeking, like Plato, to exclude imitation from education, aestheticism insists that imitation is inevitable, and that the teacher must acknowledge, rather than seek to efface, the distinction between life and art."

Susser, Eric Alan. "Modern Selves / Romantic Souls: The Aestheticism of Pater, Wilde, and Yeats." Ph.D. University of Virginia, 1997. DAI 58 (June 1998), 4672-A. Susser examines a line of aesthetes who use aestheticism's binaries in different ways: Pater, who desires "to return to a Pre-Romantic age" yet believes that modernism must move away from Romanticism; Wilde, who opposes the individual and his/her community by exalting the artist yet uses...
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Silverberg, Rinata Ann Renee. "Joyce's Parody of Period-Bound Languages in 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.'" M. A. University of Manitoba, 1994. *MAI* 35 (Oct. 1997), 1159. Silverberg argues that Joyce parodies "period-bound language" used in the aesthetic movement by such writers as Pater, Moore, and Wilde, in order to "overcome conventionality, to abolish period-bound languages, and to perpetuate a dialogics of reading."
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