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2. See Carolyn Williams, “On Pater’s Late Style,” Nineteenth-Century Prose 24.2 (1997), 143–60, for example, for a rewarding re-consideration of this mode of structuring Pater’s writings.


4. For the regulation of women’s reading in the period, see Kate Flint, The Woman Reader 1837–1914 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) passim, and on Moore particularly, 144–45.

5. Escott was editor from November 1882 through June 1886, during which time Pater contributed not at all to the Fortnightly.

6. Pater was later to choose to review Lilly on the French Revolution for the Noticeable Books department of the monthly Nineteenth Century in a signed review published in December 1889.


10. See the Star (11 July 1889), 4b: “for the first time in two hundred years none but secondhand copies can be obtained of Sir Thomas Urquhart’s admirable translation of the works of Rabelais.”

11. Star (11 July 1889), 4b.


13. W. T. Stead was charged and sentenced to three months imprisonment for indecent assault and aiding and abetting. See Raymond L. Schults, Crusader in Babylon (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1972), 177–80.


15. Quoted in Beckson, London in the 1890s, 192.

16. Ibid., 191.

17. See Wright’s complaints about the difficulties of dealing with Jackson in his autobiography, Thomas Wright of Olney (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1936).


20. Pater’s contradictory practices with respect to the retention of “Winckelmann” and the exclusion of “Aesthetic Poetry” may be explained in part by the explicitness of the former on the subject of homosexuality and the danger of further tampering with the text of The Renaissance just at the moment that the “Conclusion” is restored. The
point about the expendability of “Aesthetic Poetry” in 1890 is that it is not in the context of The Renaissance when it appears in Appreciations in 1889, and few readers would have identified it with the controversial “Conclusion” restored the previous year. Moreover, as I argue, Cleveland Street and its aftermath, and “Pernicious Literature,” changed the climate between 1888 and 1890.

21. Star (11 July 1889), 4b.
22. Beckson, London in the 1890s, 205.
23. Male and female configurations of male secrets, such as Bunbury and Lady Windermere, the leak in An Ideal Husband, and the notion of the male “past” are parts of a single, recurring structure in the plays. As the male past is foregrounded so provocatively in 1893 in the popular novel The Heavenly Twins, it is possible to read An Ideal Husband as in part a response to Sarah Grand’s (melodramatic framing of the argument—syphilis or social (male) purity.
24. This story is notable in Pater’s work in its adoption of a female narrator, and it may be read as a fictional attempt by Pater to portray the position of the unmarried woman, here historicized but also eloquently marginalized in Victorian terms through her provincial as well as domestic setting. For more on the implications of the female narrative perspective in this tale, see Lesley Higgins, “But Who is ‘She’?: Forms of Subjectivity in Walter Pater’s Writing,” Nineteenth-Century Prose 24.2 (1997), 37–65. But the presence of Watteau’s historical existence and fame seem to me to balance what I take to be this distancing device of the female frame of the tale, to make it a bachelors’ (both Watteau and Jean-Baptiste) as well as a spinster’s tale. The “portrait” is a landscape with figures.

Lesley Higgins
No Time for Pater: The Silenced Other
of Masculinist Modernism | 37–54

7. Anti-Semitism is the focus of one section in Christopher Ricks’s T. S. Eliot and Prejudice (London: Faber, 1988); homophobia is not considered. See Anthony Julius,
8. McGrath’s excellent study is too discrete regarding the modernists’ motives for creating such a critical distance: after Wilde’s trial, he states, “Pater’s aesthetic philosophy was linked to the misfortune of Wilde and other writers who never survived the nineties” (161). McGrath, The Sensible Spirit: Walter Pater and the Modernist Paradigm (Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1986), 161. My argument also refuses the psychologizing approach of Bloom and his followers, who insist that we must “place Pater in his Oedipal context” in order to “apprehend his influence not only on Stevens and Yeats, but on Joyce, Eliot, Pound, and many other writers.” “The Crystal Man,” Selected Writings of Walter Pater, Bloom, ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), ix; see Frank Moliterno, The Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce (Greensboro: ELT Press, 1998), 71. Rather than suggesting that modernists were trying to achieve “autonomy” by killing off the “father,” I am contending that their various distancing or silencing strategies in relation to Pater and his writings were catalyzed by what Sedgwick terms “homosexual panic.” Yeats’s memoirs astutely suggest that the spreading stain of Wilde’s “condemnation” cost many “novelists and essayists and artists” the approving “ear of the great public” (Memoirs, 89). This contradicts Moliterno’s hasty generalization that Pater’s “fame and notoriety . . . must have been an attraction for most young writers at the turn of the century” (Dialectics, 6).


10. Ibid., 34.


21. Ibid., 218–19.
24. Ibid., 97.
29. Lewis, *The Art*, 212, 244, 213.
33. Lewis, *Doom of Youth* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1932), 207.
36. Ibid., 134.
37. Ibid., 120.
38. Ibid., 140, 142, 143.
41. Ibid., 145, 148.
42. Ibid., 145.
43. Ibid., 143.
45. Ibid., 443.
50. More was “bitter against Pater as a critic who falsifies everything he touches,” and Babbitt “compare[d] Pater to that arch-impressionist, Anatole France.” Ruth Child, The Aesthetic of Walter Pater (New York: Macmillan, 1940), 130.

51. According to Eliot, when More composed the early Shelburne pieces, “Walter Pater ruled from the grave, and his living representative was Arthur Symons. I should say myself that More was a better critic than Pater” (Criterion 16: 667). Pater’s description of La Gioconda echoes loudly: “like the vampire, she has been dead many times” (Ren/H 99).


54. Ibid.


58. “Observations” concludes, “Coleridge occasionally wrote good criticism; and Walter Pater, if he had had a better English style, and been more interested in what he wrote about, might have done something in the same way” (71).


60. Ibid., 6.

61. Ibid., 31.

62. Ibid., 95.


64. Ibid., 438, 443.

65. Ibid., 437.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid., 442.


73. Eliot, Selected Essays, 14.


75. Eliot, Selected Essays, 145.

76. Pater focuses on the controversies of Pascal’s life rather than “Pascal in his final sanctity, his detachment of soul from all but the greatest matters” (MS 63), the phase and writings most admired by Eliot. Pascal’s style, Pater suggests, “reminds us of the

77. Eliot, Varieties of Metaphysical Poetry, 76.
78. Eliot, Selected Essays, 439.
81. Sinfield, “‘Effeminancy,’” 42.
82. Sinfield, 46.
86. Ibid., 17.
88. In “Gerontion,” Fresca is one of several “whirled/ Beyond the circuit of the shuddering Bear” (Complete Poems, 39). The speaker’s realization, “I that was near your heart was removed therefrom / To lose beauty in terror, terror in inquisition” (Complete Poems, 38) echoes Pater’s “Leonardo da Vinci” essay, which cites “some interfusion of the extremes of beauty and terror” that the painter experienced (Ren/H 110).
92. Eliot, Complete Poems, 64.
93. Ibid., 65, 15, 19, 20.
94. Eliot, Varieties, 92.
95. Eliot, Selected Essays, 405.
96. Eliot, Complete Poems, 74.
98. Eliot, Complete Poems, 182.
99. Ibid., 171, 195, 198.
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Pater's Reception in France: A Provisional Account | 55–62

1. See S. Bann, “Extremities of discourse,” originally presented as a paper to the British Comparative Literature Association, University of Warwick, 1977, and published in their review, Signs of Change (Summer 1978); repr. in the Review of Contemporary Fiction 3.2 (1983), 130–33.

2. Letter to the author, dated Paris, 8 November 1978: “As for the myth of Osiris of course I was aware of it, and if I do not recall having been directly inspired by it when writing Fable I am very willing to see in it the natural resurgence, brought about by the state of crisis, of a great archetype”; “I have not read Walter Pater and am going to try and find translations of his writings here.”


5. Marguerite Yourcenar, Lettres à ses amis et quelques autres (Paris: Gallimard, 1995), 211: “I would dare to say that the enormous importance that he attached to the Marius of Walter Pater shows to what extent he was ignorant of Antiquity as such, even under the already almost ‘modern’ form of the late Roman world.”


8. Edward Hutton, Rome (3rd ed; London: Methuen, 1912), 303. See also in particular Chapter 8, on the Baths of Caracalla, for passages on the “eternal life of the City” which the author holds to be visible to the aesthetic observer.


11. Ibid., 48.

12. Ibid., 57: “jusqu’à présent, Walter Pater ne m’apparaît nullement comme un grand esprit: c’est un causeur fin et agréable, mais voilà tout.”

14. Du Bos, *Approximations*, 42–43: “L'esprit de Pater ressemble à une de ces cathédrales où l'on entre à la tombée du jour, à l'heure où il n'y a plus personne, et qui vous envahissent alors du sentiment de je ne sais quel recueillement peuplé; et Pater lui-même s'est toujours avancé dans son esprit comme on avance dans une cathédrale, à pas lents, retenus et silencieux. Marius l’Epicurien demeure le grand office qu’il y célébra, d’une voix sans reproche, dont chacune des inflexions pénètre jusqu’au coeur de nos plus intimes retraites, et qui semble toujours appeler l’apparition, sur l’autel, du Saint-Sacrement qu’elle-même n’ose y dresser.”


16. See André Gide et François-Paul Alibert, *Correspondance 1907–1950*, Claude Martin, ed. (Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1982), 256–57. The passage from Gide’s journal for 4 August is quoted in 257, note 1, and suggests that he was considerably relieved to get back to the classical world, after reading Dostoevsky. The letter to Alibert reads: “c’est en pensant à toi que je lis Pater... il donne une traduction excellente de cet Hymne à Déméter, dont je reconnais chaque phrase, mais dont la beauté ne m’avait jamais paru plus rayonnante. Toute la dévotion païenne y respire. C’est plus beau que les statues du Parthénon; plus beau que la Bible et que ce que l’homme a produit de beau sur la terre” (p. 256). Gide had previously been familiar with the *Hymn* in a translation by Leconte de Lisle, which he had used in his own writings on Persephone (ibid., 257, note 2). Pater’s somewhat abbreviated version of the “Song of Demeter” is included in the essay, “The Myth of Demeter and Persephone”: see *GS*, 83–91. Gide also credits Pater with having provided the information (new to him) that the manuscript of the Greek hymn was discovered as late as 1780 in the imperial library at Moscow.

17. Gide Alibert, *Correspondance*, 377. It is not clear which page Gide has translated and sent with the letter.

18. A study which has been omitted here, but deserves further attention, is Georges Duthuit, *Le Rose et le noir. De Walter Pater à Oscar Wilde*, first published in 1923; this was recently republished in an edition of Duthuit’s criticism, *Représentations*, Yves Bonnefoy, ed.


20. Ibid., 95, 267.


23. See Ainslie, *Adventures*, 267–68. Ainslie’s interest in the figure of the artist, and the notion of life as a work of art, may be deduced not only from his anecdotes about Wilde and Pater, but also from the fact that he translated Barbey d’Aurevilly’s study of Beau Brummell into English. See Douglas Ainslie, *Of Dandyism and of George Brummell* (London: Dent, 1897).


26. Ibid., 1: 353.

27. Ibid., 1: 602.
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The Reception of Walter Pater in Germany and Austria | 63–72

1. See the diary entry quoted in Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Sämtliche Werke*, Kritische Ausgabe, Rudolf Hirsch et al., eds., III, *Dramen* 1, Götz Eberhard Hübner et al., eds. (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1982), 482, line 25.


3. Cf. letter to Bruckmann-Cantacuzène, 26 June 1894, ibid., 104.

4. Ibid., 110. All translations from German are my own.


9. “Gewisse, vom Künstler selbst ausgehende Theorien, wie die ziemlich engen und armen von Baudelaire in Umlauf gesetzten Schlagwörte, manches Geistreiche
von Pater gesagte, erschien [sic] mir als das einzige, was nicht vollkommen abgelehnt werden dürfte” [“Certain theories that originate in the artist himself, such as the rather narrow and impoverished stock phrases circulated by Baudelaire, and various witty things said by Pater—these seem to me the only things that are not to be rejected completely”: Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Harry Graf Kessler, Briefwechsel, Hilde Burger, ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1968), 28 (letter of 26 July [1900]).
10. Ibid., 45 (letter of 9 April 1903).
16. RA, 1: 657. As far as I know, the Hofmannsthal literature offers no clear explanation for this choice of pseudonym, which associates a very English first name with an Irish surname common in counties Tyrone, Armagh and Monaghan, perhaps designed to bring Oscar Wilde to mind. Interestingly, in the pronunciation of “Hertfordshire” that was current at the time, the “t” was silent.
17. For a clear exposition of the ideas in the Pater essay, see Steve Rizza, Rudolf Kassner and Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Criticism as Art (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997), 56–64.


27. Ibid., 363.


33. See Klaus Martens, *Felix Paul Greves Karriere: Frederick Philip Grove in Deutschland* (St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1997).

34. Most notably the drama *Der Kaiser und die Hexe*, first published in *Die Insel* and then in book form, both in 1900.

35. For details, see Rizza, *Rudolf Kassner and Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, 274. It was Kassner’s translations of the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* that influenced Thomas Mann’s *Der Tod in Venedig* [*Death in Venice*].


40. This again echoes something that I have elsewhere argued is behind one instance of Hofmannsthal’s reception of Pater—his use of images from the Leonardo essay and the Conclusion in and around a poem written in the mid-1890s. See Vilain, “Wer lügt, macht schlechte Metaphern,” 732–41.


42. From a letter written on 5 July 1902 (and thus a few weeks before the review appeared). Quoted from Rilke, *Sämtliche Werke*, VI, 1421.

Physiology, Mesmerism, and Walter Pater’s
“Susceptibilities to Influence” | 73–89

1. These words are from the physiologist W. B. Carpenter’s *Principles of Human Physiology, with their Chief Applications to Pathology, Hygiene, and Forensic Medicine* (4th ed; London: John Churchill, 1853), 800. I will be discussing his writings later in the essay.


3. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Use and Abuse of History*, Adrian Collins, trans. (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1949), 33. I have quoted from this translation because Collins uses the word “influence” and because Harold Bloom uses this translation in *The Anxiety of Influence* (2nd ed; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 49 (though of course Bloom does not cite his source). More recent editions translate the German *Wirkung* by “effect” rather than “influence,” e.g. “The historical culture of our critics will no longer permit any effect at all in the proper sense, that is an effect on life and action,” in R. J. Hollingdale’s translation (*Untimely Meditations* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983], 87). But “influence” is also a possible meaning of *Wirkung*.

4. Bloom primarily discusses the struggle between one poet and another, and the “anxiety of influence” that is produced by the efforts of a later poet to write against the space occupied by the work of earlier poets. In the “Preface” to the second edition Bloom states that, “What matters most (and it is the central point of this book) is that the anxiety of influence comes out of a complex act of strong misreading, a creative interpretation that I call ‘poetic misprision,’” yet he is still concerned above all with an anxiety that is achieved in the new poem (xxiii). In this project, I am interested in exploring what it is to be “under the influence” of a literary (or artistic) work for someone other than a poet or artist.


6. Ibid., 34.

7. Nordau states that “hypersusceptibility to suggestion is the distinguishing characteristic of hysteria,” and he argues that the peculiarities of the hysterical person—“extraordinary emotionalism,” “disproportionate impressionability,” an “excessive excitability of [the] imagination,” and “the exceeding ease with which they can be made to yield to suggestion”—are precisely the pathways by which the public has been led astray by the most prominent artists, writers, and musicians of the late nineteenth century. See Max Nordau, *Degeneration* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 32, 25.

9. Ibid., 145.


11. I am indebted to Alison Winter’s *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998) for much of my information about mesmerism in nineteenth-century Britain; my understanding of nineteenth-century physiology and of its relation to mesmerism is guided by her research and discussion.


13. This is Winter’s account of Martineau’s ideas (223). In this section I am relying primarily on Winter’s Mesmerized, Derek Forrest’s *The Evolution of Hypnotism: A Survey of Theory and Practice and of Prevailing Medical Attitudes from Mesmer to the Present Day* (Forfar, Scotland: Black Ace, 1999), and Alan Gauld’s *A History of Hypnotism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

14. In a letter to her uncle John Welsh, from 13 December 1847, she writes: “I have just been reading Harriet Martineau’s outpourings in the Athenæum, and . . . you wished to know if I too had gone into this devilish thing. . . . flash there went over me, from head to foot, something precisely like what I once experienced from taking hold of a galvanic ball, only not nearly so violent. I had presence of mind to keep looking him in the face, as if I had felt nothing. . . . I could even hinder him from perceiving that he had mesmerised me.” See *Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle*, J. A. Froude, ed. (New York: Harper, 1883), 238, 240.

15. The characterization “strikingly mesmeric terms” comes from Winter, and she also states that Browning “had ‘influenced’ her as no one else had” (*Mesmerized* 239). The quotation from Elizabeth Barrett is cited by Winter, and comes from Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *The Brownings’ Correspondence*, Phillip Kelly and Ronald Hudson, eds. (Winfield, KS: Wedgestone Press, 1984–1991), 1: 488–89.


18. I have no direct evidence that Pater had read any particular text by Carpenter, but his work was very widely read, and Billie Inman cites several instances of Pater's knowledge of contemporary physiological discourse. See Billie Andrew Inman, Walter Pater's Reading: A Bibliography of His Library Borrowings and Literary References, 1858-1873 (New York: Garland, 1981), 180, and Walter Pater and His Reading, 1874-1877: With a Bibliography of His Library Borrowings, 1878-1894 (New York: Garland, 1990), 180, 398.


22. Ibid., 29, 32.

23. Carpenter writes, “It is, in fact, in virtue of the Will, that we are not mere thinking automata, mere puppets to be pulled by suggesting-strings, capable of being played-upon by every one who shall have made himself master of our springs of action. It may freely be admitted that such thinking automata do exist: for there are many individuals whose Will has never been called into due exercise.” See Principles of Human Physiology, 800.


26. Walter Bagehot, Physics and Politics, or, Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of “Natural Selection” and “Inheritance” to Political Society (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1999), 10.

27. This is a question with a very long history. Alan Badiou writes that Plato banished the poets “from the Polis on grounds of imitation—let us understand: of an overly sensible capture of the Idea” (Manifesto for Philosophy, Norman Madarasz, trans. [Albany: SUNY Press, 1999], 34–35). Pater's writings can be read in relation to a long tradition reacting against the banishment of the poets “from the Polis on grounds of . . . an overly sensible capture of the Idea.”

28. The first definition is the first main heading under “sensible” in the Oxford English Dictionary; the second is the second major heading.

29. For an excellent discussion of the tensions between “sense” and “sensibility,” see William Empson’s The Structure of Complex Words (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989).

30. In Marius the Epicurean Pater ascribes an extreme version of such sensibility to Apuleius: “for him, the Ideas of Plato were no creatures of logical abstraction, but in very truth informing souls, in every type and variety of sensible things” (ME 2: 87). The exploration of “susceptibilities to influence” in Marius the Epicurean hinges on a growing awareness of the powers “in” or suggested by things.
31. Bernhard Berenson claims that Pater’s writings on art had a mesmeric effect on him. He states that Pater’s famous passage on the Mona Lisa “put me into states of body and mind not very different from those produced by hypnotic suggest,” and that he really only began to see Leonardo’s art once he was freed from “the post-hypnotic suggestion of my mesmerizers.” See Bernhard Berenson, The Study and Criticism of Italian Art, Third Series (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1916), 2, 5.

32. Winter, Mesmerized, 309.

33. Ibid., 63. Winter is referring to John Elliotson. The figure of playing upon the body of another is filled with sexual implications, and the controversies around Elliotson’s mesmeric practices were not unrelated to the fact that his two prize patients were working-class women (the O’Key sisters). It is only forty years later, however, with Charcot in France, that hypnotism (a successor to mesmerism) becomes closely associated with hysteria.

34. Margaret Oliphant, “Sensation Fiction,” Blackwood’s Magazine (May 1862), 571–72. She is describing the experience of reading Wilkie Collins’s The Woman in White.

35. Bagehot, Physics and Politics, 10.

36. Bagehot, The English Constitution (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1997), 8. Bagehot argues that the “lower strata” of society have not yet progressed to the point where they can be ruled through reason and discussion; they must be moved instead by the power of the “theatrical parts” of the constitution.
13. Ibid., 27.
22. Ibid., 219.
23. Ibid., 218.
25. The latter attribution is currently held to be correct. Cf. Newton, “Greek Sculptures from Asia Minor,” 87.
31. Ibid., 399.
32. Ibid., 400.
33. Ibid., 419.
35. The reports were published by Parliament under the titles Papers Respecting the Excavations at Budrun and Further Papers Respecting the Excavations at Budrun and Cnidus. Original dispatches are housed in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum, transcriptions in the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library (Add. Mss. 46889A-B and 46890).
41. Ibid., 231.
44. A. C. Benson, Walter Pater (1906; London: Macmillan, 1921), 73.
Stefano Evangelista


2. “The Myth of Demeter and Persephone” was delivered in the form of two lectures at the Birmingham and Midland Institute in 1875 and subsequently published in the Fortnightly Review in January and February 1876; “A Study of Dionysus” was published, also in the Fortnightly Review, in December of the same year. Together with other studies written in the course of nearly twenty years, these two essays were collected and published by C. L. Shadwell under the title Greek Studies in 1895, one year after Pater’s death.


9. The essay first appeared in the Fortnightly Review in April 1874 and was reprinted in Appreciations in 1889.


13. Ibid., 279, l. 115 ff.


17. Library records show that Pater repeatedly borrowed Müller’s works from Brasenose College Library from 1867 to 1874. See Billie A. Inman, *Walter Pater’s Borrowings from the Queen’s College Library, the Bodleian Library, the Brasenose College Library, and the Taylor Institution Library, 1860-1894* (1977).


20. Müller, *Comparative Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1909), 73. All subsequent references to this essay will be from “Comparative Mythology,” in *Chips from a German Workshop* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1867–1875).


22. Ibid., 58.

23. Ibid.


25. Ibid., 392–93.

26. Ibid., 456, 455.

27. See *Lectures*, 2: 387: “[n]o advance was possible in the intellectual life of man without metaphor.”

28. Ibid., 488.


35. Cf. “Defence,” 7: 112. “But poets . . . are not only the authors of language and of music, of the dance and architecture, and statuary, and painting; they are the insti-
tutors of laws, and the founders of civil society, and the inventors of the arts of life, and
the teachers. . . .”
   Press, 1984), 15 et passim.
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“Reanimate Greek”: Pater and Ruskin on Botticelli | 119–132

1. The Works of John Ruskin, E. T. Cook & A. Wedderburn, eds. (London: Allen,
   1903–1912), 4: 355.
2. “A Fragment on Sandro Botticelli,” Fortnightly Review, 14 o.s. (1870), 155–60,
   reprinted as “Sandro Botticelli,” in Studies in the History of the Renaissance (London:
   Macmillan, 1873), 39–51.
3. Pater is not cited by Ruskin in Ariadne Florentina, the revised, published text of
   the lectures (but see Works of John Ruskin, 22: 483n–85n). Nonetheless, W. G.
   Collingwood recalled that in the lectures as delivered Ruskin read “with apprecia-
   tion” Pater’s description of the Birth of Venus (The Life and Work of John Ruskin [Lon-
   don, 1893], 2: 137).
5. Ibid., 27.
6. G. Vasari, Le vite de’più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori, P. Barocchi & R. Bet-
8. The reference (Ren/H 40) is to the stories of Andrea del Castagno’s murder of
   Domenico Veneziano, disproved in 1862 by Gaetano Milanesi (J.A. Crowe & G.B.
   Cavalcaselle, A New History of Painting in Italy, [London: Murray, 1864–1866], 2: 308
   & n.), and Fra Filippo Lippi’s abduction from a convent of Lucrezia Buti, on which
   no edition of Vasari had yet cast doubt, whereas Crowe and Cavalcaselle instanced a
   series of “contingent circumstances” which in their view rendered it dubious (2: 333
   ff., 431–32).
9. See e.g. Athenæum 2280 (July 8 1871).
13. Ibid., 22: 337.
14. Pater’s essays on Renaissance artists, so carefully revised in other ways, were never corrected factually.
18. Ibid., 27: 372–73. Vasari’s explanation of the origin of Sandro Filipepi’s acquired name of “Botticelli”—as the name of his first teacher, a goldsmith—was later disproved by Milanesi, who traced it to Sandro’s brother Giovanni, known as “il Botticello” (*Le vite*, G. Milanesi, ed. [Firenze: Sansoni, 1878], 310n).
19. See e.g. *Ren/H* 78 (Leonardo’s life compared to a “secret errand”); 49 (“one asks in vain for more than a shadowy outline” of the Italian sculptors of the early fifteenth century); and esp. 42, for the wilful confusion, in the essay on Botticelli, of Matteo Palmieri with his near namesake and contemporary, the Pisan historian Mattia, “two dim figures” who are duly distinguished in the *Nouvelle biographie générale* (1863) on which Pater relied (see below).
24. Pater apparently relied on the article on Matteo Palmieri in the *Nouvelle biographie générale* (he reproduces its mistaken transcription of the title of Palmieri’s poem: see *Ren/H*, 337) and on A.-F. Rio, *De l’art chrétien*, 2: Paris, 1861, 469–70, if not directly on Richa.
28. Ruskin Foundation [Ruskin Library, Lancaster], MS 5B, ff. 48, 52, 55, 58, 64, 100, 128, 137.
34. See e.g. Mark 3:31, 32.
37. Ibid., 80.
40. “Men go forth to their labours until the evening” is adapted from Psalms 104:23.
42. Ruskin’s only published mention of the painter was a passing, negative comparison in *Academy Notes* for 1855 (*Works of John Ruskin*, 14: 19).
43. The painting is now in the National Gallery. It was on exhibition at the Royal Academy at the time of Ruskin’s lectures.
45. Ibid., 22: 403.
46. Ibid., 22: 405.
47. Weinberg, “Ruskin,” 27.
49. Ibid., 22: 18–19.
50. Ibid., 22: 18.
51. Ibid., 22: 342.
52. Ibid., 22: 385–86.
53. Ibid., 23: xxvii.
54. Ibid., 22: 223.
55. Ibid., 22: xxvii.
56. Ibid., 22: 82.
57. *Correspondence of John Ruskin*, 262.
58. Ibid.
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*Acknowledgment:* A version of this chapter first appeared in *Raritan* 21 (2002).

2. “The School of Giorgione” was originally published in the *Fortnightly Review* in October 1877. It was added to the third edition of *The Renaissance* in 1888.
4. “Leonardo da Vinci” was originally published in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1869 and was part of the original edition of *The Renaissance* (1873).

5. For a related analysis, see Svetlana Alpers, *Rembrandt’s Enterprise: The Studio and the Market* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). As she puts the question, “what can one make of the disturbing fact that some of the works of the very artist whose paintings have been seen as paradigmatic of individuality are painted by other hands?” (3). In passing Alpers contrasts Rembrandt’s practice (his “studio habit”) with Leonardo’s—emphasizing the truism that Leonardo tended to work alone and without a workshop.


9. Works such as Luigi Lanzi’s *Storia Pictorica della Italia* (1792–1795) began to suggest that art-history could recalibrate its conclusions by focusing on the technical habits of the masters. Other important art historians who developed the more methodical study of documents and styles which allowed for the reconsideration of attribution include Carl Friedrich von Rumohr, whose important *Italienische Forschunge* (1827–1830) was of great influence on English writers by mid-century. Two works
which demonstrated what could be achieved by the new methods and approaches are Passavant’s *Raphael Santi*, and especially *A New History of Painting in Italy* (1871) by J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle, which was to become the main source for Pater’s work on Giorgione. Important popularization was carried out not only by Anna Jameson, but by Franz Kugler; the second edition of the latter’s *History of Painting* (1837) was annotated and translated by Charles Eastlake, published by Murray as *The Schools of Painting in Italy* (1851), and proved to be an indispensable guide to erudite tourists throughout the century. Although Rumohr was not translated until late in the century, he was important for writers such as Jameson and Eastlake. Passavant’s *Raphael* was innovative in its attention to sources as well as in its introduction of the *catalogue raisonné*—including an attempt to separate works by Raphael from those of his students. Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s *History of Painting in Northern Italy* includes fifteen pages of “Paintings Falsely Ascribed to Giorgione.” Kugler’s preface to the second edition of his *Schools of Painting* includes an important account of the rate of change in artistic ideas in the period: “The ten years that have elapsed [since 1837] have changed, in many respects, not only the opinions of the author, but the standard of knowledge respecting art and its history generally.” *The Schools of Painting in Italy* (London: John Murray, 1951), iii. Another useful contemporary source is Eastlake’s review of Passavant’s book for the *Quarterly Review* (1840), printed in his *Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts* (1870). Useful books engaging with the recalibrations of taste and canon in the arts during the nineteenth century include Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art and Taste* and Carol Gibson-Wood, *Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli* (New York: Garland, 1988). For Eastlake and the period generally, see also David Robertson, *Sir Charles Eastlake and the Victorian Art World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).


14. Bernard Berenson, *The North Italian Painters* (1907) in *The Italian Painters of the Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 181, 180. Berenson presents the problem as having its sources in the resistance of the European mind to mastery: “We Europeans, even when not aware of it, hold to our own individuality, and can never be content with merely copying our masters, however great they may be” (184). Given that it is this resistance to the loss of individuality that he presents as the motivation for Leonardo’s followers to attempt to distinguish themselves by a vain prettiness, it is a dark irony of Berenson’s account that “[t]he only serious interest attached” to Leonardo’s Milanese students “is that they record ideas of the master’s; their chief attraction is that they record these ideas in terms so easy to grasp and remember that, like mnemonic jingles, they flatter the most commonplace minds” (181).
15. Martin Kemp, “‘The Madonna of the Yarnwinder’ in the Buccleuch Collection reconsidered in the context of Leonardo’s Studio’s Practice,” in _I Leonardeschi a Milano: Fortuna e collezionismo_, Maria Teresa Fiorio and Pietro C. Marani, eds. (Milan: Electa, 1991), 35. The collection in which Kemp’s essay appears joins the handful of works devoted to the followers of Leonardo in recent years, such as Pietro C. Marani, _Leonardo e i Leonardeschi a Brera_ (Florence: Cantini, 1987); Vezzosi, et al, _Leonardo e il Leonardismo a Napoli e a Roma_; and Maria Teresa Fiorio, _Leonardesque Painters in Lombardy_ (Milan: Amilcare, 1982). Work on the Leonardeschi in the first half of the century was largely limited to William Suida’s _Leonardo und sein Kreis_ (Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1929). A very recent resurgence of interest has been driven almost entirely by the desire to recover the work of northern Italian painters whom art history has damned as insipid followers of Leonardo. Tellingly, the English title of _Legacy of Leonardo: Painters in Lombardy, 1490–1530_, Francesco Porzio, ed. (Milan: Skira, 1998) is a reversal of the original Italian.


17. Two subtle and historically-specific discussions of literary collaboration are Jeffrey Masten’s _Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) and Wayne Koestenbaum’s _Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration_ (New York: Routledge, 1989). Masten is particularly nuanced in his treatment of Foucault (Masten, 26–27). A recent psycho-biographical attempt to engage the topic of heterosexual partners in art and literature is Whitney Chadwick and Isabelle de Courtivron, eds., _Significant Others: Creativity and Intimate Partnership_ (London: Thames and Hudson, 1993). See also Ruth Perry and Marine Watson Brownley, eds., _Mothering the Mind: Twelve Studies of Writers and their Silent Partners_ (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984). Harold Bloom should be mentioned in this context. A sophisticated late development of high Modernist thought, Bloom’s theory of influence engages with the topic not in order to do away with the romantic image of the creative genius, but to give it a new life and complexity. His project offers terms for describing the relations among poets, but it does so in order to clarify the achievement of “strong poets.” See _Anxiety of Influence_ (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1975. In art history Norman Bryson has provided a rich development and complication of Bloomian ideas in _Tradition and Desire: From David To Delacroix_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

18. Cf. Thomas Crow’s study of the play of desire and influence among a closely related set of painters in _Emulation: Making Artists for Revolutionary France_ (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995). Crow places the circle of painters around and following David in relation as members of a new sort of family—one made up entirely, it seems, of fathers and sons. While the conceptual claims of this fascinating work are somewhat limited by its biographical emphases Crow, like Alpers, is able to develop the
paradoxical force of work carried out under constraint. As he says of canvases formed in the interplay of David and his students: “The collective work apparent in the copy of the Socrates and in the Brutus manifests an aesthetic freedom and a liberation of the talents of pupils who elsewhere would have found little outlet for their individuality. But it carried with it a new kind of domination. . . . [T]heir conspicuously brilliant efforts became so many signs of his power over them” (117).


21. Pater anticipates recent art-historical claims: “Unlike the Leonardeschi who learned from the master’s example but ultimately turned this experience to their own ends, Salaì appears to have been the faithful replicator of Leonardo’s models and, by his own light, executor of Leonardo’s intentions. Such a contribution may be discounted from an aesthetic point of view, but it must have been of enormous importance for the propagation of the kind of popular Leonardism familiar to us.” Janice Shell, “Gian Giacomo Caprotti, detto Salaì,” Legacy, 397–406; 406.

22. Cf. Kenneth Clark, “there was no such painter as Andrea Salaino. The name seems to be due to a confusion between Andrea Solario and [Caprotti] Giacomo Salaì. The latter was the boy with curly hair who joined Leonardo in 1490 and stayed with him throughout his life.” The Renaissance, ed. Clark, 116n., qtd. in Ren/H 374n. The error may be in Pater’s sources. Kugler, for one, does discuss an artist he identifies with both names—“Andrea Salaino (Salai)”—and whom he praises for several works after Leonardo, including a Saint Anne, a Madonna and child, and a daughter of Herodias. Kugler, Schools of Painting, 2: 291. In a later edition, this artist becomes “Andrea Solarolo.” Kugler, Schools of Painting, 3rd ed., Austin Henry Layard, ed. (London: Murray, 1902), 2: 416.
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7. J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle, A History of Painting in North Italy (2 vols; London: John Murray, 1871). Some of the Giorgione paintings dis-attributed by Crowe and Cavalcaselle include the Louvre Concert Champêtre, Knight embracing a Lady, and Jacob meeting Rachel, all of which Pater weaves into his definition of the Giorgionesque, despite their dis-attrition. Ironically, as Kenneth Clark points out, most of Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s attributions have themselves been overturned in the twentieth century. See his edition of The Renaissance (New York: Collins, 1961), 136n.


9. Here is Rossetti’s sonnet, first published in The Germ (1850), and again, extensively revised, in Poems (1870): “For A Venetian Pastoral by Giorgione (In the Louvre)"

WATER, for anguish of the solstice:—nay,
But dip the vessel slowly,—nay, but lean
And hark how at its verge the wave sighs in
Reluctant. Hush! Beyond all the depth away
The heat lies silent at the brink of day:
Now the hand trails upon the viol-string
That sobs, and the brown faces cease to sing,
Sad with the whole of pleasure. Whither stray
Her eyes now, from whose mouth the slim pipes creep
And leave it pouting, while the shadowed grass
Is cool against her naked side? Let be:—
Say nothing now unto her lest she weep,
Nor name this ever. Be it as it was,—
Life touching lips with Immortality.

10. Rossetti’s interest in the Venetian school expressed itself not only in his 1870 sonnet on Giorgione but also in his paintings of the 1860’s. His portraits of voluptuous women were explicitly associated by his contemporaries with the Venetian school and, especially, Giorgione. See Alastair Grieve, “Rossetti and the scandal of art for art’s sake in the early 1860’s,” in After the Pre-Raphaelites, Prettejohn, ed., 17–35.


12. Critics had a mixed response to Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s use of art jargon. In his 1871 Academy review of History of Painting in North Italy, Sidney Colvin writes that “the technical vocabulary of the painter’s art is a peculiarly cramped and unattractive one;” and he singles out some of Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s more egregious recurring phrases, such as “addled draperies,” “horny surface,” “peachy touch,” and “furry dab,” to exemplify the art jargon of the book (1 July 1871), 328. But the Saturday Review praised the authors for avoiding “the snares of word painting and tinsel” (10 June 1871), 747.

13. Quoted in Hill’s notes, 282. For a complete transcription of Pater’s correspondence with his publisher, along with detailed commentary, see The Book Beautiful: Walter Pater and the House of Macmillan, R. M. Seiler, ed.


16. Linda Dowling describes the relation of aesthetic discourse to the homoerotic bonds between Oxford men in her book, Hellenism and Homosexuality.


22. W. J. Courthope, “Modern Culture,” Quarterly Review 137 (October 1874), 409.

23. It should be pointed out that Pater defines the “aesthetic critic” twice: once, in his “Preface” to the 1873 Renaissance, as a subjective critic, and again in the 1877 Giorgione essay, as a formalist critic. These two types of criticism are related but different; one finds meaning located in the mind of the critic, the other in the relation between the form and matter of the work of art. Yet I think Pater’s use of the designation “aesthetic criticism” for both formalism and subjectivism is not accidental. Both are
connected through an aesthetic of private contemplation, an imaginary world whose values are constructed in the mind of the critic rather than in the public worlds of connoisseurship or bourgeois morality—though, of course, the actual line separating the discourses of these two worlds is difficult to draw.

24. I use the terms “poetry” and “literature” here as Pater does, not referring to actual poetry or literature, but to the narrative quality of art, as opposed to its formal quality.


27. A typical comparison between the two institutions comes in Wilde’s *Picture of Dorian Gray*, when the patrician Lord Henry Wotton declares of Basil’s stunning portrait, “You must certainly send it next year to the Grosvenor. The Academy is too large and too vulgar. Whenever I have gone there, there have been either so many people that I have not been able to see the pictures, which was dreadful, or so many pictures that I have not been able to see the people, which was worse. The Grosvenor is really the only place.” See *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 18.

28. Whistler first assigned a musical title to a painting in 1867, when he named a picture of women in a domestic scene *Symphony in White, No. 3*. He subsequently went back to title his 1862 *The White Girl* as *Symphony in White, No. 1*. The use of musical terms to describe a formalist aesthetic in painting was at least in currency by 1868, when Swinburne wrote of the painting of Albert Moore, “The melody of colour, the symphony of form is complete. . . .” (in his “Notes on Some Pictures of 1868”). See Linda Merrill, *A Pot of Paint: Aesthetics on Trial in Whistler v Ruskin* (Washington: Smithsonian Institute Press, 1992), 25–27.


30. Inman suggests that Pater might have disagreed with Wilde’s mildly satirical criticism of Whistler, which seems valid, considering that the formalist aesthetic of Pater’s “Giorgione” essay, with its recurring musical metaphors, was strikingly similar

31. Pater's sensitivity towards public opinion and censure was especially evident in 1877, when, in March of that year, he withdrew from the competition for Professor of Poetry at Oxford in the wake of the publication of W. H. Mallock's popular and scandalous satire, *The New Republic*. That Pater decided not to print the controversial "Conclusion" to the 1878 edition of *The Renaissance* demonstrates his continuing awareness of the public eye.


33. See especially Shearer, 313–14.

34. On the growth of Victorian art audiences, see Brandon Taylor, *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public, 1747–2001* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999), especially chap. 3, "Instructing the whole nation...".


36. Although "formalism" and "abstraction" are not quite the same thing, one might be seen as a step towards the other, since formalism is a departure from the realist transcription of nature in art. In fact, the late-Victorian notion of "formalism," as Pater formulates it, is one node in the intellectual history of non-objective modern art. Art histories of modernism usually begin with Kant and other Enlightenment thinkers who first suggested the idea of an "aesthetic" autonomous from the message or content of a work of art; they then trace a trajectory through the idea of "art for art’s sake" in France and then in England; and finally arrive in the early twentieth-century with Cubism, Post-Impressionism, and other forays into visual abstraction. Although Pater does not usually appear as a central figure in these art histories—perhaps because they focus on France—it seems a crucial moment in the history of art-abstraction when Clement Greenberg, the most famous theorist of Abstract Expressionism in the mid-twentieth century, footnotes Pater's essay "School of Giorgione" in his own seminal essay, "Towards a Newer Laocoon," again picking up the idea that music most perfectly embodies "pure form." Greenberg's essay appears in *Partisan Review* 7.4 (July–August 1940), 296–310.

37. Sidney Colvin characterized the issue with the term "picture-blindness" in his 1879 *Fortnightly Review* article "Art and Criticism": "Picture-blindness...—the condition of those who have not the faculty or the habit of seeing and feeling for themselves what there is to see and feel in the combination of lines and colours before them,—is certainly the condition of the majority. The only cure for picture-blindness lies in habitual and rightly-directed looking." *Fortnightly Review* 32.152 (August 1879), 212.

38. Kate Flint also writes about the critical reaction to Burne-Jones at Grosvenor Gallery. She focuses on the psychologist James Sully's response to Burne-Jones's...
painting *The Mirror of Venus*, and analyzes the contributions of late-Victorian psychology to the notion of aesthetic spectatorship. See her essay, “Edward Burne-Jones’s *The Mirror of Venus*: surface and subjectivity in the art criticism of the 1870s,” in *After the Pre-Raphaelites*, 152–64.


40. What exactly it meant to be an “Oxford man” was itself a controversial topic when Henry James makes his comment—as many scholars have noted, the 1860s and 70s were a time of liberal reform at Oxford, resulting in less traditionally class-based admission standards, and a new idea of the types of knowledge students were expected to master. Of course, then as now, the designation “Oxford man” still rang with a strong sense of class and economic privilege, and it is with this connotation that James invokes the phrase. For a sampling of debates surrounding the identity of a late-Victorian “Oxford man,” see Dowling, *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford*; A. J. Engel, *From Clergyman to Don: The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth-Century Oxford* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); Christopher T. Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy, 1860–86* (London: Allen Lane, 1976); Heyck, *Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England*; and Reba N. Soffer, *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).


44. See Laurel Brake’s essay, “The ‘wicked Westminster,’ the *Fortnightly*, and Walter Pater’s *Renaissance*,” cited above.

45. The paradoxical commodity status of avant-garde art has been discussed in many places and in many contexts, but it is well-formulated, with respect to British Aestheticism, in Jonathan Freedman’s *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism and Commodity Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).
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Pater’s “Great Change”: *Marius the Epicurean* as Historical Conversion Romance  170–188


9. Hanson, *Decadence and Catholicism*, 117.

10. “Parsons in Petticoats,” *Punch* 48 (10 June 1865), 239.


15. For Susan Dorman *Hypatia* and *Callista* are texts in dialogue with each other about “the kind of Christianity possible in the nineteenth century,” dividing along sectarian lines (“*Hypatia* and *Callista*: the Initial Skirmish between Kingsley and Newman,” *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 34, 2 [September 1979], 188, 181, 182). Leon B. Litvack’s “*Callista*, Martyrdom, and the Early Christian Novel in the Victorian Age” more broadly reads *Hypatia*, *Callista* and *Fabiola* as “propagandist . . . in what amounted to polemical warfare” (*Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 17, 2 [1993], 164). Neither critic pursues the more secular cultural orthodoxies and anxieties which these fictions reinforce and conceal; nor are they concerned with a generically-driven intertextual reading.

16. Laurel Brake points out how Pater combines a range of allusions and discourses to produce multiple readings for different audiences in *Walter Pater* (Plymouth:
Northcote House Publications, 1994), 44. However, she does not consider the implications of Pater’s specific appropriation of the historical conversion romance in this context.


18. E. F. S. (Mrs. Mark) Pattison, *The Book of the Spiritual Life, with a Memoir of the Author by the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke* (London: John Murray, 1905), 29–30. See also Billie Andrew Inman’s contention that, in the essays of 1874 and 1875, Pater was determined to show that “although technically not a Christian, he had so much religious spirit in him that he posed no danger to his students or to anyone else” (“The Emergence of Pater’s Marius Mentality: 1874–1875,” *ELT* 27,2 [1984], 119). Adopting the genre of the pre-eminently Christian historical conversion romance is another diversionary strategy to this end.


24. David DeLaura has suggested certain parallels between *Marius* and Newman’s *Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* and argues for the influence of Newman on the later novel, including his development of “the ‘personal’ and ‘subjective’ quality of the apprehension of truth” (*Hebrew and Hellenes*, 319). David A. Downes also notes similarities between Newman, Pater and even Kingsley in their interest in conversion as a “personal process by which religious commitment becomes a total and unconditional human motivation” (*The Temper of Victorian Belief: Studies in the Religious Novels of Pater, Kingsley, and Newman* [New York: Twayne Publishers, 1972], 64). Neither, however, explores the extent to which Pater’s “religious” responses are not linked to an external Object and intellectual doctrine (as are those of Newman and Kingsley), but are subsumed under his drive for self-culture in which certain characteristics of Christianity—and other systems of belief—share particular appealing traits for one of Marius’s sensibility.


28. Ibid.


30. Ibid., 180, 181.

31. An early review of *Hypatia* draws attention to Kingsley’s attack on such a position by historical parallelism. Like the Roman Emperors’ skill in adopting Christianity alongside other gods and beliefs, “so our modern sentimental Deism would herd Christianity with all other faiths in a common philosophic pasture, and make religion the worship of man rather than of God” (“Hypatia,” *British Quarterly Review*, 18 [August and November 1853]], 159).


34. Leon Litvack sees sadism too in the tortures of martyrdom represented in novels like *Fabiola* since they seem to be relished “equally by those who inflict pain and those who receive it.” The popularity of the sensationalist depiction of martyrdom for readers of the age is further indicated by the many translations of such texts and their adaptation for the stage (“Callista, Martyrdom, and the Early Christian Novel,” 166).

35. Wiseman, *Fabiola*, 221.
38. Ibid., 25.
39. Ibid., 173.
42. Wiseman, *Fabiola*, 12.
47. See also Billie Andrew Inman’s persuasive suggestion that Pater frequently associates bodily abuse and dismemberment with rebellion against the moral and religious ideas of the powerful establishment (*Walter Pater and His Reading: 1874–1877, With a Bibliography of His Library Borrowings, 1878–1894* [New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1990], xxx–xxxi). Images of knighthood and the new chivalry are also associated with a marginalized group—that of the gay sub-culture—in the late nineteenth century (Hanson, *Decadence and Catholicism*, 213).
49. Wiseman, *Fabiola*, 266.
50. In this respect historical conversion narratives invite their Victorian readership to reappraise attitudes to liturgical ritual, frequently condemned by contemporaries as feminine in its style and exotic in its extravagance. Its appeal to the aesthetic temperament—itself suspect as a harbinger of sexually deviant and improper tendencies—suggests a certain unwholesomeness in a respect for ritual, altogether an effeminate and un-English taste (see David Hilliard, “UnEnglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism and Homosexuality,” *Victorian Studies* 25,2 (Winter 1982), 187, 190–97).
53. Nathan A Scott, Jr. suggests Marius converts to Christianity because his sense of sorrow and mutability is satisfied only by an encounter with “a community of love,” “indwelt by agape” (“Pater’s Imperative—To Dwell Poetically,” *New Literary History* 15.1 [Autumn 1983], 115, 113). Scott downplays the rather abstract and vague nature of the depiction of Cecilia and her community and the vivid detail of Marius’s en-
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5. Ibid., xiii.

6. It is tempting to conflate—or at least to associate—what I call “seduction” with *paiderastia*, the Greek love of boys, viewing it as yet another shade in the spectrum of male same-sex desire. Indeed, this essay might be read by some as either overtly or implicitly encouraging such an association: the seductive practices it explores, after all, occur between men. I want to avoid, however, reducing all Paterian expressions of *eros* to encoded homoeroticism. An erotic art, seduction is compatible with male same-sex desire, can be embraced as a vehicle for its expression, can even serve as a potent political tool in its experience. Not all homoeroticism, however, is seductive. Not all seduction is homoerotic. For an evaluation of Paterian *eros* which militates against

7. Plato, *Phaedrus*, Benjamin Jowett, ed. and trans.; *The Dialogues of Plato Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions* (4th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1953), 3: 133. Readers aware of the dubious nature of Jowett’s Platonic “translations” might wonder at my reliance upon his scholarship. Several critics have evaluated the deeply ideological nature of Jowett’s project, including what Lesley Higgins terms “its evasive prudery” and “deliberate obfuscations,” its efforts “to empty out” from the Platonic canon “all significance of male-male erotic motives, consequences, and activities” (48–49). I have chosen Jowett’s translation, however, albeit selectively, for two reasons. First, many—if not most—undergraduates at Oxford in the 1880s were familiar with the Plato of Jowett’s *Dialogues*; the translation, therefore, is representative of the intellectual culture this paper seeks to describe. Undergraduates comprised a crucial segment, in both a quantitative and symbolic sense, of Pater’s audience. Second, that my overall point about the operation of seduction is able to come through, even in a translation notorious for its aggressive effacement and distortion of eroticism, only reinforces, I suggest, the interoperability of seduction and dialectic in Plato. See Lesley Higgins, “Jowett and Pater: Trafficking in Platonic Wares,” *Victorian Studies*, 37,1 (1993), 43–72.


16. I am referring, of course, to Althusser’s provocative statement that “[t]he existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects are one and the same thing” (175). This idea is explored at length in his essay “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation),” in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Ben Brewster, trans. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971).


23. I would like to thank Laurel Brake for the information about Pater’s policy on women at lectures, raised in the discussion following the “Forms of Development” panel at the International Walter Pater Conference in July 2000 at Christ Church College, Oxford.
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Poetics of *Ekphrasis* in Pater’s “Imaginary Portraits” | 202–212

1. I put the phrase in quotation marks because I do not only mean the collected *Imaginary Portraits* but also other narratives which Pater seems to have conceived as “imaginary portraits”: “The Child in the House,” “An English Poet,” “Hippolytus Veiled,” “Emerald Uthwart,” “Apollo in Picardy,” “Tibalt the Albigense,” “Gaudioso the Second,” *Marius the Epicurean* and *Gaston de Latour*. I chose such narratives for my corpus in my doctoral dissertation on Pater’s “imaginary portraits.” Title of the thesis: “Mirrors of Culture and Images of Self: From the Portrait to the Imaginary Portrait in Walter Pater’s Works” (University of Paris 4-Sorbonne [France], December 1999). The dissertation is due to be published by L’Harmattan, Paris (2003).


3. There is an equivalence between the terms “poetry” and “imaginative power” for Pater: “to identify in prose what we call the poetry, the imaginative power…” (“Style,” *Ap* 6).


5. In “The Child in the House,” dream is part of the idealization and the imaginative process in the child’s brain-building.


7. “What is rather to be imitated is the status of the sculpture or painting as a physical art object. That status is achieved for the poem by its making a claim to an integrity
like that of an object created by the plastic arts, an integrity marked by the wholeness of that spatial character which results from the exploitation of a sensuous (or an illusionarily sensuous) medium” (Krieger, *Ekphrasis*, 226).

8. *Ekphrasis* is “a set verbal device that encouraged an extravagance in detail and vividness in representation so that—as it was sometimes put—our ears could serve as our eyes, since ‘[ekphrasis] must through hearing operate to bring about seeing’” (Krieger, *Ekphrasis*, 7). Krieger here is quoting from Hermogenes’s “Ecphrasis,” The Elementary Exercises (Progynasmata).

9. In *Plato and Platonism* Pater explains that the portrait gives a vivid image of the character of culture: “If in reading Plato, for instance, the philosophic student has to re-construct for himself, as far as possible, the general character of an age, he must also, so far as he may, re-produce the portrait of a person” (*PP* 125).


12. “Yet if the art of Myron was but little occupied with the reasonable soul (anima), with those mental situations the expression of which, though it may have a pathos and a beauty of its own, is for the most part adverse to the proper expression of youth, to the beauty of youth, by causing it to be no longer youthful, he was certainly a master of the animal or physical soul there (anima); how it is, how it displays itself, as illustrated, for instance, in the *Discobolus*” (*GS* 286–87).

13. The reference of the manuscript at the Houghton Library is # 8, bMS Eng. 1150.

14. This is my translation of the following passage which I quote here in French more extensively: “Paleotti précise littéralement que le portraitiste doit se comporter en ‘historien,’ et non en ‘orateur,’ c’est-à-dire en poète. Cette exigence de vérité est surtout impérieuse dans le cas du portrait par excellence, le seul portrait indiscutable et vraiment nécessaire: le portrait des saints, qui doit être l’image de la vérité. S’il s’agit d’un saint mort depuis longtemps, le peintre doit chercher des images anciennes, des témoignages, des traditions; mais en aucun cas, il ne peut se servir d’un modèle vivant, qui prêterait son visage. Et le portrait du saint ne doit jamais être mêlé aux images profanes... .” Edouard Pommier, *Théories du portrait. De la Renaissance aux Lumières* (Paris: Gallimard, 1998), 162–65.

15. “[S]o closely akin to those soulless creatures did he [Apollo-Apollyon] still seem to the wondering Prior,—immersed in, or actually a part of, that irredeemable natural world he had dreaded so greatly ere he came hither” (*MS* 158).

17. In Marie-Marguerite Pater’s analysis of Watteau’s paintings morality thus becomes an aesthetic quality: “I am struck by the purity of the room he has re-fashioned for us—a sort of moral purity; yet in the forms and colours of things” (IP 23).


19. Coloring is one of the two qualities that Pater deems to be essential in painting in “The School of Giorgione.”

20. In “Duke Carl of Rosenmold” the graceful skater symbolizes the fulfillment of poetic aspirations. The image is reminiscent of a passage in Goethe here quoted by Pater: young Goethe had to put on his mother’s furs because of the cold. He reached fulfillment perhaps because in his poetic quest he did not reject maternal love—a feeling associated with home life. Sebastian’s quest may be doomed to fail because he refuses all the family pleasures.

21. “L’effet-personnage d’un texte est donc une construction de plusieurs systèmes descriptifs juxtaposés, cette juxtaposition suggérant un faisceau de relations logiques (explique/implique), c’est-à-dire le lieu d’une cohérence logique et idéologique ; c’est d’autre part un lieu anaphorique et cataphorique (rsumer/annoncer), c’est-à-dire le lieu d’une cohérence narrative. Toute description, qu’elle soit focalisée sur le personnage, sur un milieu, ou sur une relation des deux, peut donc être un opérateur de lisibilité fondamental du texte. Ce type de texte réaliste-lisible-motivé tendra naturellement à se faire accompagner, plus ou moins explicitement, d’un discours d’escorte interprétatif, de type herméneutique, où ces relations d’implication réciproque, d’analogie, de ‘correspondances’ entre habitat et habitant seront soulignées, ou serviront de ‘moteurs’ aux principales transformations narratives; d’où prise en charge par le narrateur directement, ou par des personnages lucides, ‘savants,’ ‘clairvoyants,’ ‘connaisseurs’...” Philippe Hamon, *Du descriptif* (Paris: Hachette, 1993), 107–108.

22. However Pater seems to have misunderstood Spinoza’s philosophy: For Spinoza “substance” means the eternal and immanent essence of reality, and not just a thought. Moreover, Pater simplifies the structure of the *Ethics* in Sebastian’s journal. I refer you to Billie Andrew Inman, “‘Sebastian van Storck’: Exploration into Nihilism,” *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 30 (March 1976), 457-76.
2. Ibid., 74–79.


4. For a detailed study of nineteenth-century autobiography, on its origins and aims, see Andrea Battistini, Lo specchio di Dedalo (Bologna: il Mulino, 1990).


6. The contiguity between the two sub-genres has been highlighted by a number of Paterian scholars, who have shown how both literary modes were devised by their authors in order to subdue the over-strong confessional strain of their earlier works (Browning’s Pauline and Sordello, Pater’s The Renaissance). Thus, for example, Laurel Brake explains how, in Pater’s Imaginary Portraits, “[the] subjects . . . are comparable to Browning’s array of speakers in his dramatic monologues: they stand stolidly between the writer and his audience, substituting their first person ‘I’ for his; they screen him from his audience” (Walter Pater [Plymouth: Northcote House, 1994], 45), whereas Harold Bloom maintains: “Just as Browning made fictive selves, to escape his earliest strain of Shelleyan subjectivity in the verse-romances Pauline, Paracelsus and Sordello, so Pater turned to ‘imaginary portraits’ to escape the subjective confession that wells up in ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ and ‘Conclusion’ to The Renaissance. On this view, The Renaissance is Pater’s version of Shelley’s Alastor or Keats’s Endymion; it is a prose-poem of highly personal Romantic quest after the image of desire, visualized by Pater in the Mona Lisa. Turning from so deep a self-exposure, Pater arrives at his kind of less personal reverie, a consciously fictive kind” (Bloom, ed., Walter Pater [New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1985], 14).


10. Links between “The School of Giorgione” and “The Child in the House” (though mostly in reference to their allusions to Browning’s Sordello—a work whose analogies with Pater’s Renaissance are underlined by Bloom [see note 6]) are brought forth by Billie Inman in Walter Pater and His Reading, 1874–1877 (New York: Garland, 1990), 393–94.

11. There are actually two exceptions to this rule and they are both found in Arthur Symons’s Spiritual Adventures (1905), a collection of stories that I consider as the last expression of fin-de-siècle aesthetic portraiture proper. These two tales, “The Childhood of Lucy Newcome” and “Esther Kahn,” are centered on female characters, though generally conforming to the imaginary portrait genre. In fact, “The Child-
hood of Lucy Newcome” appears as a re-writing of Pater’s “The Child in the House” from a feminine point of view.

12. In one single case, actually, the focalizer does not correspond to the protagonist of the imaginary portrait, and this is “A Prince of Court Painters,” where the exclusive point of view belongs to the female diarist.

13. Two eloquent examples of ekphrasis in Morris’s story are found in the following excerpts: “. . . through the boughs and trunks of the poplars we caught glimpses of the great golden corn sea waving, waving, waving for leagues and leagues; and among the corn grew burning scarlet poppies, and blue corn-flowers; and the corn-flowers were so blue, that they gleamed, and seemed to burn with a steady light, as they grew beside the poppies among the gold of the wheat. Through the corn-sea ran a blue river, & always green meadows and lines of tall poplars followed its windings,” and then: “. . . the central porch was carved with a bas-relief of the Last Judgment, and it was divided into three parts by horizontal bands of deep flower-work. In the lowest division, just over the doors, was carved the Rising of the Dead; above were angels blowing long trumpets, and Michael the Archangel weighing the souls, and the blessed led into heaven by angels, and the lost into hell by the devil; and in the topmost division was the Judge of the world” (Collected Works of William Morris [London: Longmans Green and Co., 1910–1915]), I, 150, 152.


16. For Pater’s opinion on Rossetti’s style, see the following sentences: “[Rossetti] had this gift of transparency in language the control of a style which did but obediently shift and shape itself to the mental motion, as a well-trained hand can follow on the tracing-paper the outline of an original drawing below it. . . . His own meaning was always personal and even recondite . . . sometimes complex or obscure; but the term was always, one could see, deliberately chosen from many competitors, as the just transcription of that peculiar phase of soul which he alone knew, precisely as he knew it” (Ap 206–207).

17. On the peculiarities of Pater’s idiom, see once again Dowling, Language and Decadence in the Victorian Fin de Siècle, 130–31 in particular.


20. Vasari’s important role for Pater is extensively dealt with in Paul Barolsky’s *Walter Pater’s Renaissance* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987). Barolsky has also indicated Vasari as a common source for *The Renaissance* and for some of Browning’s dramatic monologues. He has finally pointed out the interartistic matrix of the works of these three authors, commenting: “our best writers—whether art historians and critics like Vasari and Pater or poets like Browning. . . have transformed paintings and sculptures into words, absorbing them into their own experiences and thus teaching us ways of seeing these works” (ibid., 111).


22. A very significant link between the autobiographical nature of Montaigne’s and Lamb’s essay writing is highlighted by Pater in “Charles Lamb,” where he explains: “… with [Lamb], as with Montaigne, the desire of self-portraiture is, below all more superficial tendencies, the real motive in writing at all—a desire closely connected with that intimacy, that modern subjectivity, which may be called the Montaignesque element in literature. What he designs is to give you himself, to acquaint you with his likeness; but must do this, if at all, indirectly, being indeed always more or less reserved. . .” (*Ap* 117).


25. On this issue, see Monsman’s comment: “In a sense, [Pater] anticipates Henry James, Joseph Conrad, and such stream-of-consciousness writers as James Joyce and Virginia Woolf, for with him, as with these later writers, the mental process is the focus of treatment. Yet Pater differs from them, for he denies himself certain literary techniques which they use fully. His successors were able to achieve dramatic power by giving the reader a view into the incoherent world of ideas below the threshold of ver-
balization, but the mental process of Pater’s heroes are never the raw materials of unformed thoughts. A character such as Marius, for example, thinks in beautifully polished, euphuistically structured sentences which are even far above the level of ordinary discourse. His ‘sensations and ideas’ reach us through a variety of literary genres seemingly far removed from first-hand experience” (*Pater’s Portraits*, 32).


27. The concept is extensively illustrated in Morris Beja’s remark that “as men have found themselves putting less and less trust in the truths of the past, they have more and more come to stress the *trivia* of existence. They have sought meaning in what they could see, all around them, in the apparently inconsequential objects and events of everyday life. It is true that an interest in trivial detail has always been important in literature, but today it has taken on such a special character and become so central that Erich Auerbach is undoubtedly correct when he regards concern with ‘minor, unimpressive, random events’ as one of the hallmarks of twentieth-century literature” (*Epiphany in the Modern Novel* [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971], 17). In fact, Beja is simply developing Joyce’s well-known definition of epiphany as “a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture or in a memorable phase of the mind itself . . . they themselves are the most delicate and evanescent of moments” (*Stephen Hero*, ed. by Theodore Spencer, revised by John J. Sco cum and Herbert Cahoon [2nd ed.; London: Jonathan Cape, 1969], 216).

28. And thus Beja explains that “the kind of moments of insight [Stephen Dedalus] talks about has played an important and new role in modern literature. It has long received attention in poetry and autobiography, but in the novel it was largely subordinated or even ignored until the end of the nineteenth century” (*Epiphany in the Modern Novel*, 13).

29. “Emerald Uthwart” was inspired by a visit to the King’s School (where Pater had studied from 1853 to 1858) awakening in him highly personal and long-repressed sensations.


33. According to Meisel, this precisely happens in the section describing Stephen Dedalus’s schooldays in Cork (see ibid., 129).

34. Moliterno takes the relation between the two works as exemplifying the principal thesis of his book, as is apparent in the following quotation: “The experiences of Marius and Stephen, two autobiographical protagonists, are so similar that *Marius the Epicurean* seems the prototype for Joyce’s *Portrait*. Both protagonists pass through alternating phases of sensual and spiritual experience. Both also periodically reconcile these two poles through epiphanies. Close examination of not only *Marius* and *Portrait* but most of the works of Pater and Joyce reveals a sense/spirit framework evolving towards synthesis: hence “The Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce” ([*The Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce*](#) [Greensboro: ELT Press, 1998], 7).


37. Here are Praz’s words: “Quella proiezione di se stesso che in Browning riuscì in un abbagliante ‘fregolismo’ di travestimenti, le dramatis personae, in Pater si adagiò nella più riposata ed elegiaca forma del ‘ritratto immaginario’. E a quella guisa che Orlando della Woolf si finge reincarnato nei secoli in creature molteplici e sostanzialmente identiche, il Pater nei ritratti immaginari non fece che trasporre nei più maliosi ambienti aboliti i sogni della propria adolescenza” (Introduzione a *Ritratti immaginari*, 12).

38. In Meisel’s opinion *Orlando* represents “the consummate Paterian portrait, asserting as it does the ideality of a strong and unified temperament capable of subduing time and sexuality alike to the law of personality alone. Moreover, like Gaston, Marius, or Emerald Uthwart, the fictional Orlando moves in the air of real history and in the society of real personages, very often the poetic, philosophical, and political heroes of the day, with Orlando’s Elizabeth, Shakespeare, and Pope doubling Marius’s Marcus Aurelius and Apuleius or Gaston’s Bruno.... Above all, like Pater’s portraits, too, Orlando’s story is organized by means of its setting in a series of significant transitional moments in history, like those that give *Marius*, *Gaston* and *The Renaissance* a resonant metaphoricity and a problematic that focuses each book on questions of development and repetition,” [*The Absent Father: Virginia Woolf and Walter Pater*](#) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 45.
PHYLIS CONNORS JAMES

Beauty’s New “Hour”: Paterian Aestheticism
in the Short Fiction of Olivia Shakespear | 225–235


2. The Rhymers’ Club met fortnightly at the old Cheshire Cheese on London’s Fleet Street; two collections of verse were published between 1892 and 1894.


10. Ibid., 32.

11. Coincidentally, according to Thomas Wright’s (sometimes accurate) biography, Pater’s creation of the Watteau portrait in “A Prince of Court Painters” also owes its inception to a visit to the Dulwich Gallery. Wright, *Life of Walter Pater* (London: Everett, 1907), 2: 92.

12. Watteau (1684–1721), born in Valenciennes, once a Flemish town, was known during his lifetime as “le peinture Flamand.” In 1717 he submitted the Diploma picture *Embarquement pour Cythère* to the Academie, officially described as a *fête galante*. The genre was subsequently explored by Jean-Baptiste Pater, who followed Watteau closely, transposing his atmospherics into an even more silvery and evanescent ambiance. Watteau helped deliver French painting from Italian academicism and created a truly “Parisian” style blending aspects of Rubens and Veronese. He is also responsible for joyous scenes of *fêtes champêtres* in which exquisitely dressed figures are frozen in pleasurable attitudes. Watteau’s works fell into obscurity after the Revolution, but popular interest was revived in the late nineteenth century by the Goncourts and Pater.
13. The sister of Jean-Baptiste Pater. They may have been ancestors of Walter Pater.


15. John Singer Sargent’s Madame X (1884) was referred to as a “professional beauty,” meaning that she existed in order to be seen, and was regarded herself as a work of art.

16. Marie-Marguerite recalls a writer “who likened man’s life to a bird.” See Gerald Monsman, Pater’s Portraits (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967), 104 n7. Also noteworthy is Ibsen’s popular play A Doll’s House, first produced in London in 1889, in which a caged bird is a central leitmotif.


18. Ibid., 33.

19. Ibid., 54.

20. Shakespear’s allusion to “the Romney” probably refers to his portrait of a youthful beauty of fashionable society, Anne, Lady de la Pole (1786). In the late nineteenth century a number of monographs on Romney suggested that the painter subordinated character to surface qualities.


25. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (September), 12.


27. Noteworthy are two volumes in the British Library that Olivia Shakespear may have examined: The Glory of Women or a Looking Glass for Ladies: wherein they may behold their own excellency and pre-eminence, written in Latin by Cornelius Agrippa, afterwards translated into English prose and turned into heroic verse by H. C. Gent (London: printed for TH for Frances Coles, 1652), 1–47. A similar tract written in English, The Ladies’ Oracle, by Cornelius Agrippa (pseudonym; London: Hugh Evelyn, 1857), gives directions for occult rituals, charms, and ceremonies akin to Caribbean voodoo. A ritual using a mirror is included. The works of Cornelius Agrippa are mentioned in Chapter Two of Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein (1818), in which Dr.
Frankenstein perhaps created the unnamed monster through Agrippa’s recipes for necromancy.


29. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (August), 19.


31. “There [Jesus] was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light” (Matthew 17:1–3). Radiant physical beauty is the outward sign of Christ’s moment of glorification on Mount Tábor.

32. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (September), 18.

33. Ibid. (August), 11.

34. In “The Child in the House,” Pater utilizes the vehicle of a dream for “remembrance of things past”: “A dream of that place came to Florian, a dream which did for him the office of the finer sort of memory...” (MS 172–74).

35. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (September), 19.


37. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (August), 19.

38. Ibid., 24.

39. Ibid., 55.

40. The fundamental fusion of “outward and inward,” content and form, is articulated in the Giorgione essay: “All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music” (*Ren/H* 106).


42. Shakespear, “Beauty’s Hour” (August), 22.

43. Ibid.

44. Munch’s *Frieze of Life* series expresses the Symbolist belief that individual personality is the mainspring of the impulse towards art. *Woman in Three Stages* represents the transmutation of the so-called female principle in all her important aspects. In the same series, Munch describes his *Madonna* (1895) in terms similar to Pater’s Lady Lisa and Botticelli’s Madonnas as interpreted by Pater: “‘A pause when the world stops revolving. Your face encompasses the beauty of the whole earth. Your lips, as red as ripening fruit, gently part as if in pain. It is the smile of a corpse. Now the hand of death touches life. The chain is forged that links the thousand families that are dead to the thousand generations to come.’” Andrew Wilton and Robert Upstone,

45. Woman in Three Stages was renamed the Sphinx in 1902. It was first displayed in Berlin at Blomquist’s Gallery in autumn 1895, and later that year exhibited in Oslo, where it was a succès de scandale. It is often referred to as The Virgin, The Whore, and the Nun.

46. Henry Davray’s review of “Beauty’s Hour” appeared in Mercure de France in October 1896 (188) under the title “Lettres anglaises, ’une singulièr e et jolie fantasie’ de O. Shakespear.” Davray became the model for the character Guillaume d’Avarre in Shakespear’s novel Rupert Armstrong (1899), which focuses on the cultural meanings of art and artist.

47. August Strindberg’s very enthusiastic review of Edvard Munch’s exhibition at the Bing Gallery, Paris, appeared in Revue Blanche 1 (June 1886), 526.
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5. The mind’s desire to entertain the pleasures of vanity by taking charge of the body personally, is a subject that is not far from the mind (and photograph) of another
intellectual—Roland Barthes: “Sudden mutation of the body (after leaving the sanatorium): changing (or appearing to change) from slender to plump. Ever since, perpetual struggle with the body to return it to its essential slenderness (part of the intellectual’s mythology: to become thin is the naïve act of the will-to-intelligence).” 


9. I am greatly influenced by D. A. Miller’s virtuoso account of the difference between the gay and straight male body in *Bringing Out Roland Barthes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 28–33.

10. It is important to add that the guiltiness of youth is explored as savage realism in the plot of “Apollo in Picardy”—a different setting from the providential dream of exculpatory sexuality still cherished in “Diaphaneité.”

11. J. Hillis Miller makes some similar observations in an essay that assimilates Pater to deconstructive theory: “A remnant of non-saturation is always present, a part of the body left over, some matter not wholly absorbed into form. Its existence leads to the recognition that art for Pater is generated only in the interval between forces. . . . It is the ungraspable as such, an ungraspable which for Pater, with his sense of nuance, is essential to literature and to art generally. It can only be glimpsed fleetingly, out of the corner of the eye, in the interplay of images. . . . Such meaning is not a correlate force, whether that force is subjective or objective, self or matter. Such meaning is always in excess of the material substratum which embodies it. It appears momentarily in the openings between, and it is always in league with death. . . . The relation of a dead body to the meaning it contains by not containing it is the most extreme form of that discrepancy between the material image and its meaning which governs all Pater’s insights into artistic signs.” “Walter Pater: A Partial Portrait,” in *Modern Critical Views: Walter Pater*, Harold Bloom, ed. (New York: Chelsea House Press, 1985), 74–96.


15. Williams goes on to say that “[Pater] seems genuinely unable to distinguish between the condition of a work of art—a made thing, containing within itself an achieved stillness—and the condition of any life, which is not made but making, and which can only in phantasy be detached from a continuous process and a whole con-

16. In her essay “Love at Last Sight, or Walter Benjamin’s Dialectics of Seeing in the Wake of the Gay Bathhouse,” *Textual Practice* 13 (1999), 243–72, Dianne Chisholm mounts an extraordinary critique of idealizing historiographies of the gay bathhouse by calling attention to their uneasy assimilation of gay sexuality to capitalist narratives of progress. Her insights have far-ranging applications which gesture beyond the scope of her essay, and are particularly pertinent to discussions of sexuality, aestheticism, and commodity culture.

17. “The presence that rose thus so strangely beside the waters,” writes Pater in his notorious *ekphrasis* on the Lady Lisa, “is expressive of what in the ways of a thousand years men had come to desire. . . . It is a beauty wrought out from within upon the flesh, the deposit, little cell by cell, of strange thoughts and fantastic reveries and exquisite passions” (*Rem/H* 98). One might compare these words to J. H. Van den Berg’s classic description of the *Mona Lisa* as the modern figure of horded interiority: “[She is] the secret inner self, the inner world in which everything the world has to offer is shut away. And a smile watched over this inner self. Mona Lisa holds that which is known, and she hides it. After this, that which is known will be that which is hidden, that which is unknown. And as time goes on everything will be within her, at once known and unknown.” J. H. Van den Berg, “The Subject and His Landscape,” in *Romanticism and Consciousness: Essays in Criticism*, Harold Bloom, ed. (New York: Norton, 1970), 60.

18. See Leo Bersani’s opposing descriptions in *Homos* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), esp. 145–51, as well as Cesare Casarino’s stimulating article “The Sublime of the Closet; or, Joseph Conrad’s Secret Sharing,” *boundary 2* 24,2 (1997), 199–243. Without denying the potential pleasures and politics that can emerge from an anonymous sexual identity that is anti-communitarian in principle, I would like to suggest—that I think Pater already intuits—that pleasures of transcendence often collude with patterns of repression and evasion, whose desirability often energize the very freedoms we assume we are exercising as self-identifying gay subjects.


21. I am reminded here of Jay Fellows’s remark that “Pater’s prose is most alive when it is involved in the accoutrements, morbid or otherwise, of death.” *Tombs Despoiled and Haunted: ‘Under-Textures’ and ‘After-Thoughts’ in Walter Pater* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 130. See also Peter Allan Dale, “‘Distractions of the


---
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Walter Pater and Walter Benjamin: The Diaphanous Collector and the Angel of History  |  250–260


2. Pater developed his prose style in part through daily translations from French and German authors, and even broke his usual reticence to defend Flaubert’s style. See Michael Levey, *The case of Walter Pater* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), 76. Benjamin lived in Paris the final fifteen years of his life, devoting his work to an unfinished study with Baudelaire at its center. See note 11 below for a further discussion of Pater, Benjamin, and French modernism.

3. Pater devotes a chapter of his unfinished novel *Gaston de Latour* to Montaigne’s place in the Renaissance, and in *Plato and Platonism* describes Montaigne as “the typical essayist” in a series of passages that could easily be read as a reflection on Pater’s own writings (PP 192). Benjamin’s literary executor and philosophical disciple, Theodor W. Adorno, placed Benjamin and Montaigne at the center of his conception of the essayist, describing Benjamin as “the unsurpassed master” of the essay genre.

4. Irving Wohlfarth argues thoroughly and forcefully for the collector as a central figure for Benjamin’s work and as a key to understanding his philosophy of history. See Irving Wohlfarth, “Et cetera? The Historian as Chiffonier,” *New German Critique* 39 (1986), 142–68. For a related reading of Benjamin emphasizing the problem of the collector’s melancholy (which I also develop below), see Rebecca Comay “Perverse History: Fetishism and Dialectic in Walter Benjamin,” *Research in Phenomenology* 29 (1999), 51–63.


6. “The idea that Diaphaneité is a revolutionary type who, if multiplied, could profoundly affect the body politic, seems especially reflective of Schiller.” See Inman, *Walter Pater’s Reading*, 75. F. C. McGrath points out Schiller’s “privileging of the aesthetic” with its “fusion of sense and intellect is much closer to Pater’s position than is Hegel’s preference for the more purely intellectual disciplines that must escape the limitations of sensuous experience.” See *The Sensible Spirit*, 96.


9. Richard Dellamora in his pathbreaking work *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990) analyzes in terms of gender the revolutionary potential of Pater’s diaphanous type. Dellamora, however, curtly dismisses in a brief footnote “all the Continental sources of the essay (Schiller, Hegel, Fichte, Renan, etc.)” as part of a “revisionist discourse, expressive of male-female desire, that emphasizes androgyny.” Richard Dellamora, *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism*, 230n. Without being able to suggest all the necessary connections, the present essay might be considered as preparing the ground for a reconsideration of Dellamora’s dismissal, not against, but for the central concerns of Dellamora’s work. One bridge between Dellamora and the Frankfurt School useful for reading Pater would be Herbert Marcuse’s discussion of Schiller in *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (New York: Vintage, 1962), 78–91.


11. This distance between Pater and Benjamin may also be seen in their readings and appropriations from French modernism, from Flaubert and Baudelaire in particular. Pater specifically quotes Flaubert’s famous comments on the idea of impersonality in his essay “Prosper Mérimée,” “It has always been my rule to put nothing of myself into my works” (*MS* 23-24). He goes on to add, though, that Flaubert “luckily
as we may think . . . often failed in thus effacing himself,” and in fact suggests that Mérimée may have succeeded where Flaubert failed precisely because he put more of his personality in his writings. In contrast, Benjamin clearly sides with the impersonality of Flaubert’s narrator and Baudelaire’s flâneur who can enter into the sensibility of any passerby at will, because he is not locked in the walls of his own personality. Benjamin’s strategic alliance with Baudelaire takes part of its impetus from Baudelaire’s ability to rescue objects beyond what Benjamin calls mere Erlebnis, the false experience of modern life. Benjamin finds in Baudelaire’s poetry a figure for the collector who rescues objects from oblivion much as mémoire involontaire does in Proust. See Walter Benjamin, “Some Motifs in Baudelaire,” *Illuminations*, 180–85.


13. As Donald J. Hill points out in his notes to *The Renaissance*, Arnold of Brescia presented not just a cultural and philosophical but a social and economic critique of the middle ages: Brescia “was one of the most vigorous and outspoken critics of the corruption of the clergy, the right of churchmen to hold property, the temporal power of the popes” (*Ren/H* 308).


15. Ibid., 162.


21. In his 1939 exposé of the arcades project, Benjamin notes that “the collector proves to be the true resident of the interior.” Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, 19. As an example of how Benjamin could open up for materialist criticism much that might seem locked away by Pater’s thick walls of personality, one might fruitfully explore just how Sebastian van Storck, a true resident of the interior, bears out Benjamin’s notes on the interior in *The Arcades Project*.


25. Ibid., 275.

28. Ibid., 256.
29. In this respect, Pater’s late-Victorian novel may be profitably read alongside Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart*. Set in the late-Victorian era, Achebe’s novel is similarly concerned with recovering a lost world that has been overwhelmed by Christianity. Achebe and Pater both also avoid idealizing a past that included its own forms of barbarity, and in a complex way embrace some of the tendencies of the coming age.
30. In the image of “the colossal manhood” as an oppressive historical force, Pater’s gender concerns and his critique of Hegel clearly coincide.
31. “A kind of ardent, new patriotism awoke in him, sensitive for the first time at the words national poesy, national art and literature, German philosophy” (Pater’s emphasis, *IP* 144–45).
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   “There was something terribly enthralling in the exercise of influence. No other activity was like it. To project one’s soul into some gracious form, and let it tarry there for a moment; to hear one’s own intellectual views echoed back to one with all the added music of passion and youth; to convey one’s temperament into another as though it were a subtle fluid or a strange perfume; there was a real joy in that...”
10. Ibid., 47.


15. Indeed, it becomes clear in Pater’s subsequent paragraphs that he has unproblematically accepted, at this earliest point in his intellectual career, the Shakespearean (and Platonic) compromise that separating “love” from “love’s use,” accepts love while resigning sex. While this should come as no big surprise, given the cultural prohibition against same-sex acts together with Pater’s cautious personality—what is surprising is the evidence of Pater’s later relationship with Hardinge—it does add to the representational difficulties I have already described. For it means that Pater is not describing a homosexual character so much as he is describing a character with sublimated same-sex desire and it means that at the heights of sublimation there is often little trace of same-sex desire, one of the reasons, to be sure, that it is possible to read Pater and to miss the same-sexuality and one of the reasons, no doubt, that those self-identified heterosexual men who enjoy Pater’s sublimated “style” resist efforts to desublime it and even militate against them. And this additional difficulty is itself further compounded by the fact that Pater not only accepts sublimation but actually values sublimation, or, more properly perhaps, “askesis,” as one of the special virtues of the character before him.


17. Ibid., 491. My emphasis.

18. As Nussbaum points out, “Locke has, of course, an altogether different view from Plato’s about the relationship between intellect and bodily sense-perception, but he is no more charitable to the passions and their role in the search for truth” (489).

19. In “Winckelmann” Pater makes a careful distinction between two Platons: “The modern most often meets Plato on that side which seems to pass beyond Plato into a world no longer pagan, based on the conception of a spiritual life. But the element of affinity that he presents to Wincklemann is that which is wholly Greek and alien from the Christian world, represented by that group of brilliant youths in the Lysis, still uninfected by any spiritual sickness, finding the end of all endeavour in the aspects of the human form, the continual stir and motion of a comely human life” (82).

20. Walter Hamilton, Introduction to The Symposium by Plato (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1951), 26. Here is Hamilton’s translation of the penultimate passage of Diotima’s speech: “When a man, starting from this sensible world and making his way upward by a right use of his feeling of love for boys, begins to catch sight of that beauty, he is very near his goal. This is the right way of approaching or being initiated
into the mysteries of love, to begin with examples of beauty in this world, and using
them as steps to ascend continually with that absolute beauty as one's aim, from one
instance of physical beauty to two and from two to all, then from physical beauty to
moral beauty, and from moral beauty to the beauty of knowledge, until from knowl-
dge of various kinds one arrives at the supreme knowledge whose sole object is that
absolute beauty, and knows at last what absolute beauty is” (94).

Linda Dowling has observed that Pater’s phrase is his own coinage and emphasizes
its significance. I think, however, that she underestimates its theoretical significance,
in part because of the way she translates the Greek. Looking ahead to a passage in
“Winckelmann,” where Pater recontextualizes the phrase—“as if the mind of one,
lover and philosopher at once in some phase of pre-existence—ψιλοσφήνας ποτὲ μετ
ἐρωτικῆς, fallen into a new cycle”—Dowling understandably takes Pater’s “lover and
philosopher at once” to be his own proleptic translation of the phrase that soon fol-

22. This is the argument of my doctoral dissertation, “Mona Lisa’s Modernity:
Queer Theories through Pater and Freud.”
Repr. in English Critical Essays: Nineteenth Century, Edmund D. Jones, ed. (Oxford:
25. Foucault, 61.
26. Both Dellamora and Dowling observe the verbatim repetition of lines. The
point that I mean to draw out is the psychosexual one, namely, that the encounter with
Coleridge forced the ideas into the critical unconscious and that the encounter with
Wincklemann enabled the return of the repressed.
1998), l. 251a.
Hoagland, ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 126. It is perhaps also worth men-
tioning in this regard, without exactly venturing the essentialist argument, some re-
cent research that has suggested that men with higher testosterone levels think more spatially. See the writings of Helen Fisher.


31. Ibid., 481.


34. Phaedrus, Nichols, trans. ll. 253bc.

35. In a late essay on Raphael, published in the Fortnightly Review in 1892, just two years before his death, and reprinted, together with “Diaphaneité,” in the posthumous Miscellaneous Studies in 1895, Pater observes that “Raphael in his final period at Rome, exhibits a wonderful narrative power in painting” and defines that power as “the power of developing a story in a picture, or series of pictures,” later remarking that “Henceforward Raphael will be able to tell a story in a picture, better, with a truer economy, with surer judgment, more naturally and easily than anyone else” (MS 32–33).
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1. So heated is this exchange that it resists immediate explanation, and just what it says about the investment each has in Walter Pater specifically is even less perspicuous. I will speculate further on that investment below. The more pressing stake each has in contemporary “schools” of theory is unfortunately beyond the scope of this essay, though I believe it is ultimately related to their readings of Pater, and the problem of reading his work more generally. For the debate that includes explicit discussion of him, see Jonathan Loesberg, Aestheticism and Deconstruction: Pater, Derrida, and de Man (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991) and J. Hillis Miller’s article-length review of the book in Nineteenth-Century Prose (Fall 1993, 23–41). For an exchange that does not name Pater, but nevertheless takes up similar theoretical ground, see also Loesberg, “From Victorian Consciousness to an Ethics of Reading: The Criticism of J. Hillis Miller,” Victorian Studies (Fall 1993), 99–121, and Miller’s “Response to Jonathan Loesberg” in the same issue (123–28). Miller returns to his criticism of Aestheticism and Deconstruction in Topographies (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 291–93.


5. In *Masculine Desire*, Dellamora cannily glosses this question, and implicitly defends his methodology, at the outset of his reading of *The Renaissance*: “Can a set of technical revisions to a text stand in complementary relation to a hotly contested electoral campaign?” (147). As his next sentence indicates, his interpretation will answer in the affirmative.

6. Shuter, “The Outing of Walter Pater,” 491. He employs this methodological benchmark in assessing the relative merits of Dowling’s and Dellamora’s arguments, ultimately favoring Dowling for her “instructively tentative discussion” (496).


10. Ibid., 25.

11. Ibid., 25, 24.


15. Each of the episodes I examine has been considered by the critics I survey above; and of course, the “Conclusion” has been chronicled by many others as well. In that I highlight the relatively overlooked episode in “Two Early French Stories” added to the 1877 edition of *The Renaissance*, my reading works in the prominent shadow of Dellamora’s influential interpretation of that same material. See in particular *Masculine Desire*, 147–54.

17. Dellamora’s interpretation of this addition, in keeping with the broader thesis of his book, is that it is part of Pater’s radical effort to find a discursive space for masculine desire. I would not dispute that interpretation, per se, but would rather argue that such an effort is pursued by the mingled light of other motivations as well.

18. The figurative play of this “thread” and the trace of violence it both marks and effaces perhaps recalls the “thread of pure white light” that connotes Pater’s diaphanous type, that rare creature whose brilliance is both beautiful and “violen[1],” in whom “the idea appears softened, harmonized as by distance, . . . without the noise of axe or hammer” (“Diaphaneité,” 1864). Dowling’s reading of this essay in *Hellenism and Homosexuality* usefully considers its performative implications, especially Pater’s ambivalences throughout (81–84).

19. In Yeats’s eulogy to Lionel Johnson and Ernest Dowson, members of “The Tragic Generation” who were “decadents” in the most lurid sense of the term, he reflects on the seductive danger of Pater’s aestheticism: “it still seemed to me, as I think it seemed to us all, the only great prose in modern English, and yet I began to wonder if it, or the attitude of mind of which it was the noblest expression, had not caused the disaster of my friends. It taught us to walk upon a rope, tightly stretched through serene air, and we were left to keep our feet upon a swaying rope in the storm” (*Autobiographies* [New York: Macmillan, 1927], 372–73).

20. Notably, Pater’s discussion in this chapter is introduced by way of a reading, namely Goethe’s assessment of Winckelmann, which Pater in turn reads himself. The anecdote I will examine reasserts this readerly frame, as I discuss below.


22. Another rich site for examining Pater’s duplicitious angels is, of course, his chapter on Leonardo da Vinci. There the “bright animated angel of Leonardo’s hand” specifically “stuns” the artist’s teacher, who is conveniently named Verocchio (80). This story from Leonardo’s youth ostensibly serves as an example of his early genius, but the particular terms Pater uses to describe the event set into motion a complicated narrative and figural matrix throughout the chapter. For quick on its heels comes another youthful story—from Vasari, perhaps apocryphal—in which the artist paints a Medusa on a wooden shield to the “pretended astonishment” of his father (83). The words describing the two reactions share an etymological connection to the Old French root “estoner,” which specifically calls up the power Medusa’s severed head has to turn men to stone, and ushers in an art historical survey of Leonardo’s mature Medusa, his John the Baptist, a vampirically supernatural Mona Lisa, and a whole series of paintings Pater strangely but persistently refers to as “heads” (83, 90, 91, 95, 98). I would argue these figural negotiations further underscore the ambivalent function Pater’s “spirits” serve throughout *The Renaissance*, by turns felicitous (for they signal diaphanous genius and “beauty”) and dangerous (for they bring with them the “sense of death”).
23. By calling Archangeli an “efficacious spirit” for Winckelmann, I mean to offer a point that might be made of Pater’s work writ large. Put simply, felicitous spirits or angels in Pater’s figurations are almost always threatening or dangerous “counter-spirits” as well—and, more importantly, those figurations suggest a specific theory of language. William Wordsworth, whom Pater arguably considered the heir to Winckelmann’s renaissance spirit, provides a useful set of figures for understanding this duality. In fact, it is illuminating to read the many angels and animated (or personified) spirits in The Renaissance precisely in the light of Pater’s essay on Wordsworth (in Appreciations). In it, he characterizes Wordsworth’s poetic powers in suggestively sephatic terms. Citing Wordsworth’s figure of the “efficacious spirit” in Book XI of The Prelude, Pater appreciates the manner in which “a special day or hour even, comes to have for him a sort of personal identity, a spirit or angel given to it, [which] has presence in one’s history, and acts there, as a separate power or accomplishment” (Pater, 1986, 418, emphasis mine). Yet we may hear everywhere in Pater’s angelic invocations Wordsworth’s more ominous characterization of the poet’s relation to his work in “Essays Upon Epitaphs”: “Words are too awful an instrument for good and evil to be trifled with; they hold above all other external powers a dominion over thoughts. . . . Language, if it do not uphold, and feed, and leave in quiet, like the power of gravitation or the air we breathe, is a counter-spirit, unremittingly and noiselessly at work to derange, to subvert, to lay waste, to vitiate, and to dissolve” (The Prose Works of William Wordsworth, W. J. B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser, eds. 3 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974], 2: 84–85).

24. The Loesberg and Miller debate involves questions of critical method and “responsibility” that resonate with Pater’s readings in suggestive ways. Loesberg criticizes Miller’s “ethics of reading” in his Victorian Studies review essay, “From Victorian Consciousness to an Ethics of Reading: The Criticism of J. Hillis Miller” (37 [1993], 99–121). What Miller says about Derrida’s and de Man’s “method” for reading works of literature is that they do not provide one, per se. The context in which Miller makes this assertion suggests that it could extend to Pater as well: “‘Method’ is not the same as ‘exemplary acts of reading,’ which is what I would claim they do provide. You can learn quite a bit, to speak in litotes, about how to read by reading Derrida and de Man. . . . I am obliged to try to read as well as they do. This does not mean reading as they do. I must read for myself, as they do” (“Is Deconstruction an Aestheticism?” 24–25).